

**MINUTES
PINE TREE WATER CONTROL DISTRICT
SUPERVISORS MEETING
HELD MONDAY, JANUARY 05, 2026
AT TOWN OF LOXAHATCHEE GROVES
155 F ROAD
LOXAHATCHEE, FLORIDA 33470**

Pursuant to the foregoing notice, a meeting was held for the Pine Tree Water Control District Board of Supervisors on Monday January 5, 2026 at 6:01 PM at Town of Loxahatchee Groves located at 155 F Road, Loxahatchee, Florida 33470.

Members present were: Kerry Hitt, Chairman
 Charles Brown, Supervisor
 Ruben Ferrazzano, Supervisor

Others Present: Charles Schoech, Attorney
 Eric Grainger, Engineer

1. Call the meeting to order

The meeting was called to order by Kerry Hitt, Chairman, on Monday, January 5, 2026 at 6:01 pm.

2. Everyone stood for the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. Consent Agenda

Motion made to approve the agenda.

Betty Camplin presented the financial report for August 18, 2025 through December 31, 2025.

4. Attorney's Report

Kerry presented Charles Schoech who is one of the best known 298 district Attorney and is quite

knowledgeable. We have worked with Mr. Schoech and he's been guiding us along on some of the

questions.

5. Management Report

Kerry Hitt said I need to address this. There was an error made sending the ballots out certified, and

that did not happen. I don't know if certified would have made any difference or not.
We can address

that and make a decision on what to do. All of the people did not receive their ballot.
I'm thinking

that possibly some of the problems that you might have experienced is that some of the people's

ballots were sent to mortgage companies and not to them. I'm not sure how to correct this, I think,

that is something that I could pass on to Mr. Schoech.

Mr. Schoech says the law provides that the notices are sent to the address of record on the tax rolls and if that address is incorrect then it would behoove the property owner to let the district know. There is no legal requirement that 100% of the landowners vote. If you did not receive back 100%, that's unfortunate, but it's not a legal requirement that you receive 100%.

Kerry Hitt: Kerry said It would take 63% of the votes tallied to move on with the paving of the roads.

Mr. Schoech: And that vote is to indicate whether or not the district should proceed with the issue of road paving. If you do anything through the legislature with any type of a combination of work being done through the Village of Wellington, that's going to require a special act of the legislature, and for that special act to be effective, the legislature will as they have in the past, require an additional vote to make that legislation effective. So, there will be, if you do anything through the Village of Wellington be additional approvals from the landowners.

Judith Phalen: Said that she understood it was not actually a vote for the road.

Kerry Hitt: What we need to do is get the vote, get the majority of the vote to make a decision as to whether or not we were going to spend a sum of money, which we're really not sure exactly what that amount is, somewhere between 80 and 150 thousand dollars just to do the engineering to make a decision to move forward.

Judith Phalen: I understood because I was at the meeting, that it was supposed to be providing enough information for the residents to decide. whether or not to proceed with engaging with someone to do an engineering report. But the ballot itself, what. putting in all of those amounts gives leaves one with the thought that you are actually voting on whether or not to commit this Rustic Ranches to anywhere between 8 million to \$20 million. I know that's not what you intended. I'm just telling you that when you read it that's the way it is interpreted.

Kerry Hitt: Well. The intent of it was to make a decision, why would we... if the final decision is not to pave the roads, then why would we spend somewhere between \$80,000 and \$150,000 to do an engineering study to see if we wanted to pave the roads. Why put the cart before the horse? The reason that I wanted to do this is to, let's say, are we going to move forward with it?

Mr. Schoech: I understand exactly what you're saying, and if the vote was to authorize the initial, or the preliminary work for the engineer to give you the documents so that you can then go out and find out the actual costs? That's not a commitment to actually spend. The total amount to pave the roads, that's only the commitment to do the engineering work to be prepared to go forward if you choose. After the engineering work is done. If you decided you don't want to pave. You are gonna have to pay for the engineering work, but you don't have to do the paving if the district chooses not to. That's not uncommon, typically, you don't want to spend that money to do that work unless you're going to proceed with the project. But there are numerous projects in local governments where the preliminary engineering work, the preliminary design work is done and the project never actually gets built. Excuse me. Chris Wallace, Hollow Tree Lane.

Chris Wallace: One of the things is that it wasn't presented as an inquiry. It was presented as a voting ballot. That was a mistake. Another thing was an engineering report was put in, very professional looking. But nobody ever did an engineering survey. So you have no idea what the final cost is going to be. And just putting some pretty words and pretty pictures on a page doesn't make that effect. They had it broke down to what you would be paying if you voted for it and what you would be paying, what you would be paying according to a report that was not even done by an engineer. It may have been done by an engineer, but not an engineer that did a survey. And I don't know where this engineer came from exactly. But I understand. It was put in by someone who was in favor of the road.

Mauricio Urbina: My question is, we did have clarity during the last meeting about the cost of the engineer. As a matter of fact, the engineer was here on site. And he made himself available for any questions. that either the board or the residents, the landowners, may have. So... We did have that clarity in that number. That was \$70,000 for him to get. So that's number one. So, we did have clarity on that. But my question is, so where did the figures on the ballot come from? Because I saw figures on the ballot for 12 million... 10 million... 8 million. I'm on the paving committee, I'm pro-paving. I mark no on that ballot, because I feel that, as a community, the board and everybody involved in a paving committee has a fiduciary responsibility, so I'm not going to sign up or vote for a blank check of \$12 million where the initial estimated from the Village of Wellington with a lot of... buffer was 6.75. And our estimate... was, again, before the engineering report with the survey and all that was estimated to be 3.75. 2.1 million to be the paving quote that we got from Ranger. So, I want to know, where do we get... The 12 million, the 10 million, the 8 million. And why was that... whose decision was that to be put in place?

Kerry Hitt: Those were numbers that came through Wellington. Now. Mr. Barnes is not here. He's going to be here, he's going to be a little late, and I would like him to address that. There's time set aside for you guys to discuss that. So, we need to do both sides of it.

Mauricio Urbina: So, why was the work of the... The two-year work of the paving committee, which was a lot of volunteers and landowners to come up with all this work. Even Charlie, one of the members of the board. We spent over 2 years working, meeting with the village, we did meet with the village. We had all these contractors, all this analysis. What was that for, and why was not... why weren't we... why... why nobody from the board was contacted... to discuss this 12 million and 10 million, whereas the same village presented to all of us in the meeting. And specifically said the worst case scenario was 6.75.

Kerry Hitt: I'm going to stop that now until Mr. Barnes gets here, and then we will take that up, I promise you, okay?

Henry DeGouw: Can I say something here? I think when we have some of the road members voting against it. I mean, it's a cut and dry. This thing is not going to pass on your... Why waste time on it? I'm sure the votes are already tallied, so... I mean, it's gonna fail for good reason, so... I'm sure you got other stuff to move on to, so that's all my recommendation.

Karen Morris: Can I speak? I'm online. I really think we should now take this vote. We did not have the correct information that we need to proceed. It should be delayed for another time.

Kerry Hitt: (Said to Mr. Schoech) Okay. This is about what we send out. This is what we're talking about so... what we were trying to do is be completely transparent with costs that. We were... that we looked at, I had a meeting with Mr. Barnes, we discussed this thing. We came up with estimated costs that we were trying to put in before we look at spending the money to do an engineering report. This is what we sent... the information that we sent for this. So... What we were looking at doing is making decisions. Do we spend the money now for the engineering report or not?

And I do know that 6 million was a figure, and that was a low figure. I spoke with Barnes on that. He will be here to back that up. And then we thought we really don't really know. So, in the sake of transparency, we put these numbers in here because these were the numbers that were fair numbers that people should look at and say, it could be that, and it could be more than that. We're just trying to be logical here, and we're trying to do our due diligence and We're trying to be totally honest as possible.

Mr. Schoech: Let me see if I can address it this way. I represent a number of local governmental authorities. And they deal with this issue from time to time on road paving, on conversion of septic to sewer. What has taken place here is really a straw vote to determine whether or not there's enough interest of the landowners to proceed with the project of paving. The estimates for the cost are just that. They are estimates. Because... As you well know, if this paving doesn't happen for 6 months, 9 months, or a year the prices in 6 months and 9 months, or a year from now are going to be different than what they are today. And so, the final cost is absolutely unknown. You can certainly get an estimate of what that cost is going to be and I have seen projects move forward with the design, engineering... what they call a shovel-ready project and when the... All of the design drawings are reviewed and proposals are submitted by the company that's going to do the work, in this case, a paving company. If the cost comes in and it exceeds everyone's expectation the project is shut down and doesn't go forward. If the price comes in and it's a reasonable dollar amount that everybody is pleased with, then the project goes forward. But it's not uncommon for the design work to be done and the project not to be bid for a year. Those estimates that were given a year before are totally different just because of the design cost. We're looking at the issues sometimes with goods that are affected because of... the change in tariffs, which are happening weekly.

Chris Wallace: I wanted to address something that Mauricio said before about his road committee. Which... I was actually banned from it because I was not for the road. I still am not for the road. And he is the one, actually, that banned me. And the rest of the, uh. But the rest of the road committee took anything I posted on the road committee page, they took it off. It was very, very wrong. It was wrong of Charlie Brown to be on the road committee, as a member of the board, he is supposed

to evaluate and make a decision. He's not supposed to be part of the project, and the project only allowed people that were not for the road.

Mauricio Urbina: Yes, thank you. To address the comments of the attorney, thank you very much. I think the majority of us are landowners here, and so we totally get what it is to build barns and houses and things like that, and we totally get the difference between budget and reality and delay. So, we totally get it. But what is being discussed right here is not that. What is being discussed right here is what it looks like a very confusing ballot that failed to communicate, to convey the spirit of the ballot and in addition to that, it provided very misleading numbers that even in my case made me vote no. So, in light of that, my request is for the board to make a motion where we should revise the ballot, capture the spirit of the ballot, have somebody approve the ballot, maybe an attorney now that we know, that you know what's going on. And have that ballot reflected of more... of the intent of it and the reality of it in terms of numbers, because I understand many of us are against the roads, but there is also a silent majority. In my opinion, that is in charge in favor of paving the roads. And I think that... I think that, again. It might be a silent majority, uh... But I think that... they need to be given a fair chance, and I felt that the numbers were so misleading and the ballot was so misleading. that even myself voted no for it. So, can I please request the board to make that motion?

Karen Morris: I agree, and I felt misled as well.

Chris Wallace: Not at this time, it's too soon.

Unknown: Can I ask you a question? If you're saying this was just to see who would vote on the project, why even have numbers? Just get.... Yes or no?

Kerry Hitt: Because we're trying to be transparent. We have people that are living in this neighborhood who have been here 30, 40 years. We have people that, if this road goes through, if this ballot goes through, will not be able to afford to stay here. And I think we, as a board, do have a fiduciary duty to the people of the community to try to do what is going to be best for the community. Now, what is best for the community in 5 years from now might be paving the roads. I don't know. I'm holding my personal opinion out of it. What I'm trying to do is I'm trying to say how do we move forward and do it fairly?

Unknown: But some people are basing their decision based on the inflated numbers that were on the ballot. Maybe they said no because the numbers were so high. That's why, if you're not going to have proper numbers, just take the numbers out.

Karen Morris: Agree.

Kerry Hitt: So, what we're looking to do then is spend an amount of money, and the problem is, and the engineer was here last time. I actually met with Mauricio and Becky the day before the meeting. And was told it was going to be a certain number, and by the time we got in here, the number changed, and it changed pretty significantly. So, uh, I started to begin to see and understand the problem with the elusive numbers. So... If we're going to be fair about it, we can't do a bait and switch. We can't say it's going to be this, and then it turns out to be that. And the reason that we did the ballot... the reason we put those numbers in the ballot, and the reason we put them on as we did is to cover a range as to what it could be, and we tried to do our due diligence and make that happen. If that was wrong. And we need to redo it. I'll... I'll... No way, just wait.

Karen Morris: We need to redo it.

Chris Wallace: Don't make a snap decision.

Kerry Hitt: I'm not looking at making any snap decisions, no, we're trying to get information tonight. I know Mauricio has numbers. I know there's another set of numbers out there. No, these are numbers that come from the paving people, there are numbers that come from Wellington, from their engineering department. And we're just trying to make the best. crystal ball decision that we can.

Henry DeGouw: Isn't it possible to get state loans at a much lower rate by the time perspective? Like what Lake Clark Shores is doing for their water and the sewers, their sewers come over there. They're getting it at 1.5%, I believe, but is that possible?

Mr. Schoech: Lake Clarke Shores doesn't have that yet. They're looking... I happen to be the town attorney for Lake Clark Shores. They are looking to be shovel ready so that if they can get. Grant funds, and... favorable loans they can move forward with the project, but they're having the exact same issues that all of you are having. There are residents in the town who say this number is too big, we can't afford it. And the town council has said. If we can make this project affordable by grants and loans, would you be in favor of it? And they said, it depends on what that number is. And we don't know what that number is, so they're having the exact same discussions right now that all of you are having. There are members of the council who want to move forward so that if funding is available, they're ready to move, and there are other members of the council who say not so fast. So, it's... basically the same thing. The typical

financing for these projects is tax-exempt. Bonding are tax-exempt promissory notes with a bank, and those right now are running anywhere from 3.5% to 4.5%. And that's tax exempt. If it was taxable interest, then it would be a higher rate. I'm getting ready right now, I'm working with bond council

on a project for the Shawano Water Control District, which is just west of us, where they're building a brand new pump station, and it's estimated to be between \$2.5 to 3 million dollars for that pump station. And they're in the process of getting bids from banks for tax-exempt financing. That project won't go forward until they have the financing, because in Florida unlike federal government, there's no deficit spending. You have to have the money in hand. The money has to be budgeted and appropriated before you can actually award the contract to do the project. Lake Clark Shores is a municipality. If they do a bond financing, it would be the exact same rules that would apply to the district here. But the laws dealing with municipalities and the laws dealing with special districts, of course, are very different. Municipalities have home rule, which says they're allowed to do anything and everything except which is expressly prohibited by law. The special districts don't have home rule. They can only do what they are permitted to do in their legislation. Which is adopted and approved by the state legislature. So, there is a difference, but the financing is the same. Now. I can tell you Lake Clark Shores is aggressively looking at funding from the state. They have not received sufficient funding from the state to move forward with that project.

Hendry DeGouw: But is that rate... does that sound right?

Mr. Schoech: I do not know what that rate is.

Judith Phalen: I've been listening, and... What I think I understand that I'm hearing is that the ballot that was sent out and so badly worded, and providing such misleading information that it is

probably worthless. In terms of actually having any standing with the people here right now. I don't know about the people who aren't here. The other thing that is concerning me is something the attorney said when he was talking about quotes and proposals and costs and things like that. And actually, he... probably has spoken the most true words here. He said, it's unknown, and that's true. It's unknown. We have no idea. The next thing, point I want to make... is that it seems as if from our last meeting, that our intent. was that we were going to try to find out what the 63%. of the community that responded wanted done in terms of moving forward on an engineering report. I think that's what most of us thought was going to come on the ballot, was the clarity that it was possibly 70,000 to \$80,000 to \$100,000 to do a very detailed engineering report. I do realize that there was an engineering company here. And so that raises some more questions that I would like asked. I'd like to know from the road committee. How many engineering companies they talk to. What were the proposals that they gave out to them, or the quotes that they... what were the parameters of what they were asking them to provide, detailed information about? And the same thing with whoever the paving company was, I didn't catch that. Anyway, the point I'm trying to make is that there's so much confusion going on right now. That, um... Yes, I completely agree that we need to redo this. But I think we need to redo it very cautiously, very carefully, and we need to redo it so that the actual intent is to get a vote about proceeding for an engineer's report. I mean, unless I was wrong about all of that from the last meeting, that's what I thought we were going to do. I'm not even sure at this point if I want to know what the vote was. I don't know if... knowing what the vote was will be a positive or a negative? I really don't know. I don't know if... the fact that we took that vote, and if we got 63% that said yes, are we bound by it, since we know that it was a misleading ballot. I don't know. I'm sitting here, and I'm not sure what's going on.

Kerry Hitt: There were a lot of questions that you asked.

Aldo Disorbo: You know, in the last meeting, we spoke about getting the roads paved. And addressing... the estimates that we're getting for the engineered drawings. And I know the engineered drawings were at half a million dollars, if I'm correct. We've gotten lower prices than that for engineered drawings. So, the city came in at \$500,000 to do engineered drawings, and we got a price of, I think, \$150,000?

Kerry Hitt: No, excuse me. I didn't hear that. I mean, I heard what you said but I didn't hear the half million dollars, I just asked Charlie, and he does not recall the original engineering drawings be a half million dollars.

Eric Gainger: So, here's what happens. The study that we're talking about is really just feasibility, design, concept, get it to the point where it could be standard for a budget purpose. Okay. The actual meeting for full-on engineered drawing survey, unless it's required to constructed and permanent, was a certain percentage of the budgeted amount which we talked about being over \$500,000 last year. Okay. Because it was a percentage of the...

Kerry Hitt: I knew it was closer to 400, I didn't know it was a half million, that's... I'm just... okay, so... Okay, okay, I...

Aldo Disorbo: So, Kerry, you know, earlier you made a comment saying, hey, look, if the road goes through some people can't afford to stay here and everything else. But you're looking at inflated numbers. That's why people are making a decision that they can't afford to stay here. Now, let's get the actual numbers, what it's going to cost to pave that road. And I think that people will be smart that it's not going to cost 8 to 12 million dollars. I'm saying he's gotten a price for 3.53 or 3.7.

Kerry Hitt: Well, I think the price that he has is to do the paving. I didn't see anything that included the horse trails in there.

Mauricio Urbina: Yeah, it does, it does, I have circulated the, paving quote from Ranger for 2.1 mil. Okay, the Village of Wellington did quote us \$500,000 plus for the engineering. They did, because we don't do this every day, I don't pave roads every day, and I don't do this for a living. And none of the other members of the committee do that, so as we learn more the Village of Wellington shared with us exactly what the engineer just shared. It says, you don't have to pay the entire \$500. You can pay a percentage of it.

Kerry Hitt: I'd like you to use that number, because that's the number that it was. 400.

Mauricio Urbina: Okay, well, no, I think it's 500, but I think that you can... Yeah, I think you can use a percentage of it, so with that percentage, you have enough to... to get an understanding of the cost and get the bidding going. So, when we understood that concept of getting only a percentage paid to the engineer. We were happy because we said, well, 400 or 500, 30% of that, that's great savings, but then we came across the other engineer who was charging \$171,000 and who wanted a percentage which equated to 70,000. And again, rather than, uh, going by he said, she said, which is very easy to do. What I invite you and everybody else is to look at the minutes, or look at the video recording from last meeting. You know, we can be accused of conversations that took place on coffee places.

18:43:15 or things that were said because we didn't... we... We said that the paving committee was not a paving committee to discuss whether the roads should be paved or not. But what was the viable cost of it? That was the intent of the paving committee. So that's why, whoever wanted to be part of a committee who was against paving the roads, uh, was, uh, respectfully. Um, ask not to join. And that was done, again, it's documented. it was done on chat, and it's electronic. I have the copies, I'll be happy to share them with all of you guys. Plus, it was done in front of many of the paving committees, many of them here present today. So, again, let's not go with he said, she said. But let's go with what's documented. I recommend that you guys review the minutes, watch the videos. But, yeah, it was \$70,000, and that's what it was going take to get the project going, \$70,000. And the motion to get the 70 grand last time? Fail. Right?

Kerry Hitt: Yes.

Mauricio Urbina: It failed, so just wanted to clarify that.

Kerry Hitt: Okay.

Chris Wallace: Well, I was here at that meeting, too, and that's not exactly what I heard. I know what I said.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Let me say something. So, a committee doesn't need pros or cons? In a committee, do you have pros or cons? You would think there would be.

Mauricio Urbina: No, the committee was established to determine the viability of the cost.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Right, and the input from all sides, right?

Mauricio Urbina: Somebody was flat out against the roads we felt that the volunteering time of all the committee was going to be wasted discussing something that was not the purpose of the committee. So, we collectively, not myself. It was a collective decision of the committee to uninvite anyone who was against the paving to begin with, because he wants me to determine is this viable, yes or no? And what is the cost? What is the timeline, etc. So, we failed at having somebody who was flat-out against the, uh, rotating was going to be a distraction, and it was going to take more of our volunteering time. Which can account for...

Ruben Ferrazzano: Yeah, but somebody might have questions. So, the committee doesn't need any input from anybody else.

Mauricio Urbina: No, no, sorry, we, we...

Ruben Ferrazzano: So, how do we create drainage?

Mauricio Urbina: We invite anybody, and we have invited, and you can look at the minutes, like, we always invite...

Ruben Ferrazzano: Well, I couldn't... I couldn't have been invited. No, I can't...

Kerry Hitt: No, he couldn't be.

Ruben Ferrazzano: No, no, I can't, no.

Kerry Hitt: Because Charlie is on the board, that's one of the problems. And I might have had questions.

Ruben Ferrazzano: I might have said, well, how are we going to deal with drainage? Because if you want to fill in one side of the ditch, there are properties that are lower-lying properties. So, when we have that, what do we have? We have retention areas.

Aldo Disorbo: Well, in the last... in the last hearing, Terry said that that wouldn't be a problem.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Well, we don't know, because we don't have the... we don't have our engineers.

Kerry Hitt: I think Eric... Eric...

Ruben Ferrazzano: We don't have... our engineers is...

Aldo Disorbo: If building one side, and you put a pipe in, the other side, you wouldn't have a drainage problem.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Yeah, but... It would have to be inspected.

Kerry Hitt: I didn't say that. Eric brought that... Eric brought that up, and we discussed it. And I haven't... I was based on that.

Ruben Ferrazzano: If it's a problem, you're saying that it's not a problem, but how do we actually know?

Kerry Hitt: Okay, just... Just a minute. I'm gonna take the mic now, and I just wanted to get this cleared up. Okay? We had a discussion about the drainage. They... we sort of... And maybe it wasn't fair to Eric, threw that to him, and he said, I didn't think it was going to be a problem. However, I've gone out, and I haven't had a chance to talk to you about this, but I've gone out, and I've looked at this. The road right now is the highest point there. Right. The road base is... is... has... we've paid to have a core drilled, we checked it out, we said, okay, the road base is good, we can go ahead and build it there. Now, if we fill in one of the swales, the swale's lower than the center of the road. The land that is on the side, whichever side the horse trail is going to be on. If you fill in the swale, the land is lower than the road. Then how can you put a level on... a... what is it, a mono grade, is it called? A mono grade on the road to tilt the road, to slant the road over so it goes over to make the other swale handle the output of the water, and you felt as though it would handle it.

Eric Grainger: If on one side of the road you have nothing but a small swale, and the remainder of the road section drains to the south side of structured drainage. That's a feasible design. Would there be periodic yard drains, and maybe some exfiltration prints that makes that mark. But it wouldn't be two structured drainage systems on the center street.

Kerry Hitt: But the problem is, is you have land. to... I'm gonna say it right side, just for the purpose of there. Okay, you're gonna have land to the right side which is lower than the center of the road. So, if you put a monograde on the road. You've got land over here that's lower than that, and it's not going to drain out into the other swale. So, so there's going to be...

Eric Grainger: But what I was saying is that whole side of the street....becomes a swale, and periodically, let's say 3 times per street, you'd have nothing other than just a hard drive and crossing that connects it. It's not full structure drainage on both sides of the river. So, you have structured drainage on one side of the road. We would... one possible solution, and again, this is why we do an engineering study to really work this out, but one possible solution is to put a swale on one side of the road. Whether it be exactly where the existing swale is or not is a function of the design, depending on where the right-of-way is. But we put a swale on one side of the road that does nothing other than capture the drainage that would be trapped from the fact that the road's been regraded. And then periodically along that swale, we do some cross under-the-street connections, say, maybe 2 or 3 per road to interconnect one side of the street to the other. And the majority of the structure drainage then goes on the, let's call it, south side of the road, if we chose to do it that way.

Unknown: What about not turning a... drainage into a riding easement.

Eric Grainger: No, what I'm saying is there's a right-of-way that's existing with the district's right-of-way that we would use to reconfigure the road and stay within the drainage districts right-of-way. Then we won't use your swale. We'll put another swale in next to it. There are many different ways to solve it from a design standpoint, I'm just telling you that. We're having detailed discussions here about how exactly we're going to make this work, and we don't even have something as simple as a survey or an initial engineering study, which is really the crux of the whole discussion, is if we're going to go forward with the project in any sense, to even figure out what it would cost and how the designs would fall into place, we need to have an initial study done. So that was what was discussed at the previous meeting. Unfortunately, the engineer is not here tonight, but...

Unknown question from the audience.

Eric Grainger: Well, I... that's up for discussion. I mean, there's been a lot of things said that I don't know exactly where their factual basis is coming from, I'm just telling you that.

Eric Grainger: Yeah, but it... I understand his sentiment is that he's trying to put together a committee that's focused on pricing the project and determining its feasibility through pricing. And to have detractors on that same committee can be counterproductive, so that's not to say that other people that are against the project don't have opportunities to speak, and everybody has an opportunity to vote. Everybody will have an opportunity to comment on their efforts and their conclusions, but to get a group together to try and price something and figure out how it's going to be done and at the same time, be combating other people in the meeting that want to talk about how it's not feasible. You can have a second committee that just talks about how it's not feasible. And then those two committees at the end can come together and you have your pros and cons. One committee focuses on why not, one focuses on why to do it, but to have a committee that's trying to lock down pricing and function of cost and process, and then have people that are strictly there because they're against the project is not productive. There's nothing stopping you from forming a committee of why you don't want the project to happen. I'm just saying, you know, you could certainly form a committee that talks about how it's infeasible. Just like he's formed one that's talked about how it's feasible.

Virginia Doeblar: I have a question here. I'm kind of new to this whole thing here. What is the benefit of being part of a municipality and doing this project versus being a special district that which we are...

Eric Grainger: For the most part, controlled. So, if you're part of a citywide district, let's say you become part of Village of Wellington, or whatever agency you become part of.

Virginia Doeblar: So, what are the benefits of...

Eric Grainger: The decisions that you're being subject to are decisions that are being done for the entire village, as opposed to specific to your community.

Virginia Doeblar: I know, but on a financial benefit.

Eric Grainger: Well, there's a financial pro and con, but, you know, Wellington may never decide that they want to spend money paving these roads, and you all may, you know, you might have a majority of people that want them paved, and Wellington might decide that doesn't fit our budget this year, or whatever their decision is. So, you lose control over these decisions.

Kerry Hitt: The big issue here is, I think this is what's unique, is the land, the roads belong to the landowners.

Eric Grainger: Correct.

Kerry Hitt: The roads are private roads.

Eric Grainger: Right.

Kerry Hitt: And that is... and the other thing that's unique is we as a water control district are responsible for the roads.

Eric Grainger: Right.

Kerry Hitt: It happened through the courts.

Eric Grainger: Right.

Kerry Hitt: Whether you agree with it or not, that's what the courts decided, but that's where we are, so... So, you know, we have a community of people that are trying to... first of all, it's kind of a unique community, and there are a lot of big changes that are coming, and they're coming quickly, and what we're trying to do is move through them as cautiously as we can, and you know, with as much logic and understanding and understanding what the people are trying to do. That's what it. That's what it's about.

Eric Grainger: Right. And... Um... so... The duty... We're gonna... So... I've asked Mr. Schoech to take a look at the ballot. Do you think that we should redo this?

Karen Morris: YES!

Charles Schoech: Whether you redo the ballot or not is really a policy decision, not a legal decision. But let me just address what the ballot is. It says, this ballot is for landowners' vote on the paving of dirt roads within rustic ranches and combining them with horse trails which run parallel with the roads in rustic ranches. And then there are estimates of the total cost. And the vote... the question for the vote is. If you agree to paving the roads based on the above estimated cost to the landowners.

18:54:58 check yes. If you disagree with paving the roads based on the estimated cost to the landowners, check no. That's what the vote was. It wasn't about design work, it wasn't about preliminary engineering, it was. Are you in favor of paving the roads? Based on the estimates provided. Or are you against paving the roads based on the estimates provided? If that's the question you want answered, then there's no reason to redo it. If you wanted to know whether or not you should proceed with preliminary design work so that you can get a better estimate of the cost then the ballot would need to be redone. But whether you redo it or not is a policy decision.

Um, this is Cecilia Cochran, uh, on Rustic Road. So, basically, either way, what you're saying is. you're gonna pave the roads because you just said that with the... with the ballot. Based on the cost, you said yes, or based on the cost, you say no. You're still saying we're gonna pave the roads. That's the question is, if you really break down what you just said.

Charles Schoech: The council... The board has not made a decision as to whether to pave the roads or not. And they can't really make that decision until they get the final bid cost for the paving. Uh... because they've got to have the financing in place to move forward. The question here is. In general, do the landowners within the district favor paving or not based on the estimated, preliminary estimated costs. Uh, it's not... it's not a vote to pave the roads, it's a vote to determine what the sentiment of the landowners is within the district.

Cecelia Cochran: Then you should reword it and make it clear and say, do you want to pave the roads, or do you not want to pave the roads? Not saying based on the cost, because that's a different... that's saying something completely different.

Kerry Hitt: Well, the cost is a factor. The cost is a factor, and that says, do we do it or not. Everybody here, I think, would... I would say most everybody would say, let's pave the roads, but we didn't want to lead anybody down.

Cecelia Cochran: I disagree. I disagree. Of course, people don't necessarily want to pave the roads.

Kerry Hitt: What... well, and that could be not... Okay, and I understand being. The other thing we need to take into consideration, it is an equestrian overlay community. And that's the reason we have to combine the paving of the roads with the horse trails. So, there's... there's more here to be made. The decision has got to be made on more than just, do we want to pave the roads. We need to get a number, and this is, quite frankly, has been.

Cecelia Cochran: the elephant in the room.

Kerry Hitt: Aldo, go ahead.

Aldo Disorbo: (Couldn't hear question)

Kerry Hitt: We did. But the road committee has gone in place, there's a... what I see... the issue that I see is what Ruben was bringing up, the road committee was put in place. And the people that are on the road committee want to get the roads paved. And it seems as though other people who were looking to get on the committee who could have been pro and con, I mean, the way you put a committee together and the way you make a decision is you basically come to an agreement.

Karen Morris: Can I ask a question? I'm online. Morris. on Deer Path. Where did these numbers come from? On the ballot? These estimates?

Kerry Hitt: The low numbers were the estimated numbers that we got from Wellington. And the high numbers were numbers that we got, that we... or the height....

Charles Brown: There were two sets of numbers.

Kerry Hitt: Go ahead.

Charles Brown: And so the so-called high numbers. Those were numbers that we received from Wellington. Uh, they were straight out of the engineering handbook, and did not reflect the actual condition of the roads themselves, in terms of the, for example, the quality of the base. That base is actually very, very strong. We had 10-core samples and uh, it passed, we were able to put pavement directly onto that road with no additional base, which is what drove the cost up. The numbers from the paving committee are the lower numbers, and the numbers that reflected our current situation. Whereas the Wellington numbers, the high numbers, were straight out of the book. No...

Mauricio Urbina: There's never higher. But what was shared with us was willing to share with the paying committee and with the community was 6.75 at the most. Wellington certainly did not share with us. Anything higher than 6.75.

Kerry Hitt: Well, we're saying our low numbers are 6.

Mauricio Urbina: But where did the 8, 10, and 12 come from?

Charles Brown: from Wellington. That came from their engineer.

Kerry Hitt: Yes.

Charles Brown: Straight out... yeah, yeah, yeah, straight out of it.

Mauricio Urbina: I mean, at least shared information.

Charles Brown: We were actually all in the meeting at town hall, in the big conference room, okay, and on the Wellington side, they had three... three guys. One of those guys was their engineer. Okay? And he said in that meeting, those big, round numbers were just straight out of the manual, so to speak. And didn't reflect our current situation.

Mauricio Urbina: I have still a presentation, uh, Jim. I believe here with me. If I have the presentation that Wellington presented to us in the highest number there is 6.75. That's the number from the engineers.

Kerry Hitt: Well, to answer the question, to answer the question, and Charlie, I think, has backed it up, where did the numbers come from? The low numbers, as we have on here, is 6. And the high number is 12, and we pick that number, and it could be more, it could be less, I don't know.

Jim Barnes: So, basically, I think, and I'm not sure exactly what was on the, uh, on the ballot that was sent out, but regardless, the 6 to 12, I think, in Jonathan Ryan's old presentation that was at the community center. Which is where we did the community meeting to discuss that. I think we had a range. And that was based on just the linear mileage of the roadway and the typical section that was proposed. And, uh, looking at the old information that was in HSW's report, and we did provide a range, and I think, and I can't say for sure, I'm checking with Jonathan now, but, uh, it was beyond just the \$6 million. It went higher than that, because it was basically; you had to factor in engineering, you had to factor in contingency, since we didn't have design plans, and that's why I think we had a larger number. I can't say without looking at the slide deck myself right now if it was exactly 12, but it was certainly... 6 was on the lower.

Kerry Hitt: Okay.

Mauricio Urbina: I'll share the presentation. Um, on social media. Yours village production.

Kerry Hitt: Okay. Well... to answer the question and Charlie has backed it up. I think Jim has backed it up, that's where the numbers came from. Okay. Uh...

Carlos Arrellano: I'm Carlos Arellano, 16623 Norris. Um, we don't know what the price is gonna be.

Kerry Hitt: Correct.

Carlos Arrellano: But we know if we are in favor or against. And I would like... I would like to ask... For the people that are in favor to get up. Or for the people that are against it, to get up in this room to see how we are. And I would like to ask the people that are against it to get up now. If that's okay with you?

Kerry Hitt: Well, I don't know that that would prove, because... I just want to know how...

Ruben Ferrazzano: Yeah, I don't think that's a...

Carlos Arrellano: Okay, but the ones that are present here are the ones that are interested in this.

Kerry Hitt: I understand that.

Karen Morris & Cecelia Cochran: No? Yes, we are online.

Kerry Hitt: There are people that are online, yeah, yeah.

Carlos Arrellano: People are what?

Kerry Hitt: There are people online, there are a number of people that are online that are listening to this.

Carlos Arrellano: Okay, but all the people that are in here, not online. Can I ask for permission for them to get up if they're not against it?

Kerry Hitt: I don't think that that... is going to prove anything. It's too small a group. Honestly, I think it's too small a group. You're not going to change it. Yeah.

Jenny Carlson: Hi, Jenny Carlson, Norris Road, I've been waiting here to chat and ask. So, as I understand it, like, you're asking about drainage, and was it consulted? Well, none of us are an engineer to answer that. We've asked about the road cost, and this is like asking somebody. How do you build it without plans? And the answer is, you guys have to decide whether or not you want to get plans to find out if the water can be handled, if the road could handle it. You guys have to decide that if you're gonna even bother getting plans, nobody's gonna bid this without plans. That would be... I mean, that would be like a house builder putting a... I mean, he doesn't know what kind of cabinets you want. He doesn't know if you want a two-story house. Like, you guys have got to make that decision. I understand that. This is an hour into this meeting, and we haven't done anything. You know, I just feel like we need to move forward from everybody fighting with each other, and you guys need to tell us, as the board, what we're doing here.

Kerry Hitt: Okay, to answer your question, the first decision that has to be made is, are you going to build a house? So that's where we are. No, that is what it intended to be. Lori? You've been patient.

Lori: I'm not into construction, and I just had a question. How. Why are you guys asking Wellington for these bids? Why aren't you asking paving companies? I mean... get quotes. Why are we going that route? Well, how many quotes do we have from a paving company?

Ruben Ferrazzano: Well, how many quotes do we have? From a paving company:

Kerry Hitt: One.

Ruben Ferrazzano: From the committee?

Mauricio Urbina: Two

Ruben Ferrazzano: Why only two?

Charles Brown: Well, we asked for four.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Well, I mean, you know, I mean, if you're in business, I mean,

Charles Brown: Some said we're not interested.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Oh, there's more, isn't it? I mean, there's only 4 companies here that will do the work throughout South Florida, I mean, they come from Fort Lauderdale, Miami... Well, but maybe we should have gone further out instead of 2.

Eric Grainger: I can put them up with two more.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Yeah, see, I mean... Yeah, it's just not, uh...

Eric Grainger: I put them up with two more, but the reason that the numbers were taken from Wellington is another large established area. You have a large established area that's relevant.

Kerry Hitt: No, wait.

Eric Grainger: So, to answer someone's comment, the reason the numbers were taken from Wellington is you have a large established area with contractors that do work in this area, so without design plans and a lot of guesswork. It's easiest to get budget numbers from them. That doesn't mean that those are the best budget numbers. I just told the board if they want, I can bring on at least 2 more paving contractors from other communities that do work in the Palm Beach and Broward County area to get some more numbers, but without a design, it's very much guesswork. Uh, you know, but you can, you know, like someone mentioned earlier about building a house and not knowing what you're building. I work on projects often enough that if someone tells me they have a full acre and they want to develop a commercial property. I know that the cost is between \$150,000 and \$175,000 an acre to parking lot drainage, curbing, lighting, because just because I do enough of those projects, I have the cost data to tell me that. So, a roadway contractor can tell you. Per linear foot, if the project is a certain size of 3 to 10 miles, or whatever the size of the project is they fall within a certain range of pricing, and that's when we get these budget numbers. So, we can get to more budget numbers fairly simply before the next meeting. But we really, at some point, need to decide just based on the cost of the feasibility study and the initial engineering work, is this something that there's enough interest in moving forward with to even do that study, to get better numbers. But we can get more numbers.

Ted Brinkman: We've been here over an hour. We had a vote. What was the vote? If the no's outnumber the yeses, that's the end of it, we can all go home. If the yeses outnumber the no's, then we have to have a committee to do a study, come up with a price. I don't care, I don't know whether they're right, wrong, or indifferent. We can end it.

Kerry Hitt: So, so your vote is to redo the ballot? You think we should redo the ballot, and what will we gain... what will we gain from... what will we gain from that? Well, uh, Mr. Schoech just read the... read what we asked for.

Judith Phalen: A really bright person named Jenny Carlson was talking about the ballot, and she said, I hope she is here. Jenny was concerned that people didn't actually know what you are proposing, in terms of the drainage ditches that, uh, going under the road and everything, and she said we're going to propose roadway new sketch plan. The roadway new sketch plan, since nobody ever attends these meetings but us 20. There's going to be a proposed sketch plan, like you have here, and she was referring to something that was on one of the slides. Are... of what we're voting on. Like, there's enough

money that some of the description of, okay, so on your site. And then, Kerry said. No, I think what Jenny's saying is good. We'll have that included with it and put that on the ballot. Was not on the ballot.

Kerry Hitt: There was not a picture of that on the ballot, I agree.

Judith Phalen: Not a picture on the ballot, and there was no...

Kerry Hitt: We sat down, and we tried to put together the best we could with the ballot.

Judith Phalen: I understand that.

Kerry Hitt: Okay, they did not. You know.

(Unknown question)

Kerry Hitt: I did. Yeah. I Betty did. Well, okay. In the last almost 6 years. that I've been president of this board. We as a community have endured a bit of a roller coaster. And it really has to do with the roads. Uh, most of the situations we've had. Uh, we've gotten resolved with great costs to the landowners. I'm trying to keep the cost down. For the landowners? Uh, we're on the roads again. And we have people who say that they want to get it done. We have people say they don't want to get it done. We have people who are threatening. suits, they are threatening all types of things if things aren't done the way they want it done. And... frankly, I see another situation that's brewing. And this time the battle, I really believe, is for the control of the Pine Tree Board. And the prize will be the complete control of the non-valorem taxing authority, which, incidentally does not have an annual cap, so you all know that. As to how much the tax can increase per year, which means that if the board... and the board does have the power to pass a resolution to do these roads. So, if the board passes a resolution to assess the landowners for the full value of the cost of the project, it's justified in doing so. It has that much power. There are loud voices that are mounting a challenge to take over the board, essentially. To make this more related to the current situation, if the Board votes to pave the roads the landowners will be required to pay them, period. It's cut and dry. I'm not sure the Pine Tree has the board... as a board, has the and as an entity, you're equipped to handle the challenge, I really don't. And, um... I'm wondering... in fact, I think that because Rustic Ranches is a part of Wellington and I think that because Pine Tree Water Control District is a part of Rustic Ranches, I have to raise the question, is it time for the Pine Tree Water Control District to become dependent on Wellington. That means that you have an entity in place that understands some of the things we don't understand, knows how to deal with things that we don't know how to deal with. Uh... Mistakes aren't made, and some mistakes have been made, I... not on purpose. We've tried to do the best job we know how to do. But there are a lot of people that are unhappy. Maybe you need to have an entity in here, and... Uh, as a straw vote, it is... Who would be interested in having that happen?

Karen Morris: I would.

Kerry Hitt: Let that Pine Tree become dependent on it. Let Wellington handle it.

Jim Barnes: Let me just clarify something. Okay. You would not become part of Acme. Pine Tree would still exist as a dependent district of Wellington, the way ACME does, but you would not be part of Acme. That's a separate system altogether.

Unknown: Could you maybe give a little presentation on what that would entail, becoming...

Jim Barnes: I wasn't prepared for that, but I can give you... I mean, just... we do this for, you know, I do it for a living, I guess, so I can tell you what we do with Acme, and so the main difference, and Mr. Schoech is the expert in the room here, as far as special districts goes, but... the way it operates is that just for backstory on Acme. Acme was the independent district that governed, that ran surface water management, did parks, streets, lights, etc., within the area of Wellington prior to incorporation. At Incorporation, one of the issues that was addressed and as a requirement of incorporation was that the Acme Improvement District would become a dependent district of the village. The easiest way to describe that is that in lieu of having a separate, independent board that's elected by the landowners within the service area is, uh, the board of the special district would be the Village Council. As a dependent district. So, in addition to their role as the Village Council of the Village of Wellington, they are also the Board of Supervisors with Acme Improvement District. And so, as part of, even if you're within the Village of Wellington, within the Acme portion, just like you all see a line item on your taxes for Pine Tree, those with an Acme, we see a line item that says Acme Improvement District, and that is a non-ad valorem assessment, uh, and that's the way that operates. So, in this case should the Board of Supervisors and the residents make a determination that they want to go in that direction. It would require a vote of the residents within the Pine Tree Water Control District to make a determination to become a dependent district of the village of Wellington. Pine Tree would still exist. Uh, it would not be part of Acme, but it would be within the purview, then, of the Village Council, sitting as the board of the Pine Tree Water Control District.

Paulette Venere: Just want to ask one thing. In all those projects, did you consider. Because we have city water. Are they considering where the pipes go? In the projects?

Ruben Ferrazzano: Well, I think... I believe the pipe is buried on the north side of every road. Wherever the fire hydrant is. And then you have pipe that goes to the other side to the homeowners.

Paulette Venere: Either, the weight that is going to be added to those pipes. That has to be considered.

Mauricio Urbina: Okay. Well, the premise that Kerry has put on the table is... is the situation with the roads something that we should. Like, you're saying basically that the board is not equipped to handle the road situation, and then you're exploring the idea of maybe have Wellington take over that handling. And so, I don't know that that's a viable solution because for instance, we have communities like Saddle Trail. In Saddle Trail, we had exactly the same situation. Where we had a community that was split up, it was divided. And half of the community decided to pave. And the other one decided not to pave. And so, I don't know that Wellington can bypass the will of the landowners. Uh, at that point, I will ask, what can we do to equip the board to... handle the situation? Is it... do we need better systems, different board members? What do we need? Because I believe that again, outsourcing that to Wellington. And with the presidents of Saddle Trail, it's not necessarily the solution. In my opinion.

Jim Barnes: If I could just make a clarification on the Saddle Trail example, there's actually the two sides to Saddle Trail. The one side that was paved, you still had uh, it was not unanimous. The other side never actually even considered going through the process, so it was only just on the one side of Saddle trail that considered paving, and it was not unanimous, but the village council still opted to move forward with the vote of a percentage of the, uh landowners within that portion of it, so it wasn't... it wasn't a one-side pave, one side didn't, because of the, uh, split. The one side didn't even consider paving, just as clarification.

Chris Wallace: part of Acme, it's not part of Pine Tree. We would be... we would be separate, but we would be in Wellington. And I think that... Who knows what would be coming down the line? If we check the Pine Tree board. We've had it for a long time. And now it's time to be governed by Wellington, it's an incorporate us into Wellington more than we are now, and have Wellington council handle, uh, Pine Tree business. What are we going to have next sidewalks and street lights and parks, and... We live in a rustic area and we love it. If we have some people take over the board that is mildly absorbital.

Kerry Hitt: I don't believe that most of the residents understand the power that the port has. And... depend on how the board leans. You could have anything voted in that comes down the road, and... You really could not do anything about it. So... I'm trying to look out for the... what I believe is the best for the community. And at this point in time, I think that you know, we've had our... we've had our rough times with Wellington. Those are gone, they're worked out. Mr. Barnes is visiting the meetings. He's interested in Rustic ranches as part of Wellington. Not as a bunch of rednecks that are out there on the other side of the canal, and I think that, uh... that Wellington would be able to govern this thing evenly and fairly. That's my opinion. Um... would be handled properly. Yeah.

Chris Wallace: That's the way they do things. They would make sure that every road was paved the same way. If there's an issue with drainage, they would take care of that.

Rosito Badua: How many votes are in? For yes or no. And if the majority of the votes are yes, we need all the information you're looking for. If the majority of the...

Kerry Hitt: We're done. We did the vote, we had it. If we have to redo it, is there any harm in saying where the votes are?

Ted Brinkman: That's a great idea, I think I said it a while ago. Yeah. We have a separate issue here?

Kerry Hitt: Yeah.

Ted Brinkman: To join Wellington or not, which would totally put the roads aside. Can we have a motion to do that and have a vote, which would have to go out at registered mail and be voted on by everyone?

Kerry Hitt: That would definitely... in fact, I don't... I don't know.

Ted Brinkman: And see if that would be the one who would... They have to come back to the issue. If that gets approved. Again, let's go home and have dinner. I'd like to make a motion... that we have a vote? Do we want to join one?

Kerry Hitt: Since I brought it up, I will... I will make a motion that the board explore what's necessary to look at becoming Pine Tree Water Control District become a dependent district to Wellington.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Okay, I don't know.

Judith Phalen: All I can say right now is that we came here to talk about roads and paving. And now we're talking about a complete reversal of something that's been in place for, like, over 40 years.

And I hate to use this term, bait and switch. Here's the thing. I am really concerned about some of the things you said a few minutes ago about how you feel there's so much antagonistic comments, behaviors, threats of lawsuits, etc.

Kerry Hitt: I don't think I used the word antagonistic.

Judith Phalen: No, I did, because that's the way it sounded to me, that you felt that you were being, that the board was being threatened in various ways.

Kerry Hitt: Yes, I was, and I have the text, yes, absolutely, I was.

Judith Phalen: Okay, all right, and I'm sorry that that happened to you.

Kerry Hitt: Well, okay.

Judith Phalen: But here's the thing. I don't feel... Okay, don't walk in your shoes, I don't know everything that's going on, but I feel like that if we have made such a mess of trying to figure out a proper ballot so that we can move forward or not move forward about paving roads. That it only complicates the situation if suddenly we have to decide whether or not we want Wellington to be deciding whether or not Ruben can go fix gates. I mean, I just... I don't understand that.

Kerry Hitt: I understand that, Judy, and bluntly, I understand that. That's your opinion. We all have opinions here. Okay, fine. So... We can do one of two things. We can both do both things. We can give the number of votes. If you have the votes, and then we can get back on.

Ruben Ferrazzano: We can get back to Pine Tree, because this is... I mean, I got a ton of questions about Pine Tree and... I didn't get you. And the job we're supposed to be doing.

Mauricio Urbina: I Voted NO.

You made your point, Mauricio.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Yeah.

Marc Stanuschewski: Normally, we should set this report. He's at the very end. What do you mean what your issues is? This is a... This is something which has to... be written in a contract for engineer, and then you commence. Or your comment can say, okay. The problem for the engineer is to make it not worse. But have to make it better than before. We do not understand this.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Well, my concerns are a flooding of the properties. That is my concern. Yeah, but you bring this up to an inch? You have built your barn and you've got it up high enough.

Marc Stanuschewski: No, no, no, no, no, no. I spent a million dollars to avoid these problems.

Ruben Ferrazzano: All right, well, I didn't, you know, I didn't, and you're forcing me to spend a million dollars.

Marc Stanuschewski: No, no, this is not to... This is not what I'm talking about.

Ruben Ferrazzano: What are you talking about?

Marc Stanuschewski: I'm angry, because I'm involved in this now, 3 years. Yeah. And you were fighting against ours. city, our own town. The \$500,000 a year for attorney. It makes no sense, I said, stop this and make it better, and then... Now I see the same situation with you, 5 inside the community. This is not... I'm fine, I'm living on a paved road. I have no problem with that. And what you said is you have to bring it up earlier to all these people. This is maybe a concern, what do you have? Right! And this is... the engineers should take care of your concerns, and it should say, okay. This is the plan, I can handle this. And it's maybe better for you later than before. No, this is his shot to make it better, not worse. So, I'm done with this. I will not show up anymore, because this is stupid here. It doesn't have a vote on it. Yeah, no. Well, because this is stupid. I cannot vote for something like this. You can... You can... and everyone views it? This is then also a no. A no for a while? And when I know... I'm not sure...

Karen Morris: I really believe that this should not be voted on. This is just too much... Arguments, too much fighting in this, I mean... I just... Mr. President, I really grieve for you with what's going on.

Betty Camplin: So, do you want me to give you the numbers?

Kerry Hitt: Yes, let's do the vote.

Betty Camplin: Okay, there are 73 responses. 110.5124 acres - yes; 258.5551 acres - no. That is 70% no. And 29.9 yes.

Kerry Hitt: Okay. The next issue that I brought up. Are there people who are interested?

Cecelia Cochran: No.

Karen Morris: I am. I am. Perhaps we should have a vote on that instead of having it done online. Or having it done in a meeting. Because some people may be afraid to vote the way they really want to.

Kerry Hitt: No, it's not a vote. To clarify things, we're not looking to vote on whether or not we're going to become dependent on Wellington. I wanted to do it as a straw poll to see who would have that interest in doing it. It's something that should we look at doing.

Ted Brinkman: We're done, right? We're not paying the road as of now.

Kerry Hitt: I'm not sure... at this point, I would say no. But there's been questions on the ballot. We'll talk to Mr. Schoech about that, what we need to do. I felt as though this was very clear. I felt as though we were looking at this thing, and we're trying to make a decision whether we're going to spend somewhere between \$150,000 and \$400,000 for an engineering report.

Ted Brinkman: Well, that... But again, join Wellington or not, I would say yes to it.

Mauricio Urbina: The numbers are not valid. Because even right now, uh, thank you, Jim,

Charlie Benezia: Kerry, I think it might be prudent for you or somebody on the board to explain exactly what you mean when you say how much power the board has. Because I don't think it's actually

as transparent to everybody in here, as you know it to be, because you're on the board and you've seen the fine print.

Kerry Hitt: Okay.

Charlie Benezia: Does that make sense?

Kerry Hitt: I do, okay. Maybe even better, Mr. Schoech, could you put it in your words as to how much power the water control district board has, and what the non-ad valorem tax authority is?

Charlie Benezia: If I may add this just quickly, just explain the percentages. It's a three-person board.

Kerry Hitt: Yeah, correct.

Charlie Benezia: The third majority. What two people who are elected to the board have the power to cause within the neighborhood, and how that will affect all of our taxes.

Kerry Hitt: Correct.

Charles Schoech: And this doesn't apply just to Pine Tree, it's... applies to all special districts. It's... it's not a pure democracy. It's not... The decisions aren't made based on the vote of the individual landowners. Yes, the position and vote of the individual landowner affects how the board votes. But the board has the ability to adopt a budget, to levy an assessment and to approve or disapprove projects regardless of the vote of the landowners. The landowner's remedy is at the ballot box and they would determine whether or not they like the action of the board or didn't like the action of the board, and would re-elect board members or elect someone in their place. But the board gets to make the decision on the budget, the expenditures and the assessment. And that would include the projects that those funds are then used for and spent for. So, there's 3 board members and, uh... a quorum is 2. And so, two of the 3 board members can make a decision to move forward with a project, even if the landowners disapproved of the project. And the landowner's remedy, as I said, would be at election time to... either re-elect that board member or replace that board member.

Charlie Benezia: But in the event that that board makes a decision. For example, paving the roads at whatever the cost will end up being, it's irreversible after that. So, with the board being one individual is re-elected every year, correct?

Charles Schoech: Correct.

Charlie Benezia: So... I mean, I don't know the specifics on where that timeline would fall as far as going from approval or by the board to engineering to this or that, but essentially what I was trying to maybe get out of you guys is to say that. If... I'm trying to think of how to explain it.

Kerry Hitt: Let me help. If I understand it, if I understand it correctly, if I can put these words in. Once the decision is made by the board to move forward. That's it. That's the decision to be made to move forward. As Mr. Schoech says, that you can vote, you can vote them out. But you can vote out one every. every year, because it's a 3-year.

Charles Schoech: The board can... vote to move forward, but they have to do this incrementally. They... because there's no financing in place for this project. So, first, they would have to. do the design

work. After that design work is done. And you have the appropriate documents you then go out to bid and get formal bids from contractors. At that point, you can reject the project based on the bids. Or you can move forward with the project. And until the contract is signed with the contractor, you can always back out and change your mind. But you've already paid for the design, the engineering. Uh, and so the question then is, at that point. Do you want to back out or not? And I have seen governments move forward with projects at that point and back out because the price exceeded what they thought was reasonable.

Kerry Hitt: However, couldn't it be moved from step to step to step by the board?

Charles Schoech: Absolutely.

Kerry Hitt: So, the board has the power to do that.

Charles Schoech: has the power to do that, yes.

Kerry Hitt: But they have the power to do that depends on and again there is no limit, there's no percentage limit on a non-ad valorem tax. As there is in other taxing authorities, is that correct?

Chris Wallace: And there are 2 people that either wants something, whether it's the road, or a building or whatever. Doesn't matter what anybody else thinks. The board makes that decision.

Kerry Hitt: Yes.

Chris Wallace: So, you never know, really, what's going to be coming down the line next time.

Charles Schoech: The board is the final say on whether a project goes forward or not, regardless of the sentiment of the landowners. But as we all know, the board usually listens to the landowners. They're not going to make 100% happy, because some are always going to be opposed, and some are going to be for it. Uh, but the board makes the decision not to landowners.

Jenny Carlson: For those that are online. To piggyback off of his comments, and I think what isn't being said tonight is, for those that are concerned for, against, or whatever, just know that these meetings, for who the heck's gonna be elected, happen in the middle of goddamn summer when nobody is here. So, if you care how your money is spent, or you care what's going on, you need to show up, and you need to be here because the vote takes place in person. It's not mailed out. So, just for heads up for anybody listening.

Aldo Disorbo: Let's talk about the election. Yeah, proxies, I'm saying... If you go to the proxies from the last election, you know, they were no good. There was a few that were no good. So, I'm saying, you're the lawyer on this. Oh, here you go, here you go.

Unknown: Proxy, um... I have proxies from Miss Wallace. Proxy that says, I, Chris Wallace. nominate Ruben but it's signed by Veronica. I have a proxy from Paulette, appointing Chris Wallace not signed by Paulette. Paulette, is that your signature?

Chris Wallace: We didn't need a signature.

Unknown: It's a proxy. It needs a signature.

Chris Wallace: It did not need a signature.

Unknown: It's not... this is not her signature. This proxy was a vote without a signature.

Chris Wallace: This proxy has been in place since 1977.

Aldo Disorbo: You elect a board that's gonna make decisions, but when you have the board
19:39:41 adding in, projections. I'm not handling...

Charles Schoech: I have not looked at those proxies, so I do not... You know? But if there's a contested election, the proxies would need to be, uh looked at to make sure that they are properly prepared. And I don't have an opinion on that, because I've not seen them.

Mauricio Urbina: And what about the motion that was put in place last... During the last meeting, where the board agreed that the handling of proxies moving forward, and the guidelines for elections were going to be documented and posted on their website. It has been 4 months, 5 months since that motion was put in place and approved by the board. Where are we with that?

Kerry Hitt: We don't have it finished yet.

Mauricio Urbina: That's concerning. That's very concerning.

Kerry Hitt: It sure is. Because we just talked about the power of the board, um, Ms. Lori just... reveal something that I find.... It's... it's terrible. And the board was tasked with... fix the problem moving forward. A motion was made for the board to hire an attorney, document the process, document the guidelines. It's been 4 months. And no action has been taken.

Kerry Hitt: There has been action taken. It had to do with... I had a phone call, I had phone calls trying to find out what was. What would, uh... constitute a... a good, a proxy that was good. I spoke with Mr. Schoech about it. I... Understood that an email, you don't have to necessarily have to have a signature, as I understood it. But if you have an email, or a text, or something electronic.

Charles Schoech: Yeah, it should be signed.

Kerry Hitt: It should be signed?

Unknown: I have 3 proxies in my possession right now that were signed by Ms. Wallace as another person. And she attached, I think, text messages. Um, but according to statute, Florida Statute 298.1111 there has to be some compliance with Florida law. You cannot forge somebody's signature on a proxy. Paulette, but... You put her name on there; she just testified that it's not her name.

Unknown: But she signed your name. I have 5 of those in my possession right now.

Zoom Landowner-unknown: I have a question. Can the board... can the board... Please tell everybody their names, because you're not even labeled up there, and I'm somewhat new. I don't know who any of you are, and I have been to the meetings, but you're never labeled up there. I want to know who is who up there on that.

Kerry Hitt: We've asked people to identify themselves when they take the mic.

Zoom Landowner-unknown : Well do it again, because I missed the first minute, sorry.

Kerry Hitt: Okay.

Zoom Landowner-unknown : Go ahead.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Ferrazzano Ruben. Board member.

Kerry Hitt: Kerry Head board member.

Charles Brown: Charlie Brown, board member.

Charles Schoech: Charles Schoech, Attorney.

Eric Grainger: Eric Grainger, engineer for the board.

Zoom Landowner-unknown : Thank you.

Unknown: Well... So, you have 3... Right. His wallet, meaning moving, signed by Veronica. Not valid. But it's a different proxy, different signature, different name. Same as you here, Ted Brinkman. Same signature. She handwrote the signature and signed it.

Chris Wallace: I wrote the name, I did not sign

Unknown: You cannot sign somebody else's name on a proxy...

Chris Wallace: All you're looking to do is take over this board. You're looking to fraudulently vote in...

Charlie Benezia: Just following the precedent that has been set for the last 40 years.

Unknown: You're supposed to comply with Florida law, I'm sorry. You're supposed to comply with the statute.

Chris Wallace: I do.

Kerry Hitt: So, there were 4 votes you have? Lauren. Okay, how many do you have? And then the next question is. Will it affect the vote? What was the vote? We went through the vote, and it seemed to me it was more than that.

Betty Camplin: Yeah, I'd have to look at it.

Kerry Hitt: Okay. Do you have it here?

Betty Camplin: It's in my email.

Unknown: You want more? I got more.

Ted Brinkman: We questioned that at the last election. I understand, I'm just saying, did anybody look at the policy? Now that some have been proven to be wrong, how many are wrong?

Kerry Hitt: Well, I'm sure that they looked over... I'm sure that they looked over all of them. So, how many do you have? That's... Okay, so... Would the next step be to see if they really are...A proxy, if I understand it right, is basically permission to vote for somebody in the absence. Okay.

Chris Wallace: She cannot supplement. When we were... when we were managed by Wellington, we had a Pine Tree board in Wellington, and we were managed by Wellington. This was our procedure, and this is the way we did it since the 70s. Now, I came here in 85. And that's the way we have always done it and it was acceptable. It was an accepted way of doing things, and it had been done for years and it is accepted.

Ted Brinkman: If it's wrong, it's wrong. If you discovered it now and can't be continued. They have to abide by state.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Let's consider... And I asked the attorney, what is considered a signature? Is it an X? Is it typed? What really makes a signature a signature?

Unknown: She's signed somebody else's signature.

Ruben Ferrazzano: No, no, no, that, that's... I asked him a question, not you, so...

Charles Schoech: The signature is the person's. Uh, signature, and in some cases, if they are not capable of writing their name, they can do it by an X, but then it's usually verified. But, uh, I have not looked at these. I cannot give you an opinion off the cuff without more information. If the board wants me to look at these and give them an opinion, I'd be happy to, but uh... I can't do it just based on partial information.

Kerry Hitt: Right? I think we need to get to the bottom of it, and get it resolved one way or another, and, and... Can we get to it by going to these people and finding out if they have given the proxy? Ask the people who had them, and, and... And if that's... if that's legitimate, then it's legitimate.

Charles Schoech: That is a possibility.

Kerry Hitt: Okay.

Mauricio Urbina: Well, the problem with this... the problem with this, in my opinion, if I may speak, and what is, uh. Uh, your name, sir?

Charles Schoech: Charles Scoech.

Mauricio Urbina: Charles. The problem with this is that we just uncovered that we have an issue that is systemic. It has been part of the system for the last God knows how many years. I decided to become involved once I was assessed for a lawsuit that I was charged I believe \$3,000 or \$4,000 under the leadership of the board. Um, because we were forced to pay legal fees. So that's when I decided to become involved, but the reason I say systemic is not only because it has taken place for the last 40 years. Is because, in my opinion, there is... Neglect. Neglect to look into the issue. And to resolve the issue. And that's a little bit different, because. You know, okay. Whatever. Maybe... maybe the board wasn't aware. But by now, the issue has been brought to the table. It's been documented. We have asked for corrective action. And time has gone by. And neither the proxy situation has been looked into. And more importantly. the corrections procedure, the documents around it, the correction has... they're

not in place. There is not an update. So, the issue is systemic, and the biggest problem with this, to speak to your point in the power of a board is that if I understand correctly, the statute, those proxies?

Are quote-unquote, um, they have a lifespan of 2 years. So, if those proxies are deemed valid. Those proxies are going to be used, or can be used for the next 2 years, according to the statute. And that's... that's the biggest problem. That's not what I read on the... Okay, Mr. Schoech said that he would look into this, and I would make a motion that the...

Charles Schoech: This is the first meeting I have been to. I was not the attorney when this vote was taken. I have no knowledge about any of this, and I'll be happy to look into it if the board wants me to. But I certainly can't give you an opinion.

Mauricio Urbina: So that being said. There are many landowners, not myself, clearly there's many that are certainly the ones that voted. Differently, that feel... that their will was not well represented. You are upset, and yes. Those actions are opening the board and our community to potential legal action that can translate yet again, into legal fees, like the ones we had to pay \$3,000 or \$4,000 a couple years ago because of a fight that was... We had no end in sight with Wellington. And I refuse to have... a board that... is neglecting to take action and is continuing exposing themselves to potential legal action, not on my part, I'm not gonna sue... I'm not gonna sue anybody. It's about integrity. It's not... it has nothing to do with Ruben. I respect Ruben a lot. He has been... He has been a con... He has been, he has been a contributor and a volunteer, and I want to acknowledge his work, his hard work, but it's beyond that. Integrity.

Kerry Hitt: Mauricio, I'd like to interrupt you. Okay, just one moment. Okay, I'm gonna make a motion that we... address this, no, I'm gonna finish. I'm gonna make a motion that we address this, that... I make a motion we have Mr. Schoech look into the proxies and resolve the issue to determine whether the proxies are valid. And can we go one step further to contact the people? To make sure that they have agreed to give the proxy to Chris Wallace. Can that validate it? Okay. So, that is the motion. Do I have a second?

Charles Brown: Second.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Yeah, I agree. Okay. Okay. And that's what we'll do, we are going to address it. We're gonna get it resolved.

Mauricio Urbina: But it's... what is going to be... what... what... how can I trust, or how can we trust the board? If this was a motion... No, let me finish, please, Kerry. This motion was approved. Agreed upon by the board last time, 4 months or 5 months ago. What is going to ensure that this time is going to get done.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Because... Well, you have a lawyer right here.

Kerry Hitt: That's what we just did.

Ruben Ferrazzano: It said he would look into it. That's your guarantee.

Kerry Hitt: And maybe to answer your question, maybe? Maybe what we need to do and that's part of the reason that I brought up. We can have him look through the... If you will do that, we'll give you all the...

Charles Schoech: I don't know that I have any ability to certify any election, but I will look at this, and I will give them my opinion on the validity of the proxies.

Unknown: When looking at the proxies. Shouldn't they be filled out properly, i.e, if they... Corporation, or an LLC owns the property, it should be named as the owner, not an individual person. And I think most of these are owned by corporations or LLCs. What I understand, it's individual people on there. It should be the LLC, and then signed by a manager. Or an officer at the corporation, and can we check to see if that's being done?

Kerry Hitt: That's what I look into. That's what he's going to do.

Karen Morris: When do we get the results from the attorney?

I didn't hear you, I'm sorry. Where do we get the results from the attorney?

Charles Schoech: I will give it to the board, and it's a public record.

Kerry Hitt: We will put it on the website. To answer your question, Mauricio, in terms of how can you trust the board, maybe it's time, as I said. Maybe it's time that we have somebody else handle this whole thing. That's why I brought up. Is it time? Is it time that maybe Wellington. That Pine Tree becomes dependent on Wellington. Wellington handled this because up until a couple of years ago, this thing's... Went along pretty smoothly. The big problem was with the roads. I'm not going to rehash that. But it ran. Basically, what the water control district is responsible for is draining water. This is a gravity-fed system. Water runs downhill. It's not that difficult. There's... from what I understand, there's not another water control district that has this type of issue. And maybe we need to have somebody else who's familiar with doing this handle it. Jim? Do you have a... anything to say, or do you...

Jim Barnes: Well, it's certainly something that, as you know. The board knows and the residents know it's been something that we've been dealing with for years. It was just for background, it was one of the conditions originally to annexation, was that there was going to be a vote of the residents, uh, landowners. And, uh, to make it a dependent district of the village, and then that boat was not supported. So, that's where we're at today. It's a different time. That's correct. Uh, so, but that is... it is something that was contemplated by the Village Council. Years ago during... at the annexation, and certainly still something, given that there was a basis for entering into the interlocal agreement was that certainly the relationship had improved. And we were open to entering into an interlocal agreement again.

Kerry Hitt: Okay, more recently. Different time and different people. So... And just, like...

Karen Morris: I have a question. I have a question. Is that Mr. Barnes? I can't see him in the picture.

Kerry Hitt: Yeah, it is.

Karen Morris: Hi, Mr. Barnes, Karen Morris-Clark, how are you? Mr. Barnes, can you just give us some quick benefits for why it would be better for Wellington?

Jim Barnes: Well, I'm not gonna do that, necessarily, but I'll explain the process, just what I was gonna say before you made the comment, is basically, the process is such that, you know, it's not gonna

happen overnight. If something like this were the will of the landowners and the board. So, the process, and again, Mr. Schoech's the expert, he can jump in if I misspeak, but generally speaking, I think generally you would want to get a vote of the landowners. To basically say, yes, we want to be a dependent district, or no, we do not. Pretty straightforward, yes or no, dependent or not dependent. But given that Pine Tree is still a statutorily governed pursuant to the 298 it still will require a local bill from the local delegation, legislative delegation, which would not be filed until the 2027 legislative session.

Charles Schoech: Correct.

Jim Barnes: And, uh, at that point, generally, the lead-up time to that is sometime. Usually in the late fall. getting the local bills in. Generally speaking, not to speak for elected officials at any level, particularly at the state, uh, they look to what the landowners, residents in the community prefer on matters like this. In fact, it was similar to when areas were taken out of pine tree and put into Acme, and similarly, out of Acme and put into Contract. It relied on what the will of the local governments were and the residents and landowners. So, then at that point, assuming it's passed in the 2027 legislative session. Generally speaking, uh, you know, it could just be in effect at that point. However, chances are that local bill will probably also include a second vote of the landowners to accept that change in the statute, and at that point, it wouldn't be effective. So, it's not a... it's not an immediate thing, however, uh, one thing that we would certainly consider, given that we have an existing working relationship with Pine Tree, and the basis for that is also that at the end of the day, you're still all Wellington residence, is that we would... if it looks like that that is the will of not only the board, but also the landowners, that we would go ahead in advance of the final action being taken by the legislature, and the final vote by the landowners, we would go ahead and work in a manner similar to the way we worked previously, where we really assisted in managing the district, whether it was related to running the meetings. The board would still have to exist until such time that it became a dependent district, but whether it was managing the meetings, updating the website, ensuring compliance with all the statutory requirements. Financial reporting, etc, where we essentially provided the staff support for the District. If that helps.

Kerry Hitt: In doing that, then we would be able to work with Mr. Schoech. The board work with Mr. Schoech, and the, sort of, the coordinator between the two is that. Is it workable?

Charles Schoech: The answer to that is yes, but it would have to be in conjunction with the village attorney.

Kerry Hitt: Okay. Okay, that's...

Jenny Carlson: You decide to do whatever they want to spend money. Why do we require a vote or not just the board making the decision to become dependent. Why does the landlord have to vote?

Jim Barnes: That's something that's in Chapter 298 of the statutes and, uh, required. Because it was created as an independent district.

Kerry Hitt: As far as spending money, right?

Jim Barnes: As it relates strictly to the operations of the state, you're changing the legislation.

Charles Schoech: Which at the state you're changing the legislation, and it would require an amendment to the legislation. And that would require an approval of the...

Jenny Carlson: Isn't this nonsense vote we do now, or it's a real one on, like, a county ballot where people have to fill out?

Charles Schoech: It would be... it would be a landowner vote, but I have... had many bills in front of the state legislature, and never have they allowed one to go through without a final vote after the legislation is amended and approved. The actual implementation of the legislation is subject to a final vote, and it would be a vote of the landowners of the district, which would then implement that legislation.

Henry DeGouw: Jim, what percentage of the land voting. The 50% plus 1, or is it? Like they were doing 63%.

Jim Barnes: So, for the dependency portion, it's simple majority, which is 50% plus 1.

Charles Schoech: Correct.

Jim Barnes: For the dependency of the district.

Judith Phalen: I want to skip back to what we were talking about before we started talking about becoming a dependency in Wellington. I just want a little clarification on the amendment that... I mean motion that you guys made and seconded about, um, the lawyer looking at the, proxies and then I heard you say something to him about you can verify with the people whose names are on them. What I'm... what I'm trying to understand is, was that specific motion simply for clarifying those proxies. And the last election. Or are you also going to be asking him to give forth? What we thought we had voted on at the last were on the website would be specific instructions, specific. I guess maybe even screenshots or PDFs of what a valid proxy looks like everything that has to be on it, everything that has to be in place. All of the proof, whether it's a signature or a text or an email or whatever. And some kind of a clarification, because you were talking a little while ago that there were electronic signatures that could be in place, so I think we're going for the...

Kerry Hitt: You want a procedure. Is that basically what you're asking? You would like a procedure put together?

Judith Phalen: No, isn't that what we voted on last week?

Kerry Hitt: That's fine. That there would be a procedure? I agree, I agree.

Judith Phalen: Okay. Okay. I just... I don't know what your, um, motion entail, I guess is what I... Well, it was... it was basically to... to... to agree to pay him to do the work. And... Part of that work, we would ask if as he goes through it, he... looks into this, the validity of where we are, and then set up a procedure so we can move forward, and there will be no questions on it from that point.

Judith Phalen: Sounds good to me. Okay.

Chris Wallace: Mr. Schoech. I can make all of the phone numbers and names available to you if that would help you.

Charles Schoech: Let me look at documents, because I don't know that I want to be contacting landowners and verifying proxies. That really isn't the attorney's responsibility. Let me look at the

documents, let me see where we are, and then we can address that issue. Okay, if you need any information from me, I'll be glad to give it to you.

Kerry Hitt: Okay. Alright, we need to move on. We spent a lot of time on this. I think that we have... a direction. Ruben was going to make a comment. You were doing work on the road. On the trails, horse trails and the...

Ruben Ferrazzano: Yeah, we've got a problem with the horse trails as far as... the polo guy's coming in. And they'll run 6 horses at a time. And they'll run it down the trails, and these horses need to be ran twice a day, which is really tearing it up. For you guys on the south end, you don't have a riding trail. On the north end, we have a riding trail.

Jenny Carlson: It's not that has one, it's the black edge on the canal when they do riding.

Ruben Ferrazzano: They don't...

Jenny Carlson: 100%, there are multiple sets going behind my...

Ruben Ferrazzano: Please. Okay, now, but...

Jenny Carlson: There are usually one rider and two carries, not six.

Ruben Ferrazzano: No, no, no, these guys will run 5, including themselves. 6 deep.

Jenny Carlson: And they are going up and down the canal strip because they're checking...

Ruben Ferrazzano: Well, I think the equestrian rule says. Two horses. One horse in a lead horse, and another horse behind them. If I can recall right. But these guys, I've been getting complaints on my side about them just tearing everything up. Well, what I'm doing is, I decided to put signs up that's... You know, because what happened was they were cutting the locks. So, I put a lock in, they would cut it. I put another lock in, they would cut it. Then we decided to have some signs made up that says gates must be locked at all times. Couple pictures of a camera to stop this... They came... crying to me. I said, can't we just keep it open? Because we were unaware of this. And I guess I'm a little sympathetic on that. So, I told them, unless we... unless... The committee here wants to change it.

20:08:10 I had told them, unless the committee wants to change it, we're gonna leave it open. We're gonna let you finish the year off. And then you guys are gonna have to make arrangements, because most of the polo riders and everything, they all run around a circle within their property. Most of them, currently. So, I don't know how you feel about that, as far as me allowing them to. Because last year, I'm the one that graded it all back out.

Unknown: They make it unrideable for anybody.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Yeah, no, no, they make it... you won't be able to go down, you won't be... Anybody that owns a horse, they just turn it off. So, I don't know if you guys have an objection to me stating, because it's sort of not fair to them either.

Kerry Hitt: Well, I would agree. I mean, they're part of the community.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Yeah.

Kerry Hitt: But... it's going to be... I mean, again, we're not going to satisfy everybody, you know.

Jenny Carlson: Wellington trails on the Wellington Pearl map, and don't they have rules posted?

Ruben Ferrazzano: Well, wait, wait. No, there are rules about that, but these trails do not belong to Wellington. There are private trails that belong to You have one?

Kerry Hitt: Yeah, I have two of them.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Charlie, you don't have one on your end, do you?

Charles Brown: Yeah, instead of canal.

Ruben Ferrazzano: What do you want to do? You want to stop them now, or do you want to just let them go for the rest of the year, and then that gives him enough time to figure out how they're going to, uh, you know, take care of their own stuff, but we... that needs to stop. I'm just figuring out that we need to stop it right now, or do we just let it, you know, hey.

Kerry Hitt: Is there anything...

Ruben Ferrazzano: I'll be out there at the end of the year regrading it.

Kerry Hitt: Is there anything that can be done on the maintenance? That's a question. What about the...

Ruben Ferrazzano: We have gates! Okay, that would be a different problem. We have gates that are rotting off right now.

Kerry Hitt: That's a maintenance thing that we can handle.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Yeah, yeah, yeah, I mean, if you look at the squiggles, which is another issue, not necessarily with the horses. But the North and South Squiggles, we can't even get into there to clear them out because of the overgrowth. That overgrowth needs to be removed. I think we need to not straighten it out, we'll leave it as a squiggle. But some of them need to be cleaned out.

Kerry Hitt: Okay, weren't you handling...

Ruben Ferrazzano: Well, what I handled... what I did handle was... Um... damage from the hurricane of last year. We hired somebody to come pick up the materials out of the canals, coconuts, stuff like that, anything that would clog up the system. I took care of that, I forgot what we paid for it, I'm pretty sure I can look. It was at 19?

Kerry Hitt: 1900?

Ruben Ferrazzano: 19,000, was it? Yeah, it was around \$19,000 just to get the ditches and everything cleaned up.

Kerry Hitt: But that's done.

Ruben Ferrazzano: So, that part's done, but the squiggles... You know, and back to now where you're at (Kerry Hitt), there is a lot of overgrowth there.

Kerry Hitt: Can you get an estimate?

Ruben Ferrazzano: A lot. Yeah, on your end and your end. Further, further west.

Jenny Carlson: Yeah, it's my neighbors, not me.

Ruben Ferrazzano: No, no, no, no, no, no, I'm just... We're not saying you have to clean it. Because we have to clean it. We just need to get it. The community needs a cleaning.

Kerry Hitt: Can you get estimates to do that?

Ruben Ferrazzano: Well, that's the next thing. Do we need something that tells us that I'm allowed to get some estimates, or... You know, and how many estimates do we want? Do we want 4? Do we want 3? Do we want 1?

Kerry Hitt: You should have at least two.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Well, I would say at least 3 to me, but that's up to you guys.

Kerry Hitt: Well, get the estimates and then turn them in to Betty.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Do we have to put it out for... that's a good question. We're putting it out for bid?

Kerry Hitt: If it's... if it's under \$20,000, I can make. Give it to Betty, and I can make the decision.

Charles Brown: I think it's 25.

Kerry Hitt: Yeah, okay.

Charles Brown: But... you don't have to clean behind my house; I own that canal.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Yes.

Charles Brown: What... why isn't it... Not my responsibility to keep that growth cut out.

Well, do you have these... no, but it's part of our drainage. It's part of the drainage system. Even though you pay taxes and it's on your deed, it says it's yours. I think we still have the maintenance and the control of cleaning it and making sure that you're not sitting underwater, we want that water movement as quick as we can, because we only depend on water management to pump us out. If they don't pump us out, or we're holding a lot of water. So, I would think that the more the canals are cleaned, the more water moves quicker, we don't have a problem like a beaver creating dams, or grass growing everywhere, and it just takes up space. So, if... And it slows... I don't know, I'm not an engineer, but... A beaver builds a dam, it slows down water, period. You got grass growing through it slows movement down.

Kerry Hitt: Get the estimates, and give them to Betty, and then we'll move forward on it.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Okay. Anybody have a problem with that?

No?

Ruben Ferrazzano: Okay.

Charles Brown: I've never seen anybody behind my house...

Ruben Ferrazzano: No, I know, that's what I'm saying, behind your property, when... When the water table is very low, you can actually see all the soot that's behind your house, behind everybody on the West Canal. You know, and the... and I think behind Andrea's house is some growth. And I think we need... they're like lily pads or something, aren't they? I was just out there not long ago, looking at it, and that may be an issue with our guy that sprays weed control. And maybe we need to get with him and say, hey, come on out, take a look at this. What can we do here with this? See, nobody's ever cleaned your canal, out there? They've been out like that for the last...40 or 50 years.

Chris Wallace: Richard Wright did it.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Yeah, that was 30 years ago. I'm gonna get the estimates to, uh, um... I'm not sure how we're going to... clean out the overgrowth, like, behind your house, there's a lot of trees. So, anybody that owns a tree that's hanging over. We probably gotta get a backhoe or a machine with a long arm that can actually just go across. And shave it. And pull it back, and then dredge.

Kerry Hitt: So, you need to make that part of the estimate.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Yeah, right. So, you need a machine with a 65-foot boom on it. You know, and it has something to cut with.

Jenny Crlson: Regarding maintenance, and I understand we're all going to cover this, but for example, I keep my canal bank mowed, and I don't allow growth to grow other than regular, you know, grass. But we have neighbors that have 500 trees are kind of allowed invasive Brazilian pepper, and now we need this to regrowth, why would we pay to remove them?

Ruben Ferrazzano: No, no, no, and you're exactly right.

Jenny Carlson: They should be removing that. They allowed it to grow over the past 30 years, or 20 years, or 10 years, or whatever it is.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Because let's say the center... hold on! Let's take the center canal. Who was it? Is it Sam?

Chris Wallace: Sam Ryder?

Ruben Ferrazzano: contacted and, uh, asked me to take a look in the back. He's got... after the hurricane, now he's got trees that... 12 inches around that were snapped and somebody had cut them flat. Now, we... it looks like we've never maintained them. We've never cut it; we never maintained it. And I think it's part of the system.

Kerry Hitt: You need to do.

Ruben Ferrazzano: I know what you're saying, it's not fair that.

Jenny Carlson: All the trees off the bank, because they said we weren't allowed to have trees within X many feet of the canal, like, period. That was what we were told when we....

Ruben Ferrazzano: Can we... I don't know if this is a lawyer question or not. Can we back charge them? Is it legal to back charge them anyways?

Charles Schoech: I'd have to look at the documents. I can't answer that without looking to see exactly what you have there. I'm assuming you have an easement, but...

Ruben Ferrazzano: Yes, we have an easement. I'd have to look at those documents in order to answer that question.

Eric Grainger: You'd probably have to order them to correct it and give them a certain duration to correct it, like 90 days, and if they take no action within a certain period of time, yeah. No, but if you order them to correct it because it's not in compliance with the rules and regulations, they have a set amount of time to take action if after 90 or 120 days. Let me ask you a question.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Do we have those rules and regulations?

Kerry Hitt: We have... we've sent letters out.

Eric Grainger: Oh yeah.

Kerry Hitt: We've done letters. We've sent them out.

Ruben Ferrazzano: No, but those were... those were letters because of the overgrowth in the swales. Right. We're talking canal work now.

Kerry Hitt: It's the same thing.

Ruben Ferrazzano: I don't know, I don't know if it's the same thing or not.

Kerry Hitt: If it's on their property and not ours, we're responsible for the easement.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Do we have actual documentation of that? Maybe a statute, some type of resolution, or part of the 298?

Charles Schoech: We need to look at your rules and regulations.

Eric Grainger: It's not just 298, it's generics, it's specific to you.

Kerry Hitt: Okay,

Chris Wallace: We need to take a look at those trees, because removing those trees would damage that whole bank and pull it apart.

Ruben Ferrazzano: No, no, I agree.

Chris Wallace: If that property is going to be affected by that and it is a Pine Tree issue to do. Those trees have been there. We saw the size of them, and we rode the whole canal.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Yeah, and they're dead.

Chris Wallace: They're dead. But they've also been... they've been there for a lot more than what, a lot longer than Rustic Ranches.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Well, then the, then the previous owner, probably. If we have to clean it, we have to pull those trees off the bank. Then you've got to rebuild the bank, then you're going to have to sod it, you're going to have to pin it and sod it. I mean, this is not a little, little tiny... Issue. You know, the road is the road.

Kerry Hitt: So, then what we need to do is find... get... get the... this documentation.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Well, we need... if there's a statute, or if there's... if it's within our... Rules and regulations? Personally, I would want to see that. And then that would be the basis of going to that person and going, these are the rules, this is what you need to do. And you need to remove it at your cost. But without that information, I'm just guessing on... I guess we can do it. We can't do it, so... I mean, you and I can't discuss it. Can you work it with Betty and get that? Can you get the answer? Do we know?

Eric Grainger: Public records.

Kerry Hitt: You can get them.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Okay. Okay, the county. Okay. All right, I can... yeah, I'll do it.

Kerry Hitt: Are you gonna do it?

Ruben Ferrazzano: Yeah, I'll go down to the county and get it.

Chris Wallace: Before the tornado.

Kerry Hitt: So, then the solution is to get... the documentation.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Yeah, that's... yeah, I'll get with... I'll work with the Betty on that. We'll get the documentation there. Maybe we can get a letter put together and see where we stand, and... no, because I agree, I don't think... everybody should pay for somebody else's neglect.

Kerry Hitt: Okay, do we have a solution to that, then?

Ruben Ferrazzano: Yeah, I mean... that was a squiggly? That was the cleaning the canals, but the squiggles, yeah. If I can get an okay from everybody here on this side.

Kerry Hitt: Yes.

Ruben Ferrazzano: You know what I mean? So, no problems?

Kerry Hitt: I don't have a problem with that. You just go ahead and get the estimates, and then give them to Betty, and... Okay.

Ruben Ferrazzano: And then, same with the horses, let them sit it out for the rest of the year?

Kerry Hitt: Yeah.

Ruben Ferrazzano: And then... I'll get ahold of all the polo guys and tell them, look, you guys are gonna have to make other arrangements, because people just cannot ride their own horse on the trail

without having... Yeah, I want to give them notice, because the way I did it was, I gave them without notice, and I don't think that was very fair.

Betty Camplin: Ruben, rest of the year, September 30th or December 31?

Kerry Hitt: Fiscal year. September 30, 2026.

Ruben Ferrazzano: I wanted to follow up on and stop riding around. They leave... they usually come in around November. Sometimes, like dressage and all those guys come in, I think, either before Thanksgiving, or right around Thanksgiving.

Judith Phalen: They're here right now.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Well, yeah, no, the polos usually come either right after all the way to May.

Judith Phalen: Okay, so what you should be saying to them is you've got permission until the end of May.

Ruben Ferrazzano: I've already... that's exactly right, that's... I've already talked to them, but I don't think it has anything to do with the fiscal year or the calendar year.

Judith Phalen: You're selling them May 31st, or whatever it is, is your cutoff date.

Ruben Ferrazzano: And then... Well, is that what you wanted to know? What my cutoff date was?

Betty Camplin: Yes.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Yeah. But you only gave me two, you know, what's September? No, what was it?

Betty Camplin: September or December, but what I'm saying...

Judith Phalen: So, why give them permission if they're not going to be here after May until November? Because if you wait until December when they come back in November, then they will be here for November and December, and they will... If we do it September.

Kerry Hitt: They won't have the permission. Do it September, which is the end of our fiscal. Right. then it's... And then applied up to that point in time.

Ruben Ferrazzano: That's what's going to happen. You need to make arrangements. Because come next year, you're not going to be... taking these horses on the trails. Because they all get up and leave.

Judith Phalen: Well, then after they all get up and leave, that should be the ending for this year that they...

Kerry Hitt: It's irrelevant. It's irrelevant.

Kerry Hitt: It's irrelevant. Yeah. They're not going to be here, it's okay, it's a date, that's the date we're gonna pick. It's May 30th. Okay. All right. We need to get back to one more question. All right, so that we're done on now. We're done on that.

Kerry Hitt: So, we've had... we... where do we stand on the vote? Where do we stand on the vote for the roads that we've read it off, I understand that. There have been a number of people that have not been happy with how, do we... do we re-ballot, or is that sufficient, or do we... Just... move on?

Charles Brown: Depends on the size. In terms of if it's, like, 80% against that I don't think you need to do again. They had such an overwhelming majority.

Kerry Hitt: Okay.

Ruben Ferrazzano: What is the majority right now? What was it? Do we have a percentage?

Kerry Hitt: The majority says no. No, the output percentage is 79%, so... But it's just a big majority.

Kerry Hitt: Alright. What's that?

Charles Brown: Like, 80%. I'm sorry, I'm not understanding. 80%?

Kerry Hitt: What's that? it was... what is the percentage? 79%, no and, 29.9%, yes. Okay.

Kerry Hitt: There's another issue that was brought up, and I told Aldo that we would discuss that. And that is... The... the request to... paved Norris Road. How do we move forward with that, or... do we move forward? Do we move forward with the request?

Charles Schoech: I don't know any of the details about Norris Road.

Charles Brown: So, that is... as a rule, I think Jim would agree with this, we don't grant deviations by parcel. For example, we couldn't... If I wanted to have something on my property that nobody else wanted, I couldn't do that.

Kerry Hitt: But yeah, I think the street is different. Yeah, that's... that's why I had... and I had talked to Mr. Barnes about that, that maybe you can address it a little better.

Jim Barnes: So, basically, I think with the issue for discussion is this concept that in lieu of, or as opposed to paving the entire roadway network within Rustic Ranches, the desire might be to either as a standalone project or as a pilot. For the larger paving issue is to just look at one roadway. And there's nothing that would preclude the Board from doing that, or where there's something that Pine Tree about elsewhere in Wellington was undertaken as a project like that, there would be nothing that, you know, similar to only, uh, one side of Saddle trail being done. Biggest other folks didn't, consider repaving. It would be the same as Mr. Brown, like, you would probably... you couldn't just serve the one personal. You'd have to do the entire. Okay, and that's exactly what the Indian Trail is doing, and Loxahatchee Groves. They're not paving everything, but they're doing portions.

Kerry Hitt: Okay, so... How do we set up the criteria in doing that, in terms of oversight?

Jim Barnes: How you execute the project, but it's just... But actually, we're thinking of the county. The county undertakes this type of work as well as a part of an MSTU administrative snatching Unit. And, basically, it ends up being all the owners on that particular street would be responsible for the cost of that improvement, and they would be the ones with also who would be voting on that particular piece, since there's not a requirement for the balance of the landowners that would be mandated.

Kerry Hitt: So, what about the people on Norris that wouldn't want it?

Jim Barnes: I did double check to see what the process would be as to whether it would be, again, back to the majority process, or it would be something that would otherwise be where you would have to have 100%, I'm not sure.

Mauricio Urbina: Whether it was a Saddle Trail.

Jim Barnes: In Saddle Trail, the section, you know, that was just... that was more than a rotary, that was the entire section of one part of Saddle Trail. It was not a... it was not a, uh... Yeah, no problem.

Kerry Hitt: Okay. So, Mr. Disorbo wanted to put together a pilot program, but as I understood it, in order to do it as a pilot program, it would have to include everything exactly the way it would be done in the rest of the community with horse trails, with the engineering done, it would have to be done as a complete thing, not.

Jim Barnes: Something that... In this case, Pine Tree with the board would have to approve. Given that it's within the confines of Pine Tree, or... If this happens at some point in the future. It's no longer Pine Tree; it's an entity that would be sought to be approved. Of course, that typical section dictates, to some extent. The extent of the cost, whether you're looking at strictly just a roadway project, or if you're looking at a drainage issue, swale or horse trail.

Kerry Hitt: In terms of taxpayer money, what would we be required to, or allowed to do, or we do nothing? How do we... split up? Let's say we're gonna do 25% of the whole project, okay? Um... the people that are not on Norris. And some of them want the roads, you know, and... How do we handle that in terms of being fair to them? Do we put any money into it at all, or... do we have to require...

20:31:20 One is, if Pine Tree were executing the project, whereas if Pine Tree's executing the project, you would assess however you felt the assessment needed to be done to the point that Mr. Schoech made, that the board would make that decision. That's how you would determine how to assess specifically for that project. In the case of if... again, much like Saddle Trail, or in one case, we actually looked at the property near Las Palmas on 50th where it's a totally landowner-funded assessment, and you would just, the assessment will be strictly for that portion of the roadway and the affected landowners on both sides of that roadway.

Charles Schoech: Yeah, the only exception, and Indian Trail did this when they first started paving years ago. It was a... arterial or a collector road and the people on the road were assessed an X amount, and the people who were just off the road, but using the road were assessed a slightly less amount, because they weren't living on the road, but they were benefiting from it.

Jim Barnes: Right, and just an example of that to make it a non-roadway example, if the bill's executed years ago is, uh, you've been on Big Blue Trace between South Shore and Wellington Trace. On

the West side of the roadway, the entire neighborhood, which are all non-gated subdivisions, no HOA communities, uh... has a wall, and that was done as an assessment on those landowners, and there was a benefit assessment, so..., the calculation engineer, uh, developed a formula that said, you know, properties that abutted the actual wall benefited more and has much bigger number, you know, a certain percentage of the cost 100%. And interior lots even though they weren't up against the wall or didn't have the right benefit of that wall as their perimeter lot line. They still benefited because the community was walled, and they had a lesser percentage and still paid as well. You could look at it that way. If you chose to look at it as a community-wide event.

Mauricio Urbina: I don't know how articulate it has to do with the money of the other residents of this room.

Jenny Carlson: So, the question, I had, is, if Norris Road decides to be the pilot program, and those residents decide they wish to be assessed. If that proceeds, would we then be taken out of the calculation for providing the sand and the grading? But, you know, if other residents are paying some particular partial portion, then that would... I think then it's fair that we continue to pay into that, but if Norris Road were to come completely out. Yes, you should be escrowing money for eventual repaving in 30 years or whatever, but I don't know that they should be paying into the regrading that occurs on a daily basis out there. I did have another comment on the roads whenever we get to that portion of your program.

Jim Barnes: One quick thing on that is that at this point, with the exception of the material... that we had to do additional material last budget year, last fiscal year. The rest of the cost of all the grading is covered by the gas tax collection, so there is no, uh... That wouldn't be an issue. I mean, I'm not sure how the rest of the budget's spent, but as far as the grading is concerned, the labor cost and materials Uh, that's coming out of gas tax.

Mauricio Urbina: So, the portion of the gas tax associated with Norris.

Jim Barnes: It's only for maintenance, it's gas tax maintenance, so it's generally...

Jenny Carlson: But if they're repaving in 30 years, that gas tax would go towards anything which would be considered then maintenance?

Jim Barnes: No, what ends up changing is that when the loan gets paid the gas tax calculation will actually be different. We have a pot of the gas tax money we collect based on the landmass on paved or unpaved roads. And it goes into the big pot, and we go ahead and cycle through usually, all the different locations here, so we all say, okay, these gas tax paid for this one, for that, ear mark that if you... Those two based on an assessment. Now. I will say the one, just as an extra side note here. Similar to Saddle Trail, where, you know, the difference being that these are Pine Tree roadways versus Wellington roadways. But in the event that the district does become dependent. Normally would happen is that what if you paved the roadway you're not going to be assessed for that payment again. That would come out of our overall real estate overall growth. Now, in this case, again, just to make sure, because everybody's out there listening and whether you were verified, still, we're not changing the ownership of the roads. You would still own it to the center line of the roadway, but just like a lot of the roadways that Mr. Schoech represents an Indian Trail. Those are the same way, and you've got. basically, easement roads that the residents onto the center line, but they still are maintained by the special district, and

certainly maintained by Villagers, whoever else, but... doesn't change the ownership, but basically, you know, we are taking. A major assessment where the roads are paved from that point forward, then.

Aldo Disorbo: Once the developer paves the road.

Jim Barnes: Right, it's like a developer paves a road. The ownership is what's different here compared to, like, it's a similar situation, right?

Kerry Hitt: So that scenario then would carry forward, if hypothetically, there's a pilot program done in Norris would have to be done exactly the way the rest of the community would be done. And if... if the rest of the community goes along with doing it the same thing would apply to those roads in terms of Wellington taking care of. So then, would that end up... would that mean that the... the acreage, the percentage, the tax on the acreage we have wouldn't include maintenance... road maintenance at that point, because road maintenance would be handled by Wellington?

Jim Barnes: There'd still be a, uh... component of that assessment that's related to roads, but as far as having to go ahead and do a special assessment to go in when you're going to go in and redo them, yeah.

Ruben Ferrazzano: I have a question.

Judith Phalen: Me too. I'm a little confused about the procedures and steps to start a pilot project. Am I correct in understanding sort of what he said, that the people on Norris would have to get together and decide whether or not they wanted to pave the roads. That would be, like, step number one. And then step number 2, they have to do it exactly the way that hypothetically, we would do. all of the rest of the roads.

Kerry Hitt: There wouldn't be a pilot program if we did...

Judith Phalen: So, we decide what it is we want to do, because they can't be in compliance if they don't know what it is because we haven't decided what it is yet.

Ruben Ferrazzano: They would have to pay for the engineering.

Kerry Hitt: They would have to pay for the engineering.

Jim Barnes: All of the original study may see included with the swale on one side.

Kerry Hitt: Right.

Jim Barnes: The equestrians were on the other side, and...

Kerry Hitt: That's been established, right.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Who would be inspecting? The manufacturing of the road.

Jim Barnes: So, based on, I mean, again, there's a lot of... what ifs. So, in the scenario, in the event, even if you...nothing changed. We are just, you know, through an interlocal agreement, providing services to the village, I mean, to Pine Tree as the village, uh... One, high frequent issue apartment 4 within the pine tree water control district, but we would, since you're also within the Village of Wellington, we would issue you an engineering permit. So, we would inspect it. That's... from a

regulatory standpoint, and then depending on, since we also are technically through the interlocal agreement to be able to have to modify that to include now, this paid portion, and then we would also, you know, serve as the owner's representative.

Kerry Hitt: How long would it take to put something like that together, to put the whole scenario? There has to be sort of an outline and a plan.

Jim Barnes: Even changing the number of... Folks that you would technically... is, um, decide how you want to assess for that philosophy. The process itself is generally still the same. If you're... nothing changes as far as the relationship, the village and Pine Tree the independent district, etc. The rest of the process is generally still the same. The board would have to make a determination. As we discussed earlier, how we want to do that assessment under the same. If it's totally an owner-initiated. I think a lot of the... a lot of the primates and process will be determined as to really how it's funded. Right. Generally, those are all privately funded. Turn it over at the end, which certainly that expedites logic if you get rid of... quite frankly, government red tape.

Kerry Hitt: Right, right.

Jim Barnes: The flip side is that if you go through an assessment or binding process that's, you know, you'll vote for the times.

Kerry Hitt: So, the question goes back to, I think, first, the percentage of people that need to approve.

Jim Barnes: I always have to look at the whole project that we have done in the village and out of town new improvements when they go into an area that I mean, like, from just personal experience I lived in an unincorporated area years ago, there was, uh you know, the modern store. They should be well and septic. And, basically at the same time, we will be loads and giving us an MSPU, and obtaining an additional line item when the taxes from an item. And 100%, and the community had to approve it first, but ultimately, once the project was done. Everybody came.

Mauricio Urbina: I was I was passed with some of the owners which were obviously because of my involvement with the planning committee to capture the sentiment of the support or an initiative like this so we developed a support pledge. Very similar to the ballot that was circulated, obviously, with different numbers. And, uh, we have well beyond the number, the 63% number.

Kerry Hitt: But we need to establish if it's going to be 63%, if it's going to be more, that's what we... yeah.

Judith Phalen: Is it safe to assume that should the board agree to proceed with the pilot project on Norris, and then it's gone through all of the engineering details and everything to decide what it's going to look like, etc. That once... You have given them permission. It's pretty much a done deal, the rest of us are gonna have to go along with it.

Kerry Hitt: No, no. Okay, so let me, like, make sure... what we had to do first... We had a vote, and Mr. Desorbo and I have talked about it. He expressed his want to be having Norris Road be the pilot program, okay? Uh... We needed to find out if the vote was yes or no before we moved on to the next step. The vote's no, so we're moving on to the next step. Which is the pilot program. The pilot program is going to be exactly that. If that goes through. It'll be done, but it has to be done. To make it work, it has to be

done identically to the way the rest of it would be done. The rest of it could still be no. It could never be... it could possibly never be done. It may be the only road that's ever paved. So, I think I...

Zoom Unknown: You cannot... there's a couple things that I'd like to... Sorry, I don't know how to break into this conversation.

Kerry Hitt: No, wait, hold... hold, we got two talking at the same time, and I can't hear. Hold on on the internet.

Anne Huber: I have to... I have to say that after hearing the decisions being made on polo ponies versus other types of horses tearing up those trails and that kind of thing, and you just automatically just saying, yep, we're gonna make that decision. This neighborhood... you clearly don't have a great turnout here. I'm sorry I'm out of town. I would like to be there. But what I will say is that I think if you do this pilot project with any money from any of the other roads. It was described to me from a... from. what I... when I heard about it was it was a private thing that the people who lived on the road were getting together and doing this. But if this is going to become part of the association and that kind of thing. I think you're gonna have... you're opening up such a can of worms as far as who's paying for it, who's getting assessed for it. And how... how does that... is that fair to the Norris Road people when they're paying the engineering, and then the rest of the roads just get to copy all that stuff, like... How are you going to regulate all that, and how are you going to, um, address. I don't want to mix two conversations, but a lot of decisions are being made without anybody voting on any of this. You know, the horse use and the road use.

Kerry Hitt: We just made a decision based. Okay, we just made a decision based on the community, no, we made a decision that there's vote no for the votes. No, no, what I'm saying about the vote... I understand. The issue of they want the road paved. But what we're trying to do at this point in time is establish this. The cost would be for Norris, and it's the people in Norris that would handle those costs. They would be responsible for them. It would not spill over to the rest of the community. That's why it would be a pilot project.

Mauricio Urbina: So... Right now, the monitor for everybody to see. Okay, there it is, yeah, yeah. Uh, yeah. So... Whatever we decide on in terms of Norris and it being a pilot project, if... If we do... and we're trying to establish the criteria in order to get that and move forward. I want it to be as fair as it can be, you know, so... I don't know if that answers your question. It sounded to me like you were concerned that this cost was going to spill over into the rest of the roads.

Anne Huber: It's not even... it's not even the cost. I'm actually looking out for you all as the governing body, because I think you're going to get so much feedback about the decisions you're making without having your community involved. You only have a very small amount of people there.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Well, right now, we're just, you know, we're just talking about... We're just having a discussion. We're just having a discussion on it. There's nothing that we're gonna say, hey, you're allowed to do it.

Kerry Hitt: Right.

Ruben Ferrazzano: We're just bringing it up as an issue. Doesn't mean that's really gonna... what's gonna happen. So... and that may fall into the rest of the community.

Ann Huber: Right. Well, the decision about the polar ponies seems to have been determined.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Well, that's part of the equestrian overlay rules and regulations.

Anne Huber: Okay. Alright. Okay.

Ruben Ferrazzano: That they allow two horses, period. Those are their regulations, not Pine Trees. Even though we maintain... the horse trails, currently.

Anne Huber: I'm not against any of this. I just want... this neighborhood has... sounds to me from these meetings that I go to. Or I listen to on Zoom, there's a history here of a lot of challenging situations, and I'm... I'm trying to figure out how you all make decisions, because. You know, some of... maybe some of your newer owners, like, don't have the rules, and they don't have the history to know how all these decisions have been made. But I think, um... you know, it would be good to publish this. the decisions being made at these meetings.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Well, I personally think that decisions are made by what the community wants. That's what we try to do. So, if that's what the community wants. Because I don't want to be a dictator and say this is the way it's going to be, and that's that. I think everybody has a right to speak. Everybody has a right to objectives. And it's all up to you guys.

Kerry Hitt: Okay, so let's move forward and try to establish. First thing we need to do is establish the criteria, what we're going to need to do to do that, and you're going to do some checking on it. Okay. Let's use that as a starting point, and then start communication. We... I mean. We as a board can't talk, but we can, and... is making a decision as to what... If you own the property.

Ruben Ferrazzano: If you own the property. And Pine Tree has the easement right to that. Do you have a right, as far as your property, to say, well, I do want to pave, I don't want it pave? And not get that section paved. I mean, it's just, uh...

Kerry Hitt: I think, I think not,

Charles Schoech: No. you do not.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Okay, that's... Yeah. Okay, well, that's... I just wanted to make sure.

Kerry Hitt: Okay. Alright. I think we're at least got a step forward, and let's work on doing that.

Chris Wallace: Um... The maintenance of pilot, um...

Kerry Hitt: The maintenance will be taken over by... by, uh, Wellington. Yes. Is it already addressed?

Ruben Ferrazzano: Well, the maintenance, as far as if you had to put pipes underneath the ground. I mean, we're going to have to clean those pipes out every so often or at least inspect them every 5 years, 2 years.

Jim Barnes: Just like this point of view, I handle the maintenance of the swales unless we expanded it in local agreement to cover its drainage maintenance as well.

Kerry Hitt: Okay.

Aldo Disorbo: You only have one place that comes underneath the road. That's where I filled in this group.

Ruben Ferrazzano: No, no, but if we have areas that are going to be flooded out, we put... grades on there, so I can go, like, say, from the south to the north, like, on your side, let's say your side is the side that's gonna be the riding trail, and we have to put pipes up underneath that.

Aldo Disorbo: That's part of... We have spaces that would pretty much going to the pipes that's underneath the riding trail.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Right, right, and those would have to be inspected then, every... whatever it is, I'm not... I don't know when.

Aldo Disorbo: You only have one main water line that goes out to the Lake of Nevada. That's a 46-inch pipe.

Ruben Ferrazzano: Yeah, right.

Eric Grainger: Most likely the new roadway design will include new drainage.

Kerry Hitt: It would have to. It would have to, and that's part of my concern of the unknown costs. So... so, I think that...

Eric Grainger: Yeah, we're speculating.

Kerry Hitt: Yeah, exactly. Yeah, exactly. Okay, based on that. If there are no more comments, I think it's a step forward. And, uh, the next meeting is, uh, March 23rd. Hopefully, we'll have most of this. buttoned up till then. Uh, Mr. Schoech is gonna get the proxy thing resolved. Votes resolved, and we now have somebody that will be able to do it, and we will have it posted. Okay, one more question, Jenny.

Jenny Carlson: In terms of road maintenance, which is within 5G purview. Is there any way that we can get, like a water truck for the dust event, or, like, some speed control situation, because. It is absolutely outrageous. What is going on right now? Like, the dust plumes, I am now watering 20 minutes a day, all 600 feet in front of my house. However, the dust plume from in front of my neighbor is coming in, and the horses are coughing and we're coughing. Riding in the ring is really, really unmanageable right now.

Kerry Hitt: We understand that, and it... We understand that, and if you think there's a problem now, wait till the roads are paved. You won't have the dust, but you'll...

Discussion of the dirt roads, dust, watering, speed bumps, etc followed.

Meeting adjourned at 8:41 PM. Motion carried. (3-0)

Kerry Hitt

Ruben Ferrazzano

Charles Brown