

**BOARD OF SUPERVISOR'S MEETING  
PINE TREE WATER CONTROL DISTRICT**

Monday, June 16, 2025

6:00 P.M. Following the Landowners Meeting

**AGENDA**

- 1. Call to Order**
- 2. Consent Agenda**
- 3. Approval of Minutes**
  - a. Board of Supervisors Meeting April 14, 2025
  - b. Financial Report
- 4. Attorney's Report**
- 5. Management Report**
  - a. Roads update
  - b. Engineer
  - c. Chris Wallace-District Procedures
  - d. Review of Budget for Year Ending 09-30-2025 and proposed  
Budget for 2026-2026
  - e. Set TRIM for 2025-2026 \_\_\_\_\_
- 6. Board Comments**
- 7. Next Meeting**
  - a. Next Regular Board Meeting 08/18/2025
- 8. Adjourn**

**MINUTES  
PINE TREE WATER CONTROL DISTRICT  
SPECIAL SUPERVISORS MEETING  
HELD TUESDAY, APRIL 14, 2025  
AT WELLINGTON COMMUNITY CENTER – GRAND BALLROOM  
12150 FOREST HILL BOULEVARD, WELLINGTON, FLORIDA 33414**

Pursuant to the foregoing notice, a meeting was held for the Pine Tree Water Control District Board of Supervisors on Monday April 14, 2025 at 6:06 PM at Wellington Community Center – Grand Ballroom located at 12150 Forest Hill Boulevard, Wellington, Florida 33414.

|                       |                                                                                   |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Members present were: | Kerry Hitt, Chairman<br>Charles Brown, Supervisor<br>Ruben Ferrazzano, Supervisor |
| Others Present were:  | Jim Barnes-Village of Wellington                                                  |

**I. Call the meeting to order**

All right, it's six after six. We gave people a little bit extra time to get over just in case they didn't get the message. So I'm going to call the meeting to order at 6:06 PM. The meeting was called to order by Kerry Hitt, Chairman, on Monday, April 14, 2025 at 6:06 pm.

**II. Pledge of Allegiance**

Everyone stood for the Pledge of Allegiance.

**III. Consent Agenda**

Next is the consent agenda and we need to make two additions. Before we do that, one is I'm going to change around and have Eric, the engineer go over an issue that we're having with the squiggly on Deer Path.

The other is we can do this later but we're going to change. I've become aware that there are some issues in Rustic Ranches that deal with recreational vehicles and horse trailers. I've talked with Jim Barnes and found out that we are more heavily regulated in Rustic Ranches than actually they are in Wellington and we need to address that. We need to ask the City Council if they would change that to accommodate the people who are here seasonally, who use RV's for their groom quarters and that sort of thing. Right now, the regulations that are there only allow a two week stay.

Eric is going to address the issue we're having in the squiggly, then we'll discuss the situation with the RV's. So with those changes motion made and second to consent the agenda.

Kerry Hitt reported we have an issue with the squiggly off Deer Path right by Terry's place. We've looked at it a couple of times. We've had it fixed at one point in time and it just kind of keeps washing away. I met with Eric and he is going to come up with a solution to do a permanent repair. Hopefully we don't have the issue again or as permanent as we can get.

The Board consented agenda with change.

#### IV. Engineers Report

Eric Grainger, engineer said as Kerry mentioned we met out there to take a look at this to see what kind of shape it's in since the last time it was worked on. It was done more recently than when COVID started so around 2022 or 2023 when a lot of things were going on. There are now two areas that have eroded pretty notably and one of them is a repeat from the previous area. So what we're going to do is put together a standard cross section that will put together an actual combination of stand and other hardy materials that will not be subject to erosion, including some erosion mat material. And then we'll get some bids from contractors to take a look and see what the cost will be to implement that at least in those two sections. We may choose to do the section that's in between the two sections that eroded because the worse it gets, the more of a problem it becomes. It just continues to wash soils and other aggregate materials in the canal. So that's the crux of what we looked at today. I'm going to put together before the next meeting a standard section and something that can be bid in price by contractors so that we can get a handle on what the budget would be for the repair and the longer term solution. That's essentially it regarding the canal. Does anybody have any questions or any concerns about that?

Chris Wallace asked can you do during the rainy season or do you have to wait until fall again?

Eric Grainger said No, it can be done any time of year. That canal there at certain times obviously when it's quite full, but because it's a large canal, it's really oversized for what it's needed. Someone asked if it was a canal or a squiggly and Eric responded yeah it's a squiggly, I'm calling it a canal, but essentially it's where the squiggly is. These sections are more where it's defined canal. It's probably about eight or ten feet wide at its base and there are some side slopes but then it narrows down and it continues in that squiggly orientation. I just don't want it to wash out as soon as you put it up.

#### V. Engineers Report

Kerry Hitt reported we have an issue with the squiggly off Deer Path right by Terry's place. We've looked at it a couple of times. We've had it fixed at one point in time and it just kind of keeps washing away. I met with Eric and he is going to come up with a solution to do a permanent repair. Hopefully we don't have the issue again or as permanent as we can get.

Eric Grainger, engineer said as Kerry mentioned we met out there to take a look at this to see what kind of shape it's in since the last time it was worked on. It was done more recently than when COVID started so around 2022 or 2023 when a lot of things were going on. There are now two areas that have



eroded pretty notably and one of them is a repeat from the previous area. So what we're going to do is put together a standard cross section that will put together an actual combination of stand and other hardy materials that will not be subject to erosion, including some erosion mat material. And then we'll get some bits from contractors to take a look and see what the cost will be to implement that at least in those two sections. We may choose to do the section that's in between the two sections that eroded because the worse it gets, the more of a problem it becomes. It just continues to wash soils and other aggregate materials in the canal. So that's the crux of what we looked at today. I'm going to put together before the next meeting a standard section and something that can be bid in price by contractors so that we can get a handle on what the budget would be for the repair and the longer term solution. That's essentially it regarding the canal. Does anybody have any questions or any concerns about that?

Chris Wallace: Can you do during the rainy season or do you have to wait until fall again?

Eric Grainger said No, it can be done any time of year. That canal there at certain times obviously when it's quite full, but because it's a large canal, it's really oversized for what it's needed. Someone asked if it was a canal or a squiggly and Eric responded yeah it's a squiggly, I'm calling it a canal, but essentially it's where the squiggly is. These sections are more where it's defined canal. It's probably about eight or ten feet wide at its base and there are some side slopes but then it narrows down and it continues in that squiggly orientation.

Chris Wallace: I just don't want it to wash out as soon as you put it up.

Eric Grainger: We would make sure whatever process we use we'll make sure that you know there'll be some means of dewatering.

Chris Wallace: close down?

Eric Grainger: They'll do some temporary damming to control the water and we can even divert it. Because it's all on the same side of the bank so all the repair works happening on one side of slope.

Rebekah Urbina: I just wanted to see, could we have somebody just define what is the purpose and what is the squiggly for those of us who may be listening online don't know or new to this process?

Eric Grainger: Yeah, it provides north-south drainage through the connecting streets. So there are canals that go east-west that are much larger, but there needs to be a hydraulic inter connect from north to south. So this squiggly is just a very small canal. Whenever it gets to the streets, it's reduced to a pipe that goes under the road. In most cases 18 or 24 inch diameter pipes, but the section of the canal that runs along the properties is wider and it functions not only as a storm water storage area and retainage but it also provides conveyance for flow north to south. So it's really a minor canal that provides hydraulic balance between the east and west canals.

Kerry Hitt: Any other questions?



Ruben Ferrazzano: Yeah, I have a question. Are we going to be running some type of matting from one end to the other or just the repair itself?

Eric Grainager: We'll put a repair area definitely. And we're going to find out once we price it as, know, budget wise where it stands to do not only the two sections that are problematic, but the small section in between. And then also we'll figure out from there all the way to the roadway because it's a pretty good line.

Ruben Ferrazzano: All those jobs have to be bided?

Eric Grainger: Depends on how much they cost. The repair job's probably not, but if we take on a larger job to go all the way to the nearby road.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Well, eventually, I mean, I'm inclined to, let's say, let's get it fixed. Because eventually we're going to have to re-dig that canal, so do we wait until we get to that point of when we start digging them out is when we actually start thinking about ~ supporting the sides?

Eric Grainager: Well, right now what has happened is there are two sections where the canal slopes have failed.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Yeah, no, I've been out there.

Eric Grainger: Yeah, so they have to be dug out pretty quickly as part of a maintenance obligation. So depending on the scope and the cost of that, if we can do the maintenance and the section in between, we would do all that at the same time. If the project starts to become too large in terms of getting all the way down to Deer Path Road, then we would bid that out as a competitive bid process because it's a bigger project. So right now we're just looking to get a bid on that we're going look at the repair in this whole section, but I suspect that section, because it's pretty long, would turn it into a bigger project for sure.

Ruben Ferrazzano: But is that what we're going to deal with now, or just the repair?

Eric Grainger: The repair for now, at a minimum.

Kerry Hitt: Jenny?

Jenny Carlson: Question, as a repair to this squiggle versus like the squiggle that you guys just approved for them to just put a tube in it, is the repair something that will continually have to be done into different portions? Like is putting the tube in like you guys agreed to on the other section when somebody requested a more permanent solution that we would never have another failure of the bank?

Kerry Hitt: Well, it could, but the cost of doing that just that small section is over \$300,000, around \$300,000. So.

Jenny Carlson: Okay, that's what I don't understand because like the other approval there was no information.

Eric Grainger: what you're referring to is at 16552, 16552 Norris is where we actually approved the installation of drainage manholes, catch basins and pipes that go underground for a few hundred feet. And that's a structured replacement of what's there for a drainage canal right now, which it's not really a canal, it's just a squiggly section. And so that project, like he said, was over \$300,000 worth of construction work. So if we do the same in this area and even beyond, it's obviously equal to that and more, because it's a larger area in total.

Kerry Hitt: And that's only the depth of the lot from Norris to the main south canal. Ruben Ferrazzano: yeah, about 700 feet.

Kerry Hitt: So was... Yeah, around 700 feet. The reason for him, the reason for him doing that, had other things he's doing in terms of building and developing the property and that was, you know, it's worth it for them to do that.

Jenny Carlson: But... just didn't understand the magnitude of that option.

Kerry Hitt: Oh, absolutely. Good question. There was a lot involved in doing it.

Eric Grainger: Right.

Kerry Hitt: So that's all done and approved and they're moving on with it. So, okay. Any other questions?

Eric Grainger: so, yeah, so just to quickly touch on, I did mention that other property has now, we final approved, took care of all the conditions. Everything's been resolved on that, so that's moving forward. And then at 16754 Norris, there was a permit issued by Wellington, but we still have some paperwork on our end that needs to be finalized. So I reached out to the owner today, advised them of what's going on. I hope to hear back from them by tomorrow so we can get the paperwork started on that other property. That's the only other one right now. All right.

Charles Brown: It's not permitted, is it? It's not permitted as a party venue. It's permitted as a single family residence.

Kerry Hitt: This is a different property.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Which property are you talking about? The one next door?

Eric Grainger: No, so the one I just mentioned 16754 is on the same street. They recently did a outdoor barn. Some other structures are on the site that are fairly new. The city gave them a permit. The city neglected to send them to us to do our paperwork. So we're working on that.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Okay.

Kerry Hitt: I didn't want to hold you up. No problem. We'll get that and let's jump back to the agenda. Next would be approval of minutes. Have you had an opportunity to go through the minutes?

Ruben Ferrazzano: Yeah, I went through the minutes. Don't have an issue with it.



Kerry Hitt: I can second that. You want to make a motion?

Ruben Ferrazzano: No, you make the motion.

Kerry Hitt: Okay, well we'll make a motion that the minutes be approved as they are.

Ruben Ferrazzano: I second it. I second it.

Kerry Kitt: Betty, you want to give the financial report?

Betty Camplin: Okay, the financial report is from January 20, 2025 to April 11, 2025. As you can see up top, we started off with \$416,821.55 in the money market account and \$5,000 in the checking. We transferred funds from the money market to the operating to pay all the bills below. We received \$29,135.74 from Palm Beach County. So I'm not gonna read all the...vendors but you can see the amounts there and it leaves us with a grand total checking in money market of four hundred twenty two thousand forty two dollars and ninety seven cents.

Kerry Hitt: Anybody have any questions? I do not. I'd to move on. ~

Roads, ~ guess is what we'll do next. you want to take the reins at this point?

Jim Barnes: So just to update the board, we had our meeting last week related to the roads and presented the typical section and estimates in our review of the HSQ report. So based on the very informal survey that was part of that meeting and some folks also answered after the meeting and I've got to check the total quantities but roughly 75, 25, 75 % of the respondents on the survey were in favor of paving. Of course, it was a very simple survey. For those that took it, it didn't go into a whole lot of detail. That was just to get a gauge for the, you know, where the crowd was in terms of the attendees, both online and in person. ~ As we mentioned in that meeting and presented to the whole board here together this evening, is, you know, we can...go as slow as you guys want us to go, but we can also certainly accelerate some parts of it knowing that there's a desire if the board decides to move forward as do the residents if they decide to move forward. That there are some things we can speed up a little bit, but there are still some things that, you know, still takes nine months to make a baby no matter how many guys you put on the job. So basically when you look at it in terms of the amount of time it's going to take for design and the amount of time it's going to take for construction, the place where you look at ~ speeding up the process a little bit would be upfront. And so normally as we had proposed it was going to be an assessment project ~ and that assessment project you know there's a lot of advanced work that has to happen to set up the assessment whether regardless of whether it's a special district assessment or a Village of Wellington assessment. And so one of the ways to be able to ~ reduce the amount of time up front, the lead time up front, would be ~ if the district, based on the existing inter-local agreement that you all could modify with the village, could go ahead and authorize the design component, knowing that it's still going to take a little bit of time to get the engineers on board. It's still going to get a little bit of time to negotiate the contract with them, to come back to the board and present that to the board for approval. That could be something that if that's done in advance of a true assessment where the board is using existing district funds to fund that portion of the work, then that



would be a component of the work where we could save some time and reduce the total time frame it takes to do that. And assuming that that's the desire of the residents and the board, while that's happening, we could be working on a longer term permanent assessment, again, if that's where we end up, knowing that there's not a commitment...on any part of that until so when you authorize the design, let's just assume in round numbers, you we talked about ~ even whether there was disagreement or agreement on the numbers, we wanted to make sure we didn't, we don't want to come in low. You know, the last thing you want to do is have your estimate be the low bid. But you know, you want to have it somewhere where it's at some reasonable order of magnitude given that there's no design plans in place. And so our estimate, our low number was around 6 million for a total that included design that included construction administration and everything else if you assume really at that number. The design value could be even not even 10 percent, but you could assume 5 or 6 percent that you'd be in the design cost, engineering design cost of roughly \$300,000 to \$400,000 including additional survey because you need to do the whole survey of all the easements as well as additional geotechnical that's done not only in advance of the design but during construction as well. So that would include all that geotechnical as well. That's a safe number to make a decision if you want to try and handle that design portion up front as a board. And again, it's not that you're just signing a blank check saying here's 400,000, come back when you're done. We would have to come back, show you the information from the engineer, what their proposal was, how we were able to negotiate. You still would have to approve that. But that'd be a way to reduce that timeframe. But then generally speaking after that, we expect that that design could take anywhere from six to eight months, including potentially some permitting that we would still have to do. So that's the wild card in that time frame. may take a little bit longer. If we get permitting done more quickly, it could be a little bit shorter. And then construction, think Jonathan Reinsvold, village engineer, estimated the construction to be probably 12 to 18 months, depending on timeframe and how, you can't take the entire place and totally take it out of commission by doing all the paving. So you'd have to stage it so that you still had access throughout the community. So that's kind of a 10,000 foot view of what we presented at the meeting. Still looking at a typical section that was in the report you've got existing 60 foot easement you would look at ~ two 10 foot travel lanes and the typical section looked at a swale a larger swale on one side a bridle path and limited swale on the other side to move drainage along and that bridle path would also have a like a three board fence like a typical bridle path section that you have in the balance of the village that's a typical section that we looked at.

Kerry Hitt: The permitting is that south Florida?

Jim Barnes: Yes sir water yes sir okay

Chris Wallace: I feel the estimates, both estimates, that the 6 million and the 9 million are kind of low. And I think that there's going to be an additional cost to the landowners individually, not part of this paving or non-paving. If they change the grade of that road, their properties may end up filling up with water and not really have a way to drain. It'll probably, if you only do one side of the road, whatever side that will be, will have the problem of drainage. And that would be at a cost that would just be handled by the individual owner and not part of the whole project.



Jim Barnes: So I'm not sure what the question is, but I'll try and just speak to the topic that you brought up. Ultimately, the final design, even the conceptual design, isn't really in place. We just have a typical section. So the engineer is going to have to take all the different driver connections in consideration when they design that and they're not going to.

Chris Wallace: Yeah, but if they have to add, if you have to, like if your property, let's say each five acres is roughly around 300 feet. If you have to fill that up to make a grave, so your property will drain that's going to be your expense as a homeowner or a property owner.

Jim Barnes: I can't speak to it since we don't have a design, but like I said, so as I was starting to say Would you what the engineers going to do is not design it so that the project or adjacent property isn't draining properly that the design for the roadway will have to accommodate not only the roadway drainage but also potentially, you know any kind of impacts that are caused as a result of the intervening culvert crossings in the driveways. It's no different than if we're paving and repaving the areas along Forest Hill or any of other main thoroughfares in town is that we can't just assume that we're going to do whatever we're going to do on the thoroughfare and leave the adjacent driveway, whether you've got the apron coming in to tie into the existing roadway, unaddressed. So that would have to be addressed as part of the design. Since we don't have the design, I can't speak to the details of that.

Chris Wallace: Yeah, it also seems as though you're kind of favoring, or whoever did the planning originally there, is favoring only doing a bridle path on one side instead of both. Now that could make a difference for some people. Whether you're on it and you don't want it, or you're off of it and you do want it. That may make a difference to you. So who was going to have the final decision on the design?

Jim Barnes: Ultimately, it be the residents and ultimately through the board.

Chris Wallace: Well, that would be just the residents and not a board decision.

Jim Barnes: Well, I can't take 300 or 500 or 200 people's input. There's have to be some group that's going to make a final determination. And ultimately, think if the board is taking the lead on it, particularly from a design perspective, certainly, hopefully, they would be able to take the feeling of the residents. Otherwise, I'd have 300 different designs because everybody's going to want a different concept for their particular access point onto their respective roadway.

Chris Wallace: I'm going by what ~ was found out years ago when we first did an original look into this and they said at that time the estimated cost would be a million dollars a road so that would make us six million dollars. I'm thinking more along the lines of it will end up costing more like \$12 million to do this project.

Jim Barnes: Yeah, I don't know. And you know, if you may have better information than I do, so ultimately I'd wait for the engineers to actually come up with an estimate when they have plans.

Chris Wallace: I'm going back to 2017.

Jim Barnes: Yeah, and I'm not familiar.



Chris Wallace: I'm sure things have gone up since ~

Jim Barnes: 100%. I mean, the old numbers used to be easy. You could build a mile or road for a million bucks. And now it's probably around \$3 million starting from scratch for a roadway so for sure but I would say that the numbers are really tough to rely on until you actually have a set of design plans and then at that point it's still ultimately going to be a time and place kind of commodity that contractors if there's a lot of work out there you'd be paying a lot more for this job if you happen to hit the market right when some contractors have finished projects and they still haven't gotten new ones on the books you'll get a better price.

Chris Wallace: How much ~ information will we have before the final vote?

Kerry Hitt: You'll have all the information. We're going to do all the engineering. If I may interject, just, bottom line, what we're here tonight for is say, okay, you've had the meeting, people have talked about it. ~ It looks like most of the people that have been surveyed come back and say, yes, it's gonna be a good thing, lots of different reasons. And at this point, it's not the reasons that we're looking at this point is saying, is it go or no go? Are we going to do this or not? And at this point, ~ we want input from people, but I think the time to address the questions that you have are when we're farther down the road and we're looking at the actual design. Right now, can't, it's like Jim said, we don't know. ~ I'm sure an engineer is going to use good engineering practices or the firm is going to use good engineering practices and they're going to do this to be able to drain water. After all, that's what it's really all about as terms of Pine Tree, is draining the water. So I'm pretty confident that all that's going to be taken into consideration. We have a couple more questions. Actually, in the back was first, and then I'll come over here, Mauricio.

Hollow Tree Lane, Mary Schultz: Assuming that the trails will, I mean the swales will be on the side where the fire hydrants are because you can't put horse trails and have a fire hydrant in the middle.

Kerry Hitt: Again, all that taken into consideration.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Yeah. Most likely you're probably right. Oh, sorry. I believe the power poles and the lines, everything's on in the way.

My name is Mauricio. I'm a five-year farm owner of Rustic Ranches. And mostly, I like to address the board. There might be some questions or commentary from Jim. But ~ as a matter of context for those who are online or kind of newer residents, ~ I wanted to follow up on the Village of Wellington recent meeting about paving our roads. And again, I'm addressing mostly the board, a project that could transform our community for the better. The limestone dust on our roads is just not an inconvenience anymore. It's a matter of a health hazard for residents and our horses. It damages vehicles and is holding our community back. I'm asking for your leadership, the board leadership to move forward, to move this forward. And I have a few urgent requests, actually six of them. This is gonna take about three minutes. First, as a matter of context, I wanna make sure that everybody knows that I sent a letter to the board a couple of days ago with a request of motion. So this is some sort of a summarized version of what that letter entailed.



Number one, I want to ask the board to put a motion on today's agenda to fast track a community vote on Wellington's paving proposal. We need to know if the residents support this plan so we can act quickly. Time is critical to keep the momentum going and address these ongoing issues. The Pine Tree Water District infrastructure does not allow for the funding and collection of funds for this project. And the Pine Tree Water District infrastructure does not allow for the management and the experience required to carry this project. We're all volunteers, you guys and us the people of a paving committee. The village has the infrastructure to make this happen, we don't.

Second, the cost ~ is a big concern for homeowners. I mean, Chris just talked about it. Cost is a big issue right here. The Wellington plan looks solid, but we need to keep assessments affordable. So I urge you to ensure either, our paving committee, our board, or both directly involve in the bidding and selection process of all vendors. That way we can secure the best prices and avoid, sorry Jim, avoid Wellington having full control in making unilateral decisions, which I think is pretty much in line with what Jim is saying, making the project fair and cost effective for everyone. I want to make a stop here and let you know that since Wednesday, some of the owners have reached out to me with very interesting proposals ~ about contractors that they know that from a pricing perspective are more aligned with the study that we paid for initially. As a matter of fact, part of this committee, and again, as a matter of context, the paving committee has been in place for about a year and a half. ~ Part of the work that we have done has been an engineering report that was close to \$20,000 that we all paid for. And as part of that process, we also actually involved a couple of contractors in the paving industry, specifically Ranger, if I'm not mistaken. And I have to report to the people here, the people online, as well as Jim, that the prices that were quoted by them, including the design, some initial sketches of the design, and the paving are drastically different than the figures that we heard last Wednesday. So that is a concern. We have to have the mechanisms, the team of people in between the village, the board, and the paving committee to bridge what it seems to be a seven figure dollar gap between the estimation of the village and our initial estimates. Let me finish and then I can open the floor. Four more points to go. We're almost done.

Number three. I want us to get the board to provide a clear financial picture. And what I'm asking for and what I ask on that letter was for some type of balance sheet or P & L document to show what the budget is going to look like once the roads are, once the project is completed, including the paving. This is to assess the current expenses. This is to assess how the current expenses of road maintenance may be diminished, may drop. And I'm also asking the board to consider the sale of the equipment that we acquire as a community to do the grading of the roads ourselves. That is, if I understand correctly, a tractor and a grater. ~ I also want us to consider, again, this is another resident reaching out to me after Wednesday, specifically asking me to see if we can have the assessments that we're going to be assessed as a community to be deducted from our tax bill and specifically the tax portion that goes to the county. As a matter of context, the taxes that we pay, there's a percentage, I believe 12 or 14 % that goes to the village and-



The majority of the rest goes to the county. So maybe we can, again, this is just a resident asking to us for procure ~ potentially a discount or a zero sum game when it comes to the assessments with the county.

Number four, and on this one I want to thank Mr. Burke for bringing this to the attention during last meeting, last Wednesday. I consider this a big issue. ~ I don't know how many of you were in Wellington 20 or 25 years ago, whenever the big flood happened, but I was. 2012, but I was. I was not at Rustic Ranches, but I was in Wellington and impacted the entire community. I didn't know the extent of the impact in Rustic Ranches. Burke has been very vocal about it and I want to thank you for that because we cannot ignore the flood risk. The water treatment facility west of Rustic Ranches, if I understand correctly, sits higher, at a higher elevation than Rustic Ranches. And that is full of water. ~ heavy rains, like what we saw 20 years ago, could literally swamp our land, our homes, our arenas, our barns. And Wellington's plan as I understood it last Wednesday, to re-engineer swales to drain water faster, not just to hold it like is the case right now mostly. It's a game changer. I'm asking you to back this work with the village, to work with the village and to procure not only the engineering of the swales, which is part of the project as I understood it from the village, but also to work with South Florida Water Management to boost the water flow that is allowed to basically release, protecting us from hurricanes and storms, and adding a layer of risk mitigation to our water management infrastructure.

Number five, we're almost done. I want to challenge the board and our community to think bigger. While we're digging up roads, why not partner with FPL and see if we can bury our power lines? Our outdated cables knock out power every storm. Burying them could keep our lights on and save us headaches down the line. Maybe the board and the paving committee can procure this, since we're going to be doing a lot of digging over the next couple of years if this moves forward. And then

Number six is kind of a piggyback on the ~ financials, which is to potentially in the forecast that I'm requesting from the board to do, to incorporate how the gas tax revenue to maintain the roads and bridle trails will be part of the overall picture in terms of the finances. In regards to the paving committee, I'd like to thank Henry, who's not here first time he misses a meeting in the 20 year history of the community or 40 year, whatever the case may be. I want to thank Henry. I want to thank Sam and Regina Cohen, ~ Charlie, ~ and our new members of the committee, the Carlson's, Jenny and Ryan, and Michael Sinachewski. There are also two more members of the community who have reached out to me who want to be part of a paving committee. ~ Carl and Aldo. They have both demonstrated interest so I will confirm with both of them surely. ~ Whoever wants to be part of the committee, the committee I think can be welcomed with open arms. ~ I encourage everybody to be part of the Rustic Ranch's Facebook page which is open to anybody. There is also a WhatsApp group for landowners only. I encourage you to be part of that group as the committee may elect to disseminate certain information for landowners only. I'm here because I want to be part of the solution, not the problem. The Paving Committee is ready to work with you, the board, and with you, Wellington, to make this happen. Please add these motions today and let's fast track a safer and stronger Rustic Wrenches. Thank you.

Kerry Hitt: You want to start?



Jim Barnes: Sure. ~

Kerry Hitt: You want to address them item by item? First of all, thank you. I appreciate that. I know a lot has gone into it. I know that you have put a lot into the road committee. Everybody on the committee has, I think, done a great job in not only putting together the numbers and trying to do this for the community. But also in working with Wellington and we want to maintain a good relationship because we really need, we can't do this by ourselves. We're totally aware of that. The fact that Wellington's willing to step up and do this, I think is great. ~ I have saying I like to say all of us are smarter than one of us so we can put our heads together and try to make this thing obviously cost is the main issue. I mean if there weren't a cost we would have the roads paved already you know and so I'd like to ~ I'd like to continue moving forward a lot of what you said in here I have to agree with ~ there's some things I don't know if they mesh with what we're doing we sort of have to sort of our battles you know, and ~ maybe we can take a look at it and break it down and it won't all be done this evening for sure, I know. ~ So let me just kind of close up with, in terms of this evening, what we're looking to do is, I believe at this point, is decide whether we're gonna fast track and move forward and spend the money to get to the next step, which hopefully, we could have done by June ~ and then maybe at that time we can do the vote to see if we're going to move on and spend the rest of the money. So with that...

Jim Barnes: And to clarify that, technically, until June, even though you're taking a vote of some way tonight, you're not going to come out of pocket with anything because no work is going to happen beyond what the staff is doing and we don't charge you for our time. So just a decision to move forward tonight and knowing that I've told you generally what we expect that engineering number to be for the outside consultant, is going to allow us to at least get started, get the consultants on board, negotiate a scope and fee with them that we can bring back to you and the committee and the residents to review and approve and also then hopefully, if you choose to move forward to the June meeting, you would authorize the amendment to the inter-local agreement to add that to the scope of work that the village provides to Pine Tree. ~

Charles Brown: Just to clarify.

Jim Barnes: Yes, ~

Charles Brown: I think you've made this point before. But your decision tonight to fast track is not a nine million dollar decision.

Jim Barnes: It's not even a ~ There i mean it's ~

Charles Brown: On the issue of several off ramps.

Jim Barnes: Correct.

Charles Brown: In this process.

Jim Barnes: Correct starting now it's ball rolling certainly start now and



Charles Brown: Then at any point in time we can say no that's that that's what you're whatever

Jim Barnes: And then while you're making an initial commitment that's kind of like you know what we're promising to go dating and but the date doesn't happen to at least June and at that point you can still decide that I'm not as good looking as I was and I've set up my profile online and you want to bail out. So that's basically the approach that we're looking at. I'm basically taking you guys at your word that you want to move forward. You'll get started with the engineers at no cost basically to get the proposal from them, negotiate a scope and a fee that we can come back and bring to you. That's the very first step in the process. It doesn't have a commitment yet or an outlay of any kind of the process. We would have to have the whole assessment process hammered out in place and started before we could even start the engineering process. So that's where we can save the time and some of the dollars.

Charles Brown: Because the commitment is so little downside risk, personally I don't know why you wouldn't do it.

Jim Barnes: And if I could hit a couple of the items in the letter. So specific to the cost, we don't like being the high bidder even when we're just estimates. And I kind of joke about that, but you don't want to be the low bidder, you want to be the high bidder. But we want to have our estimate make sense. And without plans, we have to assume the worst and hope for the best. I think hopefully we'll end up somewhere in the middle. I think without plans and just the contractors providing prices. We do it all the time too, just to get a kind of order of magnitude, get a feel for what the cost is. ~ It normally changes when you actually do a full competitive bid process. Sometimes they get you better prices, but they also have a list of requirements they have to meet, whether they do it for Pine Tree or whether they do it for the Village, because as a public entity, they've got to provide bonds. You don't want a contractor that starts a job into the middle of job, either goes belly up or decides to walk off or some other issue happens and they don't factor in cost of the bonds because it's public work so you have to be able to complete the project otherwise you guys should be left with a half-finished roadway. ~ They have to have the appropriate levels of insurance that more than they normally would for say if they're working on your driveway or on your property in a lot of cases. So those are the things that jack up the cost of the work. But we're hopeful that really the number is somewhere in the middle. We don't know and we won't know until we actually go through and to speak to Mr. Brown's off-ramps, in the design. Let's say we agree in June to move forward. The board permits to move forward with the village and there's an agreement for that consulting engineering fee of let's say \$400,000. It's around 6 % number of the total construction value that we estimated on the low side. those plans generally come in thirty sixty ninety percent plans and you've got a hundred percent final plans that are ~ submitted ~ for bidding at any point if the thirty percent plans don't remotely even come close to a number that we think is reasonable, you guys can pull the plug and the only expense you've had is not the entire \$400,000, it's just what took you to the 30 % plan set, which normally would be your survey, some geotechnical, and the basic engineering design. And you've got two more off-ramps before you get to the final bid. And then even, and you hate to do this, but even at the final bid, let's say you've expended the entire design cost, but the numbers come in crazy, you have multiple options to one, still not do the project and wait for a more favorable bidding climate and you already have the plans done. Generally the rules don't change that much over time but you've got a lot of changes that you need to make to the



plans. Or you could go ahead and look at alternates to that bid. You know, if it, I and I'm not saying this is the desire of the board or the desire of the residents, but if you've got the best-case scenario, typical section you have with a roadway, two swales, the bridle trail everything else crammed in there if you reduce that to just the roadway and the swale, the roadway and the bridle. There's a lot of alternates you can look at and then decide if it's still worth it based on the project scope and the cost. There are a lot of different offering to use that. Specific to the drainage, we will have to re-permit. Go through the water management district to re-permit the road work. That's part of that process. We certainly would want to look at any opportunities to Mr. Aubry's point as far as just being able to improve the drainage overall in Rustic Ranches. And that ties to one, improving certainly how water is conveyed through the swales. But the other thing is no matter how good it's flowing through the swale it's only going to be able to recover based on how much is being discharged into the SDA's and that's a function of South Florida permit as well. Hopefully, we approach them to look hopefully look at re-permitting it would increase that discharge rate so it doesn't sit in the swales as long, which correspondingly then doesn't sit on your properties as long. But South Florida controls the spigot and how fast the water goes out of that spigot at the end of the system. So we would have to look at trying to get that re-permitted. And this would be as opportune time to do that as any. But ultimately, they still hold that permit requirement. And then as far as the timing, think, again, I've outlined I think where we could save some of that time work time frame and ultimately ~ we're basing you're the client, the residents are the client, the board's the client, we're just the tool you're using to get this project completed.

Kerry Hitt: Thank you. ~

Chris Wallace: I'm a little bit concerned about that. Mauricio, I think you did a great job. You looked up and very eloquently spoke. But I am not one of those people that is for paving the road. I think we should leave it the way it is. I love the wildlife. I've been here since the 80s. And I've seen so many things disappear. I've seen the quail disappear, the foxes, the bobcats. A lot of things have disappeared that was part of the reason that I moved here. It wasn't the only reason, but it was part of the reason that I moved here. I'm not going to be here in 20 years. I'm just that old. I do think that any time we did try to change it to make it better for progress, it all just fell down the drain. And the decision to go further with the plan to look into, it sounds like that's already, ~ I don't really want to say pre-decided, but close to pre-decided. Maybe that's a better way. Also, you would have bids. They're not going to be friends of friends that are contractors. We'll have to put in a bid and do a process of elimination that way. I hope you consider that too. You know? Be honest with you, I don't care about a little dust. It doesn't bother me. I have a vacuum. I have a housekeeper.

Charles Brown: There was a bobcat in my backyard yesterday,

Chris Wallace: Excuse me?

Charles Brown: There was a bobcat came down my paved driveway yesterday.

Chris Wallace: I would have loved to have it on my driveway, I don't really don't have a of dust, you know, but it's never bothered me. Okay. Somebody? Yeah, no way. In the back, he was first and then...



Sam Cohen, Rustic Road, 16738: So in regards to going forward, I just would like to clarify something. For my understanding, What is going to happen between now and June is that the city is going to, Wellington City, will gather the necessary professionals to make, to start to potentially make a plan for the design. Then in June we will vote on whether we should go forward with these potential professionals. To me, personally, I feel like the question that it begs the question, is there really a need for three months to figure that out and then make a vote if we're ready to figure out engineering? If it's possible that the city can gather these professionals in the next three weeks or so, is that not something the board can vote on to move forward? And that come June or the next meeting, we can actually, as a community, vote on something that's at hand, whether we go forward with a design or not. What I'm asking is, don't know if, you know, why is it going to take three months to get the professionals in line, then we make a vote to go forward with them, and then that will take another six months, right? So I'm trying to ask if the processes, if we can combine some of this so that we can keep this process moving forward.

Jim Barnes: I can answer that. That's a great question. Yeah, it's not going to take us 90 days. We're going to be ready. It's just there's not another Pine Tree meeting. So let's say, let's assume I'll give myself an extra week if it takes us a month to get a consultant on board. And we're assuming that we're going to be under the threshold that requires us to go out to competitive solicitation for engineers. So we have annual consultants. We have three or four to pick from. And we basically will pick a consultant and negotiate a scope and fee. Let's just say that takes us about three to four weeks. Before I actually engage them, I need to make sure somebody has given me, I trust everybody, trust but verify, and I need to go ahead and make sure that somebody else has agreed from the Pine Tree Water Control District side and the Rustic side that we're authorized to move forward with that because I'll be entering through a contract, I being the village, so I need to make sure that I've got a corresponding agreement that says that there's a payment process.

Sam Cohen: Sure, that begs the question. So then that begs the follow-up question. If it is within a month or so, let's say, ~ then as part of the Paving Committee, we can potentially reach out to the board and have the board maybe either call ~ an extra meeting or the board makes the decision to move forward. But to wait until June just to have a vote on moving forward, to me is that Like we're losing people, people that are, you know, our neighbors are traveling, it's the summer, you know, it's off season. So that's just my, just my ~ two cents if we can try to keep that momentum moving forward.

Kerry Hitt: If I may interject, okay. We're on the same page. Perfect. Okay. So it's that June is the landholders meeting, ~ which is, It's voting, there's a whole lot that's happening in the June meeting. And so that's why we had set it up as that. Now, with all that being said, I don't see an issue with...holding a special meeting if that's what it would take. ~ We're using the term fast tracking tonight what we're gonna do is make a vote, take a vote. The vote that we're going to look at is based on. I guess survey, is that the right word?

Jim Barnes: Well, I think it's really more just giving the village direction to come back and we can come back at an interim time frame before your June meeting, working through the paving committee that then can come back to the board ~ with basically a time frame for scope and fee with the engineers and



also a modification to the inter-local, which is the basis by which you're able to contract with us to contract with the engineers.

Kerry Hitt: Yeah, how about we?

Jim Barnes: Well, I would even suggest that in that time frame as well, we work toward a more formal, informal vote, where we actually track it by, you through the tax roll, and either through the committee or some function of that committee, actually do an informal vote, but formally look at the tax roll and try and assure that we've got a majority of the residents.

Non-interpretable comment from the audience

Jim Barnes: Well that's why said we would do an informal formal vote using the tax roll. So just I need to interject for one second Mr. Hitt if I could just truth in advertising. We're here because we're invited. We're kind of like vampires. You don't want to us in and let in. But once we're in, we're going to help you as much as we can. But all I need to do, if you give me the high sign that you guys don't want, we're not here to force paving down anybody's throat. I feel like I need to say that. I need to say the other night, we're here because people want to pave. That's fine. they stay at Shell Rock Roads, we're good with that too.

Kerry Hitt: No, I agree. We do not.

Jim Barnes: There is not a Wellington agenda.

Sam Cohen: Can I make the final comment? My final comment and then somebody else can pass it on. I can pass it on to somebody else. ~ You know, I moved here in 2020 a very healthy person. I have just been diagnosed with something that is life changing. So. For those that have been living here for 20, 30 years, that's totally fine. You're able to poo poo the whole dust thing. But I'm telling you, you're sitting and staring and looking at somebody who's been personally affected by it with a life-changing medical condition. So go ahead. We all got personal reasons why we want to do something or why we don't want to do something. But I wanted to make sure that my personal health was mentioned in this discussion because it seems to me that everybody who doesn't want the paving is very okay with a little bit of dust. And to minimize it in that way, because you'd be living here for 20 years with no effects, I'd...God bless you and you should live 100 years that way. But I just wanted to make sure that you actually heard it from the person who has experienced an actual medical condition. Whether it's 100 % because of the dust who can say, but it definitely has had an effect on my life personally in a life-changing way. So I just want to put it out there that it is a real thing, whether it is for you personally or not. Anyways.

Kerry Hitt: If I could add, let me add to that. First of all, we didn't get your name, Betty didn't get it. Could you?

Sam Cohen: Sure. Sam Cohen. Did you get, do you need the address?

Kerry Hitt: Just name it. Okay, perfect. what I'd like to add to is, I don't know how much weight this carries, but the difference, what I believe is the difference in what the roads were when they were built, is they were built with shell rock. There is no more shell rock available. So what they're using now is a combination, I believe.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Like a bedrock.

Kerry Hitt: Like a bedrock, which I believe is the limestone. Yeah, and I think- That's what's been brought up as the health issue. And there's more dust because it gets pulverized more. There's more dust on these roads. We've been here since 2010. And I can say when we move down here compared to now, there's way more dust that's on the road. I think that's a legitimate thing and I think it's something that we need to look at in terms of what can we do to fix it.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Can I ask one more question? As far as paving of the roads, when and if we pave it, how does that impact Wellington's roads? As far as, you you're talking a lot of equipment coming in. So how do you deal with the damages that may or may not occur because of weight or whatever?

Jim Barnes: You're talking about just during the construction equipment?

Ruben Ferrazzano: During the construction, exactly.

Jim Barnes: Yeah, mean, there's going to be impact, but you know what? It's no different than the rest of the construction that happens throughout the rest of some constructions, they want the whole road, you know. There would be no requirement of that on Flying Cow.

Ruben Ferrazzano: OK.

Kerry Hitt: OK.

Jim Barnes: Or elsewhere. Yeah, we haven't.

Ruben Ferrazzano: OK, I just want to touch bases.

?: Formal or informal vote?

Kerry Hitt: I'm sorry, say again.

?: Formal or informal vote. How are we going to be doing the voting and who, how many people voted for the.

Kerry Hitt: understand and I believe to be fair about it, it needs to be a well organized ~ the vote, that is ~

Jim Barnes: we can share with the paving committee and the board and any of the residents to again the sample that we've used in other assessments that basically has the outline of the exact question that you're going to be deciding yes or no to ~ and then it's sent ~ to each ~ property owner verified



through the tax roll and ~ the information coming back would have to be notarized as a property owner.

Kerry Hitt: Yeah. I think that's a good control and I believe it would be property owners not residents.

Jim Barnes: That's correct.

Kerry Hitt: Okay. ~ have a question myself. Would it basically be property owners in terms of a partial of land or is it a per acre?

Jim Barnes: For the vote itself, it's really just a gauge interest and it's by property. So each unique property control number. So you might have a property owner that owns two adjacent properties. That would be two properties, two votes. Because ultimately the final cost allocation would happen by way of acreage. It's no different than the other places you look at it road frontage other places you look at acreage all depends acreage is just as well distributed to look at the total cost.

Kerry Hitt: So the final vote then you would think would be based on acreage?

Jim Barnes: No the final assessment allocation.

Kerry Hitt: The assessment ~ okay but the vote would be property?

Jim Barnes: That's right.

Kerry Hitt: See if everybody agrees, as I understand it, it's going to be one vote per property and a property could consist of five or more acres, whatever the parcel is.

Jim Barnes: That's correct.

Kerry Hitt: And if one person owned two parcels.

Jim Barnes: Two unique parcels.

Kerry Hitt: They would get two votes.

Jim Barnes: That's correct.

Kerry Hitt: Okay, all right. Is that what you're questioning? Okay, okay.

Burke Aubry: Jim, you stated that the vote was in favor for paving by 75 to 25%. What percentage of the landowners ~ participated?

Jim Barnes: I've got to check, but I want to say it's crazy. And we still have some votes that we haven't tallied, but that was like as of the end of the week last week. ~ We had, I'm going to say we had like 40 people here and maybe 15 people online. Only 30 votes came in.

Burke Aubry: OK, so those numbers are not scary. ~If, as you stated earlier, if we commit to paving the roads and we designate, as you stated, roughly \$400,000 for our engineering study, and we go 30, 60,

90, and we get in 30 % and we have an estimate of \$6 million, then we get in 60 % and the estimate goes up to \$8 million. These are just guestimates. If we invest 30 % of \$400,000, that's \$120,000 that the landowners are obligated for. Then we get into 60, it's 240,000. If the number goes up to \$800,000, \$8 million, and we've invested \$240,000 and we, and the people say, uh-uh, we're out. But then we're all on the hook for the 240.

Jim Barnes: For a design that's correct.

Burke Aubry: Yep. So it needs to be made. No, I think that before a invitation to make a vote,

Every scenario needs to be created and presented to every landowner. Because people don't, they're not gonna vote with full knowledge of what the consequences are gonna be unless they're presented with them. They don't come to these meetings, talking with my hands, they don't come to these meetings and very few of them are online. I mean, we got 15 landowners here, and we got 10 online, that's 25 out of 117. That's a really poor percentage to be spending or committing any effort to something that nobody's participating in. So I think all these things need to be considered before we go forward with anything else. We got a tax roll. Send certified letters to every landowner and give them a ~ response time. I mean, you know, we're still a free country, but we've got to have a commitment because we're talking about \$50,000 or more or less, whatever, per landowner or per parcel, per property control number. So if you have three, it's 150. If you have five, it's 250. And some people, some people, ~are going to be impacted by the amount this dollar amount some people will leave the community because it's destroying the nature of the community. Some people will be overly excited and can't wait to spend the money and race up and down our roads.

Kerry Hitt: Okay? Okay. I would agree with what you're saying, but we're not at that point. Tonight, the point that we're at is we're going to make a decision whether we want to move forward. And I think, I personally believe that all the indications from people that I've spoken with personally, the people that have gotten back to Jim, the people that are in here. I think that moving forward to the next step and Burke at that point, maybe the next step is the last one, we don't know. But we don't have any information to make decisions on and the only way we're going to have the information is to move forward, get the committee together and address this objectively and go from one step to the next step. We can't go from here to leap to say hey well we're not going to do it.

Burke Aubry: 25 % of the residents have committed one way or another. 25%.

Kerry Hitt: Okay so what you're saying is we should vote to not even go ahead? Is that what you're, I'm asking, that's the question.

Burke Aubry: I think we should send a certified letter with the intentions that every landowner and say, hey, are you in or are you out? These are the consequences.

Kerry Hitt: We don't know where we are until, let's say it comes in for a million dollars to do all of it.

Ruben Ferrazzano: What are the consequences?



Kerry Hitt: That's a, yeah. Yeah, I mean, at this point we're having to look at the consequences. We look at the issues and the dust is a big one. Health is huge. Property values are another. ~ We have people who are moving into the area. The whole area is changing. I know you've been here, you're one of the originals. You've been here for 40 years or more. And I understand that and other people understand that. But there are going to be people who want to do it and there are going to be people who are not going to want to do it. And things change. I mean, nobody's going to be happy. You can't make everybody happy.

Jim Barnes: For whatever it's worth to Mr. Aubry, one thing that I think, to Mr. Cohen's point, is basically in the time frame between now and that June board meeting where we're going to try and figure out what the cost of the engineering design is and before really any major authorization happens because like I said between now and then there's not going to be any expending of funds. Not to speak for our council but generally our council will want to see more than 25 percent of their residents supporting a project before they undertake an assessment. So as I've mentioned in prior meetings I think what you know other assessments and the Village have been through before is while there's no statutory requirement on what percentage we have to have at a minimum, councils want to see a majority. And generally speaking for what I'll call the ~early stages before there's actually even a major commitment of funds, they like to see probably like a two-thirds number. Only because as you go through the process, if for some reason a bunch of those folks decide, you know, man, I really, changed my mind, I don't like this process anymore, I don't like the project, if you're only doing 50 % plus one, you can drop below the majority real quick. So two-thirds is kind of a little bit of your hedging your bets to at least say that, hey, if it drops, you might still have a majority of the community supporting it. So they move forward committing that, they're going to want to see that as well. And I think your recommendation about a letter to all the tax roll folks, that's something we would want to do in that time frame in next 30 days, 45 days, to do that with the preliminary information. And that was what I referred to as like the informal formal or formal informal, depending on how you.

?: Un-interpretable question.

Jim Barnes: I think we'll provide that information probably with a little more detail and a range of costs that there's, it's, you know, yeah, I want people to get sticker shock upfront. I don't want somebody going through thinking everything's great and at the last minute everybody's got sticker shock because that doesn't help anybody out. ~

?: Un-interpretable statement.

Jim Barnes: That's correct. That's correct. Like I said, we, know, if you, you estimate high and you come in low, you're a hero. If you estimate low and you come in high, you're a goat. So yeah, and I don't mean greatest of all time. So that doesn't work out.

Kerry Hitt: Well, we're going to do a vote on it.

Rebekah Urbina: Can I make a request for somebody on the board to make a motion or request a motion that we move forward to the next step, which costs \$0?



Kerry Hitt: That's basically what we're looking to do. We wanted to give an opportunity for people to talk about it. I think most people have talked about it. Mauricio?

Mauricio Urbina: I just want to say that as part of our research, we have held meetings, residents meetings, some of them in your house, some of them in your house, and we have collected data that supports the information that Wellington has provided. Also, ~ non-tangible conversations have taken place that indicate that the majority of the owners are here. I would like to request the board to move forward based on a show of hands right now if you guys need to have that type of support as to who supports ~ this initiative. Ultimately, the people that are here are the people who care the most. If people don't show up to the meetings consistently, that may be an indication that they're not as concerned as we are. So I propose, I request that if you guys need to solidify or back up your decision based on a show of hands that we do that.

Kerry Hitt: Well. We're going to take a vote. One of the things I would like to add here is in the process of doing it, Jim has basically said this. ~ I'd like to reinforce that is that when we move forward, want to move forward having everybody involved having a say in it. But we need to get to that point and we need to get to that point by making a decision tonight. So based on that, I would like to make a motion that we move forward and give Wellington the authority to move ahead and let's go to the next step. Right now, we need to speak for the people.

?: Un-interpretable question.

Kerry Hitt: No, don't have. We've been talking about this for years. Okay. I'm...

Ruben Ferrazzano: Well, last year and a half easily. Easily.

Kerry Hitt: So. I can say it again. I'll make a motion that we move forward to go to the next step. Well, we have the other board here, but thank you. just. Well.

Ruben Ferrazzano: You know. This type of decision for me personally, it'll probably drive me away from the community. But that's the way it goes, you know? And you can't stop progress. And that's the way I look at it. It's you guys are eventually the ones that are going to want to make the decision and if the majority rules, the majority rules. And that's the way I look at it. I don't have a personal attachment to it. I just know eventually, I've been here over 30 years. So. And it's going to be a little bit hard for me too to pay all of that off. But you know, I've made very good money off that property. Very good. So.

Kerry Hitt: Burke, you can go next then. Just, I want people to have their say, but we kind of need to move forward.

Carlos Arellano: Okay, I'm Carlos Arellano. I've been in Wellington since 1979. I hear that the roads are bad and then some people said they're dusty. Some people say that we have a bumpy road. Do we have any alternative besides paving the road? I have an alternative that I have used and it works, but we need everybody to agree. If we put the sprinkles on the fence line to get to the middle of the road on this side and on the other side, you will see that the road will not be dusty and it will be firm. If you put



concrete screening on top of the existing road, it will get hard and it will be better. I have done it and it works. That's an alternative to a couple of million dollars.

Kerry Hitt: Okay.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Is that okay with the equestrian committee? I'm sorry.

Carlos Arellano: I can get you the price for that code to the question. Concrete screening trucks.

Ruben Ferrazzano: What's that? No, no, no, no, no. The concrete screening, would that be permissible for the horses? I don't know.

Carlos Arellano: Yeah, for the horses it's okay because it

Ruben Ferrazzano: I don't know. I don't do horses.

Kerry Hitt: The road committee, did they look into that, Mauricio? I don't know that.

Ruben Ferrazzano: I know they have a specific dirt that they material that they want to use. Yes, as far as I'm aware of.

Jim Barnes: So as far as the roadways are, actually use the mix we use is a different mix than what your standard kind of off the shelf what everybody's getting at the pits, at the rock pits. So we do use a different material to begin with just for the shell rock roadways. I think in some cases, you know, and what Ms. Arellano might be talking about as well is whether you're using concrete screenings. In other cases what we've used not only in some roadways but also on pathways and bridle trails are ~ millings, asphalt millings as well, which at some point end up becoming more of a solid surface but it's just loose millings and it's not a paved area. And the other option that we talked about ever so briefly the other night but it's not something that's been looked at all is the open graded mix. It's basically what they use in northern mining roads and it's a pervious but it ends up you've got large chunks that it's an open graded mix that technically meets South Florida requirements for being pervious even though chances are with the material you have underneath there nothing's that going through there anyway but it's an open graded mix that's rougher and for a while actually is what we had down in Little Ranches but then since then probably about 15 years ago or so maybe a little longer we went ahead and put traditional ~ type asphalt in that location. But those are options that certainly will change. But anytime you're looking at any of those options, you're not looking at the bridle trail necessarily. That's set up. And you're not looking at necessarily modifying the drainage because you're not changing grids.

Kerry Hitt: That's what I'm saying, at this point we're not talking about a lot of money. We're talking about moving over to the next step and finding out what it's going to cost. And that's why I'm feeling as though we should move ahead.

Ruben Ferrazzano: But the next step includes.

Jim Barnes: Us coming back to you with what that number is.

Ruben Ferrazzano: People be notified?

Kerry Hitt: Absolutely.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Is that what we're doing? The next step will be to notify all the homeowners and then have some type of structure or vote on, you know, get a better percentage rate of who wants it, who doesn't? Then we can move a little further.

Jim Barnes: To be clear, the main reason I really want direction and need direction from the board tonight is that one, I don't want to move forward even though it's all on our time. We're not charging anybody for it, but one, don't want to waste the consulting engineer's time to prepare the proposal in scope, and I don't want to really spend our time and have the concern be that we're driving this process. We're not. The other part of that is also that we don't want to go through that process and come back and say, why'd you guys do that? You weren't ready to move forward. That's really what you're not, you are not committing to any funding this evening. You're committing for us to just take the next step. I wanted to give you an order of magnitude what that consulting fee might be coming in at. It might be less, it might be more, but that's something that you'll have to decide and vote on ultimately because we can't engage them without a modification to the inter-local agreement. So that's going to take at least another board vote. But as Mr. Cohen also mentioned, that one thing that can happen in that interim timeframe is we do the informal formal~ request from the individual property owners.

Kerry Hitt: The questions that are being answered here tonight, or asked here tonight, are ones that I think need to be at the next meeting. You know.

Michael. Flying cow road: There is one question about the permitting. ~ How is it about the permitting for the paving the roads? as well into before permit for it all is for how does it work?

Jim Barnes: The permit? Well we were so basically we would be doing the work for pine tree and but we would handle managing the engineer the engineer would ultimately

Michael: building permit necessary for paving the?

Jim Barnes: South Florida and Pine Tree.

Michael: Okay.

Jim Barnes: Yeah. And since the drainage system is Pine Trees, technically your engineer would have to issue the project a permit for Pine Tree or just review it depending on how that's processed and ultimately South Florida is the main bigger permit that we would have to obtain.

Michael: And you have in mind when you bring us to the next step that you show us some different options, how to do it. Like the last meeting or with the different surface, what Carlos recommended, it's maybe option too, who knows.



Jim Barnes: We could include that in the engineer's scope and we could certainly run a number, know, a very conceptual number since there won't be any plans, but we could include that in the engineer's scope just to see what the scope would include.

Michael: Okay, thank you. ~

Burke Aubry: One more question. ~ Watering the roads is quite effective. ~ Jenny Carlson does it at the foot of Flying Cow. Of course, Okay, good. And you benefit from it. She does a good job with it. And the guy at the end of the road, the end of Norris, that has the polo field, he irrigates the road as well. I think that's ~ to keep the polo people from being offended by people going 90 miles an hour. But if we watered the roads, because we have 50 % of our lots are unoccupied, the water issue would have to be controlled universally. ~ Like from our hydrants couldn't leave it up to each landowner to water the street in front of their house because it would never happen. First of all, 50 % of the land is unoccupied and then 75 % of it is unoccupied during the summer. So we would have to run an irrigation line six miles and have it irrigated by city water in order to do that. Any other surface that we use other than asphalt, whether we use concrete millings or asphalt millings or whatever, with the amount of traffic we have, within six months, we would have the same dust problem. I've done it on farms throughout my life, and it just doesn't last. Those are just all alternatives. It's either we're going to water the roads or we're going to pave them. ~ The other concern, last concern is like Mr. Cohen's comment about the dust affecting his health. I can't for the life of me figure out why we can't get support in our community to slow the traffic down, to post the speed limit. We are the village of Wellington. They posted speed limit signs that say 25. Let's change it. Why can't we change it? Why can't we have a vote to change the speed limit to 15 miles an hour?

Kerry Hitt: It's a matter of enforcing it. That's the whole...

Burke Aubry: Well, let's enforce it. We also pay for police protection. And it's a safety it is a safety issue. It's a safety issue for pedestrians. It's a safety issue for horses and riders and anything else we need to slow down and if it's a safety issue, then the police should support us on it. You know, I mean it only takes it only takes one \$250 ticket to get your attention

Ruben Ferrazzano: Yeah, but that \$250 if I got a ticket today. I'm gonna slow down tomorrow, I'm gonna slow down the next day. And I might slow down for a month, but guess what's gonna happen? I'm gonna speed right back

Burke Aubry: Yeah, I know, that's because you have sin nature. But if it keeps happening, if it keeps happening, you're gonna stop. And you know what, if you're a responsible human being and if you're a community member, you're gonna slow down.

Ruben Ferrazzano: I drive slow in my community. I'm just brought up a statement.

Burke Aubry: Okay, so I was the last question. Are we going to accept nominations for board members tonight?

Kerry Hitt: We're trying to get through that.

Burke Aubry: Okay, good.

Kerry Hitt: We're trying to do this now.

Sam Cohen: I just want to make a couple of final points. First of all, water, millings and all of that, number one is temporary. Number two, it adds its own complications as you already pointed out. Paving is actually not even going into the 21st century. It's actually going into the 18th century. This is where we're trying to get to at least maybe we'll end up in the 20th century having paving along Fair enough fair enough, but I'm not the only one more importantly the first of all I personally even though I'm on the paving committee I can tell you the amount of work that that has happened here to get us to this point I personally want to thank both the board Jim and the rest of the paving committee because we all talk about how we do or do not want it and each all of our opinions are valid because at the end of the day we all have a stake and everybody needs to be heard but making an opinion having saying no I don't want to do it without actually having the concrete plans or concrete ideas of how this can be done and to what cost is saying no to something you don't really know. Let's get to that point where we actually have the hard facts in our hands and then we can all decide as a community if we want to do it or not. That's what we're asking. That's what the Paving Committee is asking. We're not telling anybody that you need to do it or you need to change your opinion because we have spent so much time doing work. What we are suggesting is let us put in front of the community a final plan that we can all actually vote on and that if you're yes, it's a genuine yes on something that you can visualize and if you're, it's a no, it's not because you've been living here for 40 years, but it's a no because of X, Y, and Z, hard facts. That's what I'm suggesting.

Burke Aubry: Can't hear comment. (No Mic)

Kerry Hitt: Okay, and then I want to bring the meeting to order and this is going to be the last part of this we're going to do a vote we have. If you have something you want to say you can say it but I gotta say we did have a vote on this. We talked about it everyone on the board.

Burke Aubry: Had about ten people at the meeting I was there you decided we're gonna have a committee and you just had it and then you took \$30,000 of our money and spent it on a foundational study to see what it would cost. That wasn't approved by any of us. It should have been approved by the entire community resident membership.

Kerry Hitt: Not the way it worked. It's not the way it works.

Burke Aubry: This is not Joe Biden's America.

Charles Brown: It carries suspending authority.

Kerry Hitt: Yes.

Charles Brown: Every dollar does have to come back to the entire board.



Kerry Hitt: I know we're not going to make everybody happy. I'm sorry about that. But I think we need to move forward. And as is, I'm close.

Can I have a second?

Kerry Hitt: Okay, this is the last question then. Go ahead.

I'm sorry, I just need, at this point, we need to move on. Okay, and we're gonna take a vote. Push up on the switch. The lights on, on. Thank you.

Sam Cohen: If we pave the roads, our properties are going to be more valuable. Is Wellington going to charge us more taxes because our properties are more valuable, ~ then why should we pay for the roads? Why don't Wellington pay for the road?

Kerry Hitt: Wellington doesn't set the tax base site, I believe it's set by Palm Beach County.

Jim Barnes: No, so we have a millage rate that's set for properties within the village of Wellington, that millage is 2.47. It's been that way for the last seven, six years, seven years, ~ and there'd be no change to lower that based on Rustic Ranch roads, ~ paving those roadways. And there's no credit back to offset that and again going back to one of the first comments I had at our last week's meeting is that These aren't Wellington roads and we don't mean there's a lot of history there. Happy to spend time offline with anybody that wants to get the history on that from our perspective and ~ so that's what I've got on that. And then just a quick note to address Mauricio has one comment earlier as far as being able to go back to the county I don't think you know, it's one of those things that I think ~there's really no opportunity to do that with the county to get them to revisit that since at this point generally speaking any of the county efforts out here are fairly minimal based on you know what you're paying county taxes. But you are correct with the percentage we're about 12 percent or so a little bit more of your overall taxable the balance goes to all the different agencies.

Kerry Hitt: Okay

Sam Cohen: Okay. If we paved the roads the tax is going to go up or not

Jim Barnes: ~ I'm assuming property values would go up which would then yield a higher tax now there's a lot of properties that have Ag exemptions so that has to be factored into it as well.

Sam Cohen: So we're going to pay for the pavement of the roads and you're going to charge us more money because our properties are more valuable?

Jim Barnes: It's all based on the property value.

Sam Cohen: Okay.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Well, I would think if you're homesteaded, there's a cap on.

Jim Barnes: yeah, homestead has a cap.

Ruben Ferrazzano: You're homesteaded, the county says there's a cap on that.

Jim Barnes: That's correct.

Ruben Ferrazzano: So if you're not homestead and you just got a piece of land that might be a different situation. But if you're living on that property, I don't see, you know, taxes always go up every year anyways. But I don't think you're going to see it.

Jim Barnes: Homestead affects it as this Ag exemption on the properties that have the agriculture exemptions.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Exactly, yeah.

Kerry Hitt: Most of the horse farms out there are Ag.

Jim Barnes: That's correct.

Kerry Hitt: Okay.

Jim Barnes: So on the property, at least on a portion of the property.

Kerry Hitt: All right. The board needs to take a vote and then we need to move on to the next part of the agenda. I make a motion that we vote to move forward to give Wellington the authority to take this to the next step.

Charles Brown: I second.

Kerry Hitt: Done. ~ I know we're not going to make everybody happy. This is not necessarily a fun place to be in, this is where we are and I think that we need to look at moving forward and try to move forward with the community. ~ So one more thing that is on the agenda. Jim, we had this discussion about the RV. Correct.

Jim Barnes: So if you could indulge me for like two minutes, this would be a quick question and again, trying to get some direction. ~ based on what's in the, what was in the old Rustic Ranch's neighborhood plan and of course finally got put into the code. You have a limitation within Rustic Ranch's for RVs during, you know, on your property where I think based on what was in the original neighborhood plan you can only keep RVs on your property for two weeks. The balance of the EPA, the question preserve area in Wellington, you can pretty much have it there November through April. And the way the numbers are set up, which is across the board, Rustic and the rest of the EPA, is if you have less than five acres, you can't have an RV. If you've got five acres to nine acres, you can have one. If you have greater than 10 acres, you can have two. But the big difference is that based on the old neighborhood plan, there was a limitation within Rustic Ranches that you could only do it for two weeks, which doesn't make sense, but that's how it was translated in the neighborhood plan before, it'd be just, since we've gotten a lot of questions and issues with residents or property owners in Rustic Ranches related to that and why it's not the same, we have no issue going ahead and modifying the code to reflect the same requirements within Rustic as we have within the rest of the question preserve area, which is between



November and April, you have those same numbers, but there's not a two-week limitation. You can have them there the entire season essentially. And you can have connections to water and electric and all that stuff. As far as horse trailers are concerned, there's technically no limitation because of the state preemption for agricultural exempt properties. So there's nothing that we can do to control the number of horse trailers on the individual properties. But as far as RVs, we have no problem making that change to the code. It's going to take us a few months, but we didn't want to use one of those things. We don't want to proceed without reaching out to the community. But that's been a question we've received from several property owners within Rustic Ranchers.

Kerry Hitt: What we need to.

Jim Barnes: You don't need I mean if I'm feeling like you guys are giving me consensus that the feeling is that you don't want to have the limitation that the rest of the village doesn't have as far as the question properties we can move forward with that.

Kerry Hitt: Okay so we don't really need to do a vote on that.

Ruben Ferrazzano: No you said ~ sorry.

Kerry Hitt: They won't be able to hear you.

No Name: So I understand everybody that has their own horse trailers and their own RVs. But there are people in Rustic Ranches and other places in Wellington that are renting out spaces and renting out spaces for RVs that aren't their own. And they're actually ~ with horse trailers, renting out spaces, ~ you can park here for the season and I'll charge you this much money. Where's the limitation?

Jim Barnes: Right, so I think on the RV side, think we can definitely look at that to make sure that you essentially don't have an RV park going on, I'm guessing from what you're saying, that's what's happening in some cases. The horse trailers, we end up being limited by the state, because if it's agriculture exempt, the horse trailers are considered agricultural equipment. I know sometimes, you know, maybe some people agree with us and some people don't, but ultimately that's what the state's determination is, and we don't have an opportunity to regulate that. We are preempted from regulating the horse trailers, but there are V's, we can look at it.

No Name: So if somebody can start a business having horse trailers on their property and basically renting them a spot, and I could have 50 horse trailers on my property and nobody can say anything about it.

Jim Barnes: And I think there's actually a couple of issues we've got right now, not necessarily only in Rustic, where we've got attorneys complaining about how we interpreted that, ~ where we were saying, hey, this is not fair. This is not part of the land's use. Just you just have a bunch of people parking their trailers here. And so we're kind of going at that right now. But what we're getting initially is that the state's saying, Ag equipment, we can't touch it. But the RVs, we can. And I get your point on the RVs for sure that essentially if you just have everybody parked in RVs.

So I can start a business and take my five acres and I'm going to rent it out to 30 different people and I'm going to fill up my property with horse trailers. And you guys can't do anything about it and my neighbors can't do anything about it.

Jim Barnes: That's what we're hearing from the state right now every time we.

Ruben Ferrazzano: As that long as you're agriculture.

Jim Barnes: What's that?

Ruben Ferrazzano: As long as you're agriculture.

Jim Barnes: And that's the thing, is they determine that horse trailers agriculture,

Ruben Ferrazzano: Then in your resident, then that would be a different story.

Becky Urbina on Rustic:

Jim Barnes: But the horse trailer part, can continue to look into it, but that's not part of the code item, because the code is an address to the RVs, it does address that.

Becky Urbina: So a couple of things. Number one ~ The code right now for grooms quarters is you can have for every four stalls you can have one grooms quarter under 500 square feet. So whether or not somebody who's a property owner wants to build, invest in another infrastructure or has the money to do so or have their grooms in an RV, this is some, we're an equestrian community. This is the lifestyle of the equestrians. We're very, ~ what is the word, transitional, transitory neighborhood. ~ People are going from circuit to circuit and they're doing what they do. We also are in an equestrian community, so yeah, there's a lot of horse trailers and Wellington does not have a lot of places for horse trailers anyway. So I don't see what the problem is. I don't know about the limitations in terms of ~ RVs, but I can tell you that what is the difference between you can have one groom's quarter built with brick and mortar versus having one RV under the same ratio? So that's just my thoughts. No, there's limitations. It's one groom's quarter per four stalls.

Becky Urbina: No, but I'm saying, I'm making the argument that if you don't have the money or don't want to invest in brick and mortar, a groom's quarter for your grooms to stay, there should be some consideration for those who don't have the money or the finances to invest that their clients, I'm sorry?

?: Can't hear the question

Becky Urbina: I don't have a trailer park. I have my own RV which I stay in. I have two, I have, okay, and I also have grooms and 16 horses on the property. So the point is that temporary, okay, so I'm making my suggestion based upon the interpretation since we're bringing it up. Everybody's entitled to do what they want on their own property under the guidelines that are required by us. But since we're taking suggestions, I'm not talking over anybody. I can pass the mic. I'm just saying what I think as somebody who has horses out there and have people in the business, this is what I, you I don't think that there's a, somebody said there's a, you said there's a what? There's a business for horse trailers?



?: Can't hear the question

Ruben Ferrazzano: Okay Ag is a business. But you're exempt. By state law, you're exempt.

Kerry Hitt: Yeah. Okay, Jonathan's saying, okay, you need to pass the mic. ~

Jenny Carlson: Okay, Jim, I personally, when I read the EPA, when I did my due diligence, I understood the EPA to say that the two weeks I assumed was for an unoccupied lot. So I will say that I read the EPA, which handles it all first, and then I read that to mean unoccupied lot, because it says to even get the two weeks, you must have water, sewer, and power, which clearly in an occupied lot. So I was...You know, I personally think that's reasonable that we match the rest of the community. ~ You know. I think many of us have done, who do it just for the season, have done it with the, you know, trying to screen them and put up the bushes and do that. And I understand mine are still growing in. I'm working on that. ~ But I feel like it's reasonable for us to match, at least match what the EPA allows in all the other communities, ~ especially since it has become somewhat of an expectation in our community to allow for that seasonal housing.

Jim Barnes: And just so it's clear when we make that recommendation to the council to change the code it still has to go through a public hearing so everyone would have an opportunity to voice their opinion.

No Name: I think renting out spaces for RVs or there should be a limit of how many your own horse trailers find. You want to rent out spaces to park horse trailers and you're making money on parking. There should be a limitation of horse trailers even though they're exempt. I get it. I've been in agriculture my whole life. ~ But you can't put...multiple horse trailers, whatever the limit, whatever anybody figures out, if it's five, it's a 10, whatever. But right now, there's no limit. So I could technically go out and get 40 horse trailers, and I can make a business and put them on my five acres. So. But you're not, we were all just talking about communities and talking about all the people in the community. You're not respecting the other people in the community when you have a parking lot full of horse trailers. Okay, that's really what it comes down to. And when you have multiple RVs, that's not your own RVs, that's an RV park. Okay. And that should be state regulated, and actually it is, and it should be permitted. And grooms, I get it. We are all the time trying to find places for grooms, but there are rules. So you have to look at the rules. If 180 days and it's exactly what Wellington is, I agree. But Rustic Ranches is right now, it's a little crazy with how many RVs and how many horse trailers are getting parked on people's properties and people are making money on it. So that's all I gotta say. And plus there's strike pipes coming out of some of the RVs on some of my neighbors. So, which is also not healthy.

Jim Barnes: I'm done hijacking your meeting Mr. Hitt.

Kerry Hitt: Okay what's that?

Jim Barnes: I'll stay for the whole meeting. You just have other business to handle.

Kerry Hitt: All right there's really only one other thing. I think at this point you're going to look at requesting that they...



Jim Barnes: Yeah we'll like I said there's gonna be before it gets final approved by council there's a public hearing so we'll everybody will be notified and we'll make sure that the board and the residents are notified of that as well. Since the change to at least a minimal expense would be specific to Rustic Ranches based on that's the one that's not gonna sit with the rest of the Equestrian Preserve area. Okay.

Kerry Hitt: All right. The last thing on the agenda is we have on this agenda the nomination of supervisors for the June election. That being said, and we're going to go ahead and do that, except... Where did they go?

Ruben Ferrazzano: What are you looking for?

Kerry Hitt: I have a written procedure that was basically the same procedure that we had for voting ~ for bringing ~ nominating people to fill the board seat of the board and it was is basically set up for two ninety eight districts and there was a question, I didn't know about it, and we looked at trying to change things around, but according to the 298 district guidelines. Statute. I'm sorry. Okay. Statute. ~ In terms of voters, I'll read this here, qualified voters must be 18 years of age and hold the title to the land ~ within the boundary at the time of the election ~ qualified voters cast one vote for each acre, a portion thereof. We've done all that. That's not an issue. Qualified voters cast the candidates regardless of the election of sub-districts. I don't think that affects here, but the votes may be cast by ballot or submitted by proxy during the annual landowners meeting. There's nothing about breaking it up into two separate meetings. Because we said we were going to do that, we'll just go ahead and we'll take nominations for the next seat, which is Ruben's seat, that's going to be up ~ in June. ~ So at this time, I'm going to open up the floor for nominations. Wait, wait, we've got two people. Go ahead, Burke.

Ruben Ferrazzano: No, no. The mic. The mic. The mic, buddy.

Burke Aubry: Proxies. That was an issue last election. ~ I think that there needs to be guidelines for ~ submitting proxies. They can't be, I don't think they should be submitted to an individual. I think they should be submitted to the board with a certified letter. So there's accountability with that ~having ~ suffered humiliating defeat in the last election because of proxies that were given to an unnamed candidate.

Kerry Hitt: Okay. Can I just read this again? Votes may be cast by ballot or submitted by proxy during the annual landlord's meeting. A definition of proxy is what you're looking to say, and a proxy can be someone who has a vote and they're going to give it to somebody else to be able to cast it. And I think that's plain and simple.

Burke Aubry: Where's the accountability there? What if somebody comes and says I got 140 proxies. So I said, well, I got 141.

Kerry Hitt: We have a copy of a proxy here. And this basically is what we have to have filled out and signed and that takes care of the accountability. You have to have a piece of paper signed by the...We're talking about now what I'm trying to do is move forward. That's gone that ship has sailed, so we're trying to...



Burke Aubry: Can't hear question.

Kerry Hitt: We're going to use the proxies and that's what we're going to have. But what I'm looking at is we're breaking this up into two different meetings and I don't think it needs to be done. We're going to do that tonight. We're going to, and I understand you're looking to run, which is fine. But we'll take nominations tonight and...and we'll do this as we said in the last meeting, but what I would like to do, and in the next meeting we can go back to what the charter says and do it that way, but I just want to move forward and get this done. So, okay. Good. Okay, so that being said, I'd like to open up the floor for nominations for the seat of Board of Directors.

?: Can't hear question

I believe, according to this, up until the last minute. But we will take tonight, and we'll have that opportunity, and we can also have somebody.

?: Can't Hear question.

Kerry Hitt: I understand. Moving, since the last meeting, this is what we said we will do, we'll do that. What I'd like to do, and if it's going to take a vote of the board to do that, we can do that, and we could do that at this meeting or the next meeting.

?: Can't hear question.

Okay.

Kerry Hitt: It's for two years, two years, yeah I'm sorry, pardon me, yeah, for every three years. He's the next one now. And this is the last year for me.

?: Can't hear the question.

Ruben Ferrazzano: No. Three years.

Kerry Hitt: Yeah. Maybe. I've decided this. Yeah. Yeah. We can't record. That's right. I'm sorry. We're not used to it. Okay.

Charles Brown: Just be careful what you wish for.

Kerry Hitt: So.

?: Can't hear the question.

Kerry Hitt: Yes, absolutely. Yeah. Yeah. Okay. So...

Ruben Ferrazzano: So if you don't want me, then out the door I go. That plain and simple.

?: Can't hear the question.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Yeah I do.

Chris Wallace: I nominate Ruben Ferrazzano

Kerry Hitt: Ruben. Okay. Anybody else?

No Name: Nominated Ruben Ferrazzano.

Kerry Hitt: Okay, yeah, so we've got two nominations for Ruben. Ruben's nominating Mauricio, okay the mic all right. Okay, well, Ruben's nominated, he's in.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Are you sure? Yes, I'm sure.

Kerry Hitt: Yes, I'm sure. Okay, ~ you nominated Mauricio. I mean, you nominated,

Ruben Ferrazzano: yeah.

Kerry Hitt: You nominated Mauricio, pardon me. Okay, is there anybody else? Okay. ~ The vote will be next meeting. we're trying to get down to that. June 16th is the next meeting. All right. I think that we've gotten a lot accomplished tonight.

Ruben Ferrazzano: That'd be back over in Loxahatchee, I'm assuming.

Kerry Hitt: Yeah, the plans are it will be in Loxahatchee. Yes. Yes. So. ~ Let's move forward. Based on that, if nobody else has anything, I believe we've covered pretty much everything. I make a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:04 PM.

Ruben Ferrazzano: I second it.

Kerry Hitt: Thank you. Okay.



---

Kerry Hitt

---

Ruben Ferrazzano

---

Charles Brown

**PINE TREE WATER CONTROL DISTRICT**  
**FINANCIAL STATEMENT**  
**04/12/2025 thru 06/13/2025**

|                                                      | SUNTRUST   | TRUIST    |            |
|------------------------------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------|
| <u>CASH:</u>                                         | MONEY MKT  | CHECKING  |            |
| Starting Cash 04/12/2025                             | 417,042.97 | 5,000.00  |            |
| Transfer from Money Market                           | -41,769.43 | 41,769.43 |            |
| Permit Income                                        |            |           |            |
| Excess Funds (PBC)                                   |            |           |            |
| Interest (PBC, Suntrust & Truist)                    | 6.90       |           |            |
| PBC Investment Earnings                              | 177.26     |           |            |
| PBC Tax Collector                                    | 7,270.78   |           |            |
| Total Cash on Hand                                   | 382,728.48 | 46,769.43 | 429,497.91 |
| <u>Expenses:</u>                                     |            |           |            |
| Bank Serv Chgs (Wire Transfer)                       |            |           | 0.00       |
| Betty Camplin-Fees                                   |            | 1,500.00  | 1,500.00   |
| Betty Camplin-(Advert,Postage,ink & Checks)          |            | 116.10    | 116.10     |
| Daniel Drawdy                                        |            |           | 0.00       |
| Derrevere, Stevens, Black, Cozad Attorneys           |            |           | 0.00       |
| Dept of Economic Opportunity (Special District Fees) |            |           | 0.00       |
| First Watch Dining (Jim & Kerry)                     |            |           | 0.00       |
| Floria Court Recording                               |            |           | 0.00       |
| Harold Fickett (Website)-GridPlay Designs            |            |           | 0.00       |
| Hayden Pollack (Setup Zoom)                          |            |           | 0.00       |
| HSQ Group LLC (Road Study)                           |            |           | 0.00       |
| Kerry Hitt (Reimb for Grader Expenses)               |            |           | 0.00       |
| Lockhart Ag Technologies                             |            |           | 0.00       |
| Nowlen, Holt & Miner, CPA                            |            |           | 0.00       |
| Palm each Aggregate                                  | 1,175.06   |           | 1,175.06   |
| Palm Beach Aquatics                                  |            | 2,700.00  | 2,700.00   |
| Palm Beach County Property Appraiser                 |            |           | 0.00       |
| Palm Beach County -BOCC                              |            |           | 0.00       |
| Palm Beach Tax Collector                             |            | 17.00     | 17.00      |
| Palm Beach Post                                      |            |           | 0.00       |
| Ruben Ferrazzano (Reimb for Parts & Fuel)            |            | 170.57    | 170.57     |
| Stormwater Engineering                               |            | 1,775.00  | 1,775.00   |
| Theodore Johnson Tractor Services                    |            | 750.00    | 750.00     |
| Tiger Lake Investments (Tractor Finance)             |            | 1,692.96  | 1,692.96   |
| USPS (Box Rent)                                      |            |           | 0.00       |
| Town of Loxahatchee (Rent)                           |            |           | 0.00       |
| Village of Wellington                                |            | 20,591.80 | 20,591.80  |
| Wellington Pro Lawn                                  |            | 12,456.00 | 12,456.00  |
| Zoom Meeting                                         | 31.98      |           | 31.98      |
| Total Expenses                                       | 1,207.04   | 41,769.43 | 42,976.47  |
| Account Balance 06/13/2025                           | 381,521.44 | 5,000.00  | 386,521.44 |