

Verbatim Transcription from 7/13/19 PWAC Meeting:

Chairman Moeller (PM): Supervisor Comments.

Jerry Vicenti (JV): I'm on the agenda for one comment. On the PWAC Role and Control, let me explain real quick how this got on the agenda. In, on, at our last meeting at District 7, there was a line item for a Interlocal Agreement with the Community, Sumter Landing and PWAC to add District 12 on to that agreement. What happened was that we got into an issue of the 20 year contract that is with the District, Sumter Landing District, and we got into it and we kind of evolved into the authority and role of what PWAC does. So what I did was, I was thinking about this and I was just going to say, give you my opinion, but then I figured this is really a hot button and a lot of people don't want to even come near it I guess once you end up (inaudible) so what I did was, I did a, last night at 11 o'clock I did a statement and I'm going to hand it out to everybody and I want it to become formal, and Jennifer, I'll give her a copy. So once you read this and I'll read it out, it will only take me about a minute and hopefully, the Board will agree with me, well the Committee will agree with me. Give one to Richard. Now this just, it's a subject that I think a lot of residents, not think I know, a lot of the residents ask about it and a lot of residents don't know. A lot of residents do not understand, in my opinion, how our government is run and who controls it and who runs it, they really don't. I honestly believe that a lot of Supervisors don't' understand who runs our government. So what I did was, last night, I decided to make it formal and this really just puts it, now excuse me for any misspellings, which I don't think I misspelled anything but I made it a statement so it's really not in paragraphs. It will take me a minutes to read and I would like for this Committee to think about what my (inaudible) and obviously we'll discuss it after my reading. Ok, my proposal, for the Project Wide Advisory Committee (PWAC) request that the Sumter landing Community Development District Board (CLCDD) to amend resolution 13-05 the functions and the roles of the Project Advisory Committee. As a advisory Committee, not a, as advisory Committee and not an authority Committee with the agreement with PWAC and Sumter Landing to review and amend the agreement to give PWAC more authority to mirror the Amenity Authority Committee (AAC). The goal is to give authority to voting residents that pay for the amenities and also give control of who the residents want to represent through the election process as done by the AAC and District number Boards. You can argue the percentage, but in my opinion, 80% of The Villages government is controlled by Center Districts, in this case CLCDD which consist of commercial property owners only, I repeat, commercial property owners only. Commercial Property Owners are approximately .05%, now that's my opinion, you could argue percentages, of The Villages population. The residential residents that live in The Villages have no authority, no official authority, I repeat, official authority, over the commercial property development boards, CLCDD decisions. My opinion, we have two forms of government in The Villages, we have the CLCDD Board which consists of owners of commercial properties, a very small minority of Villages that control the Villages government and they don't have to answer to no one, but themselves, are elected within themselves, by themselves. Understand what that statement means. Ok. To add insult to injury, some of them don't even live in The Villages, they control millions of dollars of our residents' funds. In my opinion, that is not the democratic process that America has fought for for years and still are. The other 20% form of the government is a democratic democracy which is controlled by the election process where the majority, the majority rules through the voting process where the residents of The Villages elect their representatives. As is the AAC, which is also elected officials elected through the democratic elected process by The Villages residents. The Villages, and the District's elected officials consistently preach how important it is to keep uniformity and consistency throughout The Villages. We have uniformity and consistency in almost everything in The Villages, except when it comes to the most important thing, our government. In my opinion, SLCCD is not a democratic, democratic form of government it is the definition of a dictatorship. I have no idea how, in

the United States, and local Florida State government that a very small minority controls a government and not, not the majority that is elected by the democratic process. I feel that it's the PWAC's responsibility as the resident elected officials to ensure that the residents of The Villages have a voice and the final vote through the resident elections process. In closing, I'm making a motion for PWAC to have a workshop, to have a workshop to look into the issue, matter of amending Resolution 13-05 for adding control and responsibilities to PWAC for all approximately 120,000 residents will have a voice in all of the Project Wide Committee/Authority. Now, I really feel strongly about that. When I got involved in government, obviously we have two forms of government, we are not consistent, we are not uniform and we preach, we gotta have uniformity well we have two forms of government. We got the AAC and you got Sumter Landing, who answers to nobody, but themselves and they control, they are not represented. If they represent it would be the majority that put them in. The minority of people in The Villages, and that's the commercial property owners that don't even live in The Villages is now controlling our decisions. That's why we're called advisory committee and not authority, and I think we should look into amending that, I'm trying to give the voice to the residents. Technically we don't need, I understand that at no time that the Sumter Landing ever went against our advisory, I understand that. I think we should be uniform. The AAC does it right. This is a democratic government. We are part, we are not an HOA, we are elected officials in the state of Florida, we are an arm of that state and I think we should look into amending it and I am open for conversation.

Richard Baier (RB): Mr. Vicenti let me just ask a question, when you say 13-05 are you actually referencing Resolution 17-11 the more current one?

JV: Well yes, the original one, which was in January 17, 2012, obviously, I was part, I got elected in November and this is my opinion, Mrs. Tutt knew exactly what she was doing, she didn't want, the AAC obviously is the authority, they made this advisory Committee, they the District's, it was the purpose of not giving authority to the residents, the purpose, so the commercial property owners would control it, would have the last say. Otherwise, why wouldn't it be uniform? Why wouldn't we be set up like the AAC? Once you take authority away from the residents, which that's what you do, that's what this is. This is what the Sumter Landing development commercial property owners, it's really a development board. I understand they shouldn't have last say when it comes to our government.

RB: So that was a motion Mr. Chairman.

JV: My motion is to have a workshop, Mr. Chairman please don't confuse, the motion isn't to, now for us to have a workshop to discuss it. I really feel that if this gets out, and I hope it does, because I do have a couple soap boxes. I'm going to get this out. I probably have about 8,000 or 10,000 followers, I'll be honest with you in The Villages. I'm going to get this out. Let the Villages' residents know this. Most Villages residents don't know this, they're too busy playing golf, enjoying this beautiful place that we live. Please understand, that I love The Villages more than anybody in the world. People may love it as much, but not more than I do, because the bottom line is this is government, it's a democratic process and it shouldn't stop when it benefits only a few.

RB: So for the Board, I just made a copy of Resolution 17-11, after having a conversation with Mr. Vicenti, knowing this would come up, just wanted to make sure you had a copy there as referenced.

JV: But we could amend it and we could ask to suggest it and maybe the first time, in my opinion, that the Sumter Landing District may disagree with us.

Dennis Hayes (DH): Mr. Chairman if I may. Before we get into having a workshop to literally talk about this Committee taking on more responsibility, I would like just a few minutes to talk about this Committee, itself, and how this Committee actually functions before we start talking on taking on more responsibility. And the reason I bring that up is that over the last several months there has been a number of incidents, just on my own personal expectations, I don't think we as individuals function the way I thought we would. As a Committee we take on, for the most part, 80/90% is mundane, it's kind of stuff that has to be taken care of and voted on by a Committee in terms of approvals or whatever, and periodically we have to deal with what I would consider to be more contentious issues. Issues that touch people's hot button, and we've done that over the years. Jerry, you're very familiar with the traffic light on Colony Way, that was one, we had striping that was another one, but periodically we have issues that come before the Board, and more recently we had the whole issue about the cap, removing the cap and then I think there was something else. My expectation is that when these issues come up, let's use the one on the cap as an example, we were selected by our individual Boards to bring our thoughts, our opinions to this group and share them and I respectfully accept that when we took the vote, relative to the cap, two members had strong opinions that we shouldn't do that, for various reasons, and that's what this Committee is intended to do. So we took a vote and there were two objections and everybody else agreed. It's from that point on that I have the difficulty. The Committee voted to move forward with removing the cap, now maybe I am the oddball here, and it would be the first time, but when a committee, such as ours takes a vote, that vote is by the committee and it gives people an opportunity to agree or disagree but it's a committee vote, it's done. I expect this Committee to stand behind that vote. Now I was not at District 7's meeting after that vote, but it was reported that there was strong discussions about removing the cap, to the point where the Supervisor that sits on this Committee actually recommended getting people to go to Sumter Landing's Board Meeting and rescind our vote to send it back. Now, personally, that weakened us, that was an affront on this Committee and it weakened us, now for us to take on even more responsibility, if we're not going to be uniform, what good is our vote? Even if we are now responsible not just to advise without the authority so I'm looking for some consensus here with the other Committee Members, do I have a false expectation in terms of what we are responsible for. I mean if I'm all wet, zip it up I know where I stand. I also know how I feel about this Committee:

JV: Can I respond to that Chair? Thank you. I respect your opinion, I respect your opinion. I can tell you right now I'm meeting another person on District 7 Board voted to keep the cap and not get rid of the cap. We did go to the Sumter Landing Board, obviously that is the right of us to do that, ok? This is a advisory committee, if any Supervisor disagrees with that that's up to them to do it, but the issue is to pursue what they want. The issue is you may disagree with that, and that's obviously you do and that's your right to disagree, but the issue is not to be the District Board, District 7, it's not the issue of the cap that you brought up that issue, the scenario, the issue if that this is a democratic process, majority rules, we have a Board that we don't have authority, we are a committee that only suggests for or advises , but we go through a Board, which is Sumter Landing, which is the minority of The Villages, that's the subject, that's the reason, the reason the memo I did, the statement, the question is we are now, we have no authority, no official authority. The people that are running and controlling, the reason why I use the word controlling. Sumter Landing is controlled but they are not the majority. Once the minority rules, that is not the majority, that is not the process that put you in that seat. The process that put you in that seat was a majority of people in your District voted for you, all right? That's what the subject is, the subject is that it's, I don't even know how it's even constitutional in this state that has this set-up, where we have a Board, Sumter County, Sumter District, where they are in the minority, a small minority and they answer to nobody. I'll be honest with you, I don't know how the residents even put up with that. So, ok, that's the subject, it's not that you got offended over somebody not agreeing with

you on an item. Please, you talked, now I'm going to talk now to. I accept what you're saying, I understand it, I don't agree with it.

Chuck Wildzunas (CW): Can I dive in on this for a minute? In regards to the Board, and the Board's votes and decisions, I was one of the two that voted against removal of the cap. I sit here as a representative of District 5, who selected me to represent them on this Board. I went back to that Board and told them that, how the vote went, and since the Board voted. Since the Board voted in this manner that's what we're bound to. I had no thoughts of going back and saying had ought to protest it and move on. I can't always be in the majority, and for whatever reason that my vote was that way and it may not have been as you perceived. But, I went back this was the decision of the Board and this is where we're at and the District 5 Board, fortunately for everybody, said fine. You did what you could and you voted your heart. I have to agree with you.

PM: First of all, I think there are two items before us, now a motion has been made, and we'll return to that, then there's this issue of when we perform actions on this Board, and they're not just suggestions, they are resolutions, that go forward, everything we send to the Sumter Landing CDD is a resolution, we don't send them suggestions, there's that piece of it so I want to come back to you item, I would like to clear this first item of the motion that has been made for a workshop and in my mind it's not clear, would this be a workshop of just Project Wide, because you're talking about dissolving Project Wide and running elections. So this Board would go away and just like they do the AAC we'd have elections and come up with a new Board, and maybe there'd be representation that would be sitting on the CDD Boards any maybe there wouldn't. Correct me if I'm wrong, I believe that on the AAC...

RB: There is one member that is on the Board, Mr. Deakin, and he is also an elected AAC member.

PM: So now the CDD Board, because now would have no voice, no voice whatsoever, except for that one part in the amenities. It was set up that way because of the court and the agreement that was signed by the various parties. So, I guess my question is here are there any other comments.

CW: Point of Order. We have a motion on the floor and we have moved directly into discussion without there having been a second. I don't believe that's in order until and unless there is a second to the motion.

PM: Ok, so is there a second to the motion? Hearing none the motion fails. Now let's go to the second issue which is the conduct of actions that we take and (inaudible). I believe that Mr. Baier was at the District 7 meeting and maybe you could talk about the implications of the actions of what could have happened and what actually happened when the vote was taken.

RB: Are you speaking to the Interlocal Agreement?

PM: Yes, yes.

RB: District 7 had a very long discussion of the Interlocal Agreement, which was really to do three things. It was to establish three things, it was to establish a new Project Wide definition south of 44, thereby adding Districts 12 and 13 to the signatory of that Interlocal Agreement. It also reset the agreement to a 20 year period and then third of all, adding Brownwood to that agreement. So that discussion was had, it was pointed out by Staff there was going to be a well over million dollar shortfall and that the action, we couldn't predict, but the action of this Committee would likely if they pulled out

of the agreement, would be to defund any infrastructure that is currently funded within District 7. I think is that fair in the way?

JV: Exactly, exactly and originally once the lawyer came and discussed it with us, we had the votes to table it, if you remember we had the votes to table it to discuss it and once they explained that it would've kind of put a block on the budget we realized, because they felt very strongly, I did and a couple other, there were three out of five of us that felt strongly about tabling it. Because the 20 year agreement, now this is a whole different subject now, we went on, what I wrote in this statement and what we were talking about to the agreement was to add District 12 as part of PWAC it went off to that the authority, one of the other Supervisors initiated , saying what the authority of what Sumter Landing is not right, it should be PWAC's authority and that's how we evolved into the heavy conversation. I don't understand how that issue has anything to do with my written statement, I have no idea.

PM: We're done with the written statement.

JV: Yeah, well I don't understand how the issue of how even the cap became an issue with this written statement. It's a whole different subject.

PM: And that's why I separated the two.

JV: So what is your issue then?

PM: Well the issue is the actions that are taken by members of this Board after we have taken full discussion and then taken a vote that then one of the members then goes back to his CDD and in fact wants to hold another vote that almost, near miss, withdraws that CDD from PWAC.

JV: That one issue, I'm sorry Mr. Chairman, one issue has nothing to do with the other one. One issue has nothing to do with the other. I don't know and the issue, nobody, when it came up to District 7 that issue of the amending Sumter Landing and having District 7 approving it, has nothing to do with what you're talking about. I really don't think you know what you're talking about, all due respect. The bottom line is that District 7 had on the table, the line item, they had the right to if they wanted to, to disagree with it, to vote against it. We didn't. we had two Supervisors that voted "Nay" and the other three, and it passed. Now I don't know why you're rubbing it into this issue, I think you're off base and I think it's getting, and the people you're talking about, I'm one of them, so you're really bordering disrespect. So I would advise to go on to another subject or you want to just handle it and I'm here.

PM: Are there other people who want to comment.

Ken Stoff (KS): Mr. Chairman, I just have a comment. I think the actions of a Committee member outside this , outside our meetings, I believed Mr. Manager would be covered under the recently updated or I believe there will be an updated code of conduct, it's probably the wrong term. Now, I'm sure it's under the purview of this Committee to either address.

RB: So the rules and Policies and Procedures of the Boards I think is what you're referring to, really does not cover this specific action. I think that Mr. Hayes' comments were a little bit different than the discussion at the meeting relating to the Interlocal Agreement. The Interlocal Agreement was a discussion we went over. I think what Mr. Hayes was referring to is the amenity deferral cap removal discussion that occurred after the vote of the Committee.

DH: Right. Just to be clear, I totally understand the point that as an individual resident, which we all are, we have obviously the right to object to whatever as we see fit. I wasn't at the meeting with Sumter Landing, so all I can do is based on the reports that came out of that meeting, the reporting structure made it clear that as a Supervisor and a member of PWAC your position was made clear at the meeting that you were a member of this Committee, that you really felt strongly enough that you wanted that vote not taken after we had voted that it move forward. That's my problem, my problem is you get almost to the point that if you really want the ability to object individually don't sit on this Committee.

JV: Well, I personally think you're wrong. I disagree with you and you know what, until the residents, our constituents vote us in and you're up for re-election, so am I, my main purpose is to represent the residents and I felt strongly it did not benefit the residents to raise, to take off the cap. That has nothing to do with this issue that I brought up and I take offense, you're being disrespectful to me and I honestly. You're being disrespectful bringing up with this that had nothing to do with that issue.

DH: I wanted to bring this issue up last month, but you were not here and I would not to do that.

JV: All due respect, you're being disrespectful.

DH: Wow, I need a new definition of disrespectful.

JV: You can need anything you want sir. The bottom line is that is not the issue I brought up and I can guarantee you that if it benefits the residents I will fight it to the last bone. If you don't like that that's your problem. Let the residents, your constituents decide what you think is right or wrong. And I definitely think you're being disrespectful.

PM: I'm hearing a lot of disrespectful, I think it was disrespectful to leave this Committee, after we had taken a vote and go back to your individual CDD and not support this Committee.

JV: Because I didn't agree with you in the beginning sir. Let me tell you, you can believe anything you want, alright?

PM: To the point that you would have been pulled out.

JV: What is your point, I don't know what you're talking about, would have pulled out of what? What are you talking about? This is, sir, please clarify what you're talking about. The issue of the District of the cap has nothing to do with the issue that we voted on at District 7, when it came to the Agreement with Sumter Landing. What are you talking about sir? You don't know what you're talking about. They're two different issues. So clarify what, seriously, it is ridiculous, think about when you talk.

CW: I move we adjourn.

PM: I'm not sure we're ready to adjourn , I'm getting some no here. I think we have an issue with one of our members.

JV: Sir, you may have an issue with one of the members. My constituents will obviously either vote me in or vote me out next November, including some people on this Board. If you got an issue with the

way I think that's your problem. My issue is, always protect the residents at all costs. That's what I'm here for.

PM: Ok, anybody have anything else to say.

Steve Brown (SB): I just feel like, as a member of the Committee, we act, not always in unison in our thoughts but in the end result. We come up with a decision. I think we should all own that decision. There's nothing wrong with disagreeing with it, but we need to own it because we are a Committee.

PM: Well we have a member that doesn't agree with that.

JV: Sir, don't put words in my mouth, sir.

PM: You didn't

JV: At that issue I disagree with you, at that issue I disagree, that's correct. I went there because the issue was Sumter Landing. Sumter Landing has nothing to do with me going to that meeting. I mean, PWAC had nothing to do with me going to that meeting. I went to that meeting representing myself, representing what I was, representing the constituents, the people who came to me and bottom line, they had a vote, they had a vote, and I had the right to give my opinions.

PM: And not support what...

JV: I supported the opinion that I thought the residents wanted.

PM: I don't know how we can operate that way. I don't know how this Board can operate that way. If we all take a vote here, we supposedly have even a greater split in our vote, then we all go back and half of the CDD's say, well we didn't agree with that so we're not going along with it, the other, I mean where does that leave us? Where does it leave the authority?

JV: You don't have authority sir. We're an advisory committee, we don't have no authority whatsoever.

PM: We have lots of authority.

JV: Sir, we are not an authority, we are an advisory committee. You know that.

PM: I think we have lots of authority.

JV: Repeating it don't make it right.

PM: Where does this take us?

JV: Obviously you want to keep, you want to stay on this subject and you want to continue to do this. Is that what you want to do? Is that your goal sir?

PM: I want to find out how this Committee can operate when we have a full discussion and then we have a vote and then that vote is not supported when its brought back to the individual CDD's. That's the question.

JV: That is not, it never went back to District 7, you're talking about a different scenario, it was a different amendment, line item sir. Once again you don't know what you're talking about. It never went back to District 7. The issue that went back to District 7 was the agreement on adding District 12 as an item under PWAC.

PM: Correct.

JV: That never came to this Board, this Committee that went to the District 7 Board. You're talking about, you're messing up one issue with another issue. Do you understand what you're talking about? Do I have to clarify it? On a line item at the District 7 Board had nothing to do with the issue of the cap, it had nothing to do with that. It's a different line item. We voted on it, we accepted it, so what are you talking about? Come on, is your hearing not on? I don't mean to be sarcastic but are you going to answer me? I think we should drop the subject, because at this point, obviously I'm trying to end it and you want to keep pursuing it.

Ken Lieberman: I make the motion we adjourn. There is no further progress with this conversation.

KS: I'll second.

PM: All those in favor.

All: Aye.