

**MINUTES OF MEETING
LT RANCH
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT**

The Regular Meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the LT Ranch Community Development District was held on Wednesday, December 8, 2021, at 11:00 a.m. at the offices of Taylor Morrison 551 Cattlemen Road, Suite 200, Sarasota Florida 34232.

Present and constituting a quorum:

John Wollard	Chairperson
Scott Turner	Assistant Secretary
Christy Zelaya	Assistant Secretary
Karen Goldstein	Assistant Secretary
Jim Turner	Assistant Secretary (arrived at 11:10 a.m.)

Also present were:

James P. Ward	District Manager
Wes Haber	District Attorney
Ron Schwied	District Engineer
Grant Wilbanks	Waldrop Engineering

Audience:

Nathan with Down to Earth (ph)
Scott Carlson (ph)

All resident's names were not included with the minutes. If a resident did not identify themselves or the audio file did not pick up the name, the name was not recorded in these minutes.

**PORTIONS OF THIS MEETING WERE TRANSCRIBED VERBATIM. ALL VERBATIM PORTIONS WERE
TRANSCRIBED IN *ITALICS*.**

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

Call to Order/Roll Call

District Manager James P. Ward called the meeting to order at approximately 11:00 a.m. He conducted roll call; all Members of the Board were present, with the exception of Jim Turner, constituting a quorum. (Mr. Turner arrived at 11:10 a.m.)

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS

Consideration of Minutes

September 8, 2021 – Regular Meeting Minutes

Mr. Ward asked if there were any additions, deletions, or corrections for the Minutes. Hearing none, he called for a motion to approve the Minutes.

On MOTION made by Mr. John Wollard, seconded by Mr. Scott Turner, and with all in favor, the September 8, 2021, Regular Meeting Minutes were approved.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS

Consideration of Resolution 2022-1

Consideration of Resolution 2022-1, a resolution of the Board of Supervisor’s approving a Landscape Maintenance and Installation Agreement between the State of Florida Department of Transportation and the LT Ranch Community Development District

Mr. Wollard: This is the agreement for the roundabout landscape maintenance to be taken on by the CDD, although it's between the CDD and DOT. Correct?

Mr. Ward: Yes, sir.

Mr. Wollard: I don't know if I'm the right person to explain it, but that's essentially what it is. The roundabout out at Lorraine and Clark. It's a DOT roundabout, but we are going to put it into the CDD maintenance, so we have the same consistency as Lorraine.

Mr. Ward asked if there were any questions; hearing none, he called for a motion.

On MOTION made by Mr. John Wollard, seconded by Ms. Karen Goldstein, and with all in favor, Resolution 2022-1 was adopted, and the Chairperson was authorized to sign.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Consideration of Award of Bid

Consideration of award of bid for landscaping and irrigation maintenance of District assets

Mr. Ward: Just in the way of some brief background, the District currently has an agreement with the Skye Ranch Master Association Inc. for the maintenance of these assets. That agreement has been in place just about a year now. We have gone out and rebid this project. As you might recall this was bid a little more than a year ago for basically the same services. I will ask Mr. Wilbanks to take a few moments and go through that bid with you. He was kind enough to prepare a rather detailed analysis of all of the bids and to provide you a recommendation with an award.

Mr. Grant Wilbanks: We received five bids from proposers, and we have one who declined a bid. They are noted on this spreadsheet as well. I apologize for the format of this spreadsheet. It is quite cumbersome, but as you can see there is a lot of data to be entered and the point of this is to provide a side by side comparison, so we clearly understand who provided what and whether it was complete and accurate. This is a side by side comparison. The document that I gave you is a summary of that. It speaks a little bit to the methodology of how all this was plotted, how this evaluation was performed, but essentially this document takes the spreadsheet information and summarizes it. At the end of this document, you will find a scoring chart which was derived from the scoring process outlined in the project manual. The evaluation criteria is broken up into six categories: personnel and equipment,

experience, understanding scope of the RFP, financial capacity, price and reasonableness of all numbers. Each one of those categories is assigned a potential score of 20 points possible, all the way down to 5 points possible, depending on the category. Some of this criteria is a bit subjective. Some of the proposers provided lots of additional material including the information about their company, their services, personnel, financials, you name it, probably way more than anyone could really thoroughly understand and use within the time frame allowed to do this evaluation, but certainly ample and adequate. Some proposers provided only the minimum if that. We have tried to capture that both ways in each of these materials. I would recommend that we look at the last page below the conclusion at the scoring which takes each one of these six categories. You can see the scores for each and range from 87 to 47. The evaluation criteria scoring provided a bit of a methodology for each category. Again, it's a bit subjective but utilized in a side by side comparison and the completeness and thoroughness of each proposal, then looking at supplemental materials such as references, resumes, and things of that nature. You put all this in a hopper, and you develop a methodology for scoring. Some of these items are easy. If you left out critical information, then that works against you. If you did not complete information that works against you. Things of that nature. So, try to be fair and not penalize the proposer for what might be considered a minor item, for instance, if you submitted one of the affidavits, but it was not notarized, you got penalized one point for that. If you submitted multiple affidavits that were not notarized you still only got one point, it wasn't one point for each item, it was comprehensive. Some of the more important items, when you get into pricing, there were three members that did not propose the initial term grand total. That's a big problem. That can lead to what might even be considered disqualification. I will leave that up to the Board to determine. Where it does work in very specifically is when we have to create an average between the initial contract term, the first and second renewal terms, and apply that average to the price scoring in the evaluation criteria, which is for a full 25 points. So, logically, if one of those three prices is not provided, it is impossible to provide a fair average, so the score would be zero. There were only two proposals who had a score for item number 5 price because they submitted all three of those numbers. I have a very detailed analysis or methodology for one of the proposers, and I used the highest score, and I can go down this item by item and explain the score and rationale and the point deduction to you if you want. I did start with everyone having 100 points, so the way I worked it out is I deducted points under each of the six categories depending on what was left out, what was not accurate and what was not thoroughly completed. When you add it all up and you go back to that back page again, it is pretty clear on the scoring process. He asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Wollard: Two points of clarification: 1. From a scope standpoint what is currently being done under the HOA scope should mirror what we are now bidding for the CDD correct? What we are doing is essentially taking it out of the HOA and putting it in the CDD. The scope is not changing.

Mr. Wilbanks: The scope is clearly outlined in the project manual. There should be no deviation from that. Theoretically all the bids should be apples to apples based on the scope outlined in the project manual.

Mr. Wollard: And then the second point would be, we just passed a resolution for the roundabout to be put into the CDD maintenance. I don't believe this bid contemplated the roundabout as it is not constructed yet, so I don't know that we had the information yet, but I just want to make sure that is in there as well.

Mr. Wilbanks: That is correct.

Mr. Ward: Out of curiosity Grant, what is your recommendation?

Mr. Wilbanks: My recommendation would be the highest scorer, and that would be Landscape Maintenance Professionals. They by far had the most complete submittal, an outstanding submittal in my opinion. They had all the critical numbers. I don't think anyone else's submittal was even close to theirs as far as completeness and their prices were, I think, extremely reasonable. I will speculate a little bit here and say that if everyone had provided all of the pricing data required, they perhaps still would have been the low bidder. I think that's probably a win-win there.

Mr. Ward asked if there were any additional questions from the Board or audience members.

Nathan: This is Nathan with Down to Earth. I was wondering if the evaluation would be available to review from Waldrop.

Mr. Ward: Yes, sir. You can email me, or Waldrop, and we will provide a copy to you. He asked if there were any additional questions; hearing none, he called for a motion.

Mr. Jere Earlywine: I think we need to approve some scoring too, to the extent that you have some scoring, and with that final ranking, and then authorize the award.

On MOTION made by Mr. John Wollard, seconded by Ms. Karen Goldstein, and with all in favor, the scoring and ranking were approved, and the bid was awarded to Landscaping Maintenance Professionals.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Consideration of Termination of Agreement

Consideration of Termination of Agreement between the LT Ranch Community Development District and Skye Ranch Master Association, Inc.

Mr. Ward: As I mentioned at the outset, we have an agreement with the Master Association for the maintenance of this existing asset. This simply permits us to terminate that agreement immediately and then enter into an agreement with the bidder who was just awarded. He asked if there were any questions; hearing none, he called for a motion.

On MOTION made by Mr. John Wollard, seconded by Mr. Scott Turner, and with all in favor, the Agreement with Skye Ranch Master Association, Inc. was terminated.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Staff Reports

a) District Attorney

Mr. Earlywine: From time to time, we have been working on some real estate due diligence and also getting geared up for next year's bond issue. Beyond that I don't have anything to report.

b) District Engineer

- I. Report October 1, 2021**
- II. Report November 1, 2021**
- III. Report December 1, 2021**

No report.

c) District Manager

- I. Financial Statements for period ending June 30, 2021 (unaudited)**
- II. Financial Statements for period ending July 31, 2021 (unaudited)**

Mr. Ward: There has been a law that was enacted at the last legislative session that requires Districts to report certain information relative to our stormwater needs and to the extent that Districts have utilities services like water and sewer. They are required to be reported. Enclosed in your package was the reporting requirements due to be filed on June 30, 2022. Waldrop Engineering has already been asked to begin the preparation of documents necessary for that. Basically, it provides long term capital requirements for the overall stormwater management system, overall operating requirements on a long term basis, and then this information is to be updated every 5 years. The plan is to get that done over the next 60 to 90 days and then that will be back to you for your review and consideration before we are required to file that in June of next year. Are there any questions? There were none.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Supervisor’s Requests and Audience Comments

Mr. Ward asked if there were any Supervisor’s requests; there were none. He asked if there were any audience questions or comments.

Mr. Scott Carlson: (Indecipherable).

Mr. Wollard: Jim, he’s asking for the start date. I believe we made the contract effective January 1, is that correct?

Mr. Ward: We are trying to get this done before January 1.

Mr. Earlywine: Jim, if you want, we will circulate the notice letters and new contract here shortly if that’s helpful to you.

Mr. Ward: Extraordinarily helpful. Thank you. Please do it.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Adjournment

Mr. Ward adjourned the meeting at approximately 11:20 a.m.

**On MOTION made by Mr. John Wollard, seconded by Mr. Scott Turner,
and with all in favor, the meeting was adjourned.**

LT Ranch Community Development District



James P. Ward, Secretary



John Wollard, Chairperson