Watermark Condominium

Meeting Minutes of the Board of Directors

March 26th, 2024, 10:00 a.m. (E.S.T.)

401 North Atlantic Ave.

New Smyrna Beach, Florida 32169

Board Members in Attendance:

* Paul Bryan – President
* Harold Anness - Vice President
* Steve Oyster – Treasurer
* Ron Laramy – Secretary (on phone)
* Beth Corso – Director at Large

Owners in attendance: Donna Schuiteman (#105) on phone, Mark and Judith Maler (#502) on phone, Tom Wall (#603) on phone, Cindy and Ted Stacy (#406), Bud Chappell (#503), Jim Greene (#303).

Managers in attendance: Nikki and Dustin Gunter

**Proof of Notice**

Proper notification of the meeting was posted on the bulletin board at the property

**Call to Order**

A quorum of the board was established. The meeting was called to order by Paul Bryan at 10:01 a.m. E.S.T.

**Disposal of the old minutes**  
Moved by Harold Anness and seconded by Steve Oyster that the minutes of the last board meeting be approved and disposed. Approved unanimously.

**Treasurer’s Report**

* 2023 Year End Financial statements were completed in early January.
  + Financial reports are posted on the website, but if anyone needs or wants a copy please reach out.
* As 2/29/24 we have a bank balance of $233,519
  + $43,785 of that is in our reserves and the balance from our normal HOA fees etc.
* In terms of expenses, we are $3,681 over budget (important note: these are just trends as the annual budget for each category is simply divided by 12. This just shows where we are trending year to date.)
  + $2,633 over in grounds maintenance
  + $8,235 over in building maintenance ($10,000 of this is payment to Charles Adams engineers and will most likely be put back after the assessment for the building repainting and refurbishment.)
  + Several categories are under budget which results in the total above.
* All reserve payments due in January have been paid
* We have updated and corrected all signatures / on-line access needed for the checking account and online access for the credit card with the bank.
  + Authorized signatures for checking account
    - Jim Greene
    - Paul Bryan
    - Steve Oyster
  + Credit cards and Online access
    - Nikki/Dustin have a card and Nikki has online access.
    - Paul Bryan has a card and online access
    - Jim Greene has a card and online access
    - Steve Oyster has a card and online access
* Steve went to Truist bank to explore setting up a money market account for our reserve funds and separately some of our operating funds.

Motion made by Steve Oyster to set up a money market account for our reserve funds and also a separate money market account for our operating funds. Motion seconded by Harold Anness. Carried unanimously.

**Manager’s Report**

* All palm trees have been cut and trimmed
* Purchased and installed a second pickle ball net which is getting used regularly
* Replaced the shower station at the pool so that looks substantially better
* We changed our towing company as the previous company went out of business.
* Window Air Conditioner in the pool house was replaced.
  + The old one was completely rusted and falling apart
* Had to replace the button for the fifth floor for elevator
* Had our 6-month roof inspection
  + Some minor issues were found and all were fixed.
* We still have a handful of units either getting new sliders installed or considering it.
  + Most have been replaced over the past several years.
* For renting owners the 1099 forms have been sent out.
  + Contact Nikki if you have any questions.
* Ron asked the managers for an overall take on how Spring Break has gone.
  + Since the recent gun incident (which happened right in front of our building there has been an almost military type presence.
  + Much calmer than last year as a whole.
  + On a related note, the managers have reached out to a number of city and county officials to ask for an increased number of porta-potties particularly during busy times.
    - The vast majority of trespassers on our property are looking for a place to “go”.
  + Managers have met with police to let them know the problem areas and what we are experiencing.
  + Steve called out Nikki and Dustin for their extraordinary efforts during this years Spring Break.
  + Judy Maler suggested we write letters on behalf of the Watermark thanking law enforcement officials for their efforts this year, which we all thought was a great idea.

**Old Business**

* During our last meeting we voted to reach out to Charles Adams engineering to assist us in determining the needs of our maintenance for our building. They were in attendance at this board meeting to explain what they are doing and will do.
  + First thing done was a Damage Survey which was handed out in the meeting.
    - Inspectors went on all floors and checked all balconies etc.
    - From that a summary was made and is entered into the Project Manual
  + Once everything is in the Project Manual (including repairs needed, painting etc.) then we have a template for what we need contractors to bid on for the overall building refurbishment (along with estimates on what those costs should be).
    - For instance, the report Includes a choice between painting all balcony railings or replacing them.
    - Paul asked about insurance/financial statements required of contractors as outlined in the Project Manual.
      * Everything included is pretty standard, but also flexible if needed.
    - Materials spec’d out meet the needed standards.
  + Overall impression from Engineers is that we have done a good job maintaining our building.
    - They saw no issues that require urgent addressing.
  + Once repairs begin, Charles Adams team will do threshold inspections which is required by the state for any structure over three stories.
    - Usually two to three inspections a month
      * They then report to the building department with a Threshold Inspection report saying that everything is being done as required.
        + These reports are required a minimum of every two weeks.
    - Paul asked about the option of having a “Project Manager”
      * Charles Adams believes this would probably not be necessary if we go with a reputable contractor as it’s quite expensive and the inspections every two to three weeks should suffice.
  + Question was asked about whether the sea wall is part of these efforts.
    - They are not at this time, but based on the relative newness of our wall the engineers feel we are in good shape.
      * They did agree to take a look at our seawall after the meeting to determine what we might need to do going forward.
  + Nikki brought up that the pool house was not included in the Project Manual
    - Engineers will take a look at that and add a line item to the report.
  + Paul asked the Engineers their recommendation on contractors.
    - Obviously they can’t decide for us, but they did say that R & J, who we have used for years, is one of the top two firms.
      * They would be comfortable with us just negotiating with just them.
  + Once the Charles Adams team left, the board discussed whether or not we should pursue multiple bids vs. just going with R & J who has done our work for the past few refurbishing projects.
    - Tom Wall weighed in via the phone on his experience in the past.
      * Tom worked with R & J regularly and found them to be very responsive and had great communication between the crew, the supervisor, and the Watermark.
      * They have responded to any issues we have had in the past.
        + Also as part of the painting project a representative from Sherwin Williams is regularly on site to make sure things are going correctly.
    - After discussion the board agrees that we just go forward with R & J.

Motion made by Beth Corso to move forward with R & J to handle our building restoration and painting project per the specifications we will submit from our Engineers project manual. Seconded by Harold Anness. Motion carried unanimously.

* + Targeting a September begin date for the project to begin.
* Fence/Gate vote ballot counting
  + Nikki and Bud Chappell excused themselves to count the ballots.
  + Out of a total of 35 votes, two were invalid.
    - Result 20 yes and 13 no votes and with the two invalid ballots, the final vote is 20 yes and 15 no.
    - As the requirement for improvements such as this is a 2/3 majority of owners voting yes, the vote for the fence has failed to pass.
  + Knowing the main concerns for the fence was that it was going to be all the way across the front lawn, the board discussion moved to whether or not we should continue to explore just the gate with fencing on either side beachside of the sea grapes by the walkway.
    - As the cost to do this would be under $5,000 this would be a board decision.
    - There was much discussion led by Beth Corso regarding the fact that the main problem we have had is trespassers using our walkway and also using the sea grapes by the pool for all sorts of nefarious activities.
      * We also re-visited adding spikes to the existing pool fence instead of the existing fence cap.
        + Dustin will explore our options here.
    - Bids for just the 6’ gate and 6’ fencing to the pool fence on the South side of the gate, and from the gate to the North edge of the sea grapes just North of the walkway ranged from $2,680 down to $1,680 but the $1,680 quote was not commercial fencing.
    - Ron jumped in saying that even before the vote, given the concerns people had regarding the full fence that he had asked whether we could just start with the gate and fence on either side on the East side of the sea grapes so he is all for going that direction as this should help reduce our issues. Would like to explore options for spikes on top of the pool fence as well.

Motion to approve the low bid of the two bids and move forward with the 6’ gate across the walkway and 6’ fencing from the pool to the North side of the sea grapes on either side of the gate by Steve Oyster. Motion seconded by Beth Corso. Motion passed unanimously.

* + We will move forward with exploring what our options are regarding adding fencing on the South side of our property between us and the park.
* Discuss and approve the reserve draft
  + We continue to work with Expert Reserve Services to determine our requirements for funding of reserves, which has to be fully funded by 12-31-25.
    - They will also assist in creating the report that is required to go to the state of Florida by 12-31-24.
    - This will aid us in determining what the reserve payments needed will be starting 01-01-25.
  + As we continue to have a number of questions regarding the report we will hold off on approving the draft itself.
    - The first step is to approve the service dates incorporated into the report, which we don’t have a problem with.

Motion to approve the service dates as presented to us in the draft report by Expert Reserve Services made by Beth Corso. Seconded by Harold Anness. Motion carried unanimously.

* Sand dunes/plantings update
  + Sand fences were moved out in January which has been working slowly
  + Ropes addition seems to be helping curtail traffic.
  + Harold found a nursery who will ship sea oats at a price of 75 cents a piece which is much less than local nurseries.
    - They can ship in mid-April
    - Harold and Dustin will measure to determine the quantities needed and then will order soon.

**New Business**

* Collections process discussion
  + As we did have at least one tardy payment on this years reserve fees we wanted to have a firm plan for any delinquent payments in the future.
    - Going forward Belote will monthly provide Nikki and Steve Oyster with information on any delinquencies.
    - The Treasurer (Steve Oyster) will send a reminder to any owners who are delinquent.
      * For owners who rent, If the issue isn’t resolved in a timely manner, we would withhold payments of rent.
      * For non-renting owners, we will explore options on a case-by-case basis.
        + Late fees will be added as needed.
* Unit sprinkler head repair proposal
  + According to NFPA requirements we have to do a every five-year internal inspection of our sprinkler system and check everything having to do with the fire system.
    - Cost of inspection is $4,850
    - The walk through of all units (which we don’t think has been done before) resulted in the determination that a total of 148 sprinkler heads need to be replaced.
      * The cost to replace all of these is estimated at $12,580.
        + New city and state regulations necessitated this unit-by-unit inspection.
      * Total cost: $17,430
    - Ted Stacy asked the question regarding when they replace the sprinkler heads in each unit, what assurances do we have that there won’t be water/a mess left behind.
      * Dustin said that it calls out clearly in the contract that they bear no responsibility for any mess or damage done as a result of the replacing of the sprinkler heads.
      * That said, that doesn’t mean they will have complete disregard for the results of their efforts and they will work to minimize any issues.
* New Wiginton contract discussion/decision
  + Contract includes a required annual inspection and the monitoring which would be $4,680
    - We did get a bid from a competing firm which came in at $3,778 and a one-time programming fee of $199.16.
      * Upon some investigation of the competing firm there were some concerns from other associations.
  + We have until May to make any final determinations but currently we don’t believe there is any strong reason to switch from Wiginton.

Motion made by Beth Corso, seconded by Harold Anness to approve the proposal from Wiginton to replace 148 sprinkler heads at a cost of $12,580. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion made by Beth Corso, seconded by Harold Anness to approve the proposal for the every five-year inspection by Wiginton of the internal fire suppression system at a cost of $4,850. Motion carried unanimously.

**Open discussion**

* Steve Oyster brought up issues he has had relating to sprinkler heads etc. regarding new construction/unit remodels. Paul stated that all sprinkler heads are the responsibility of the association but if sprinkler heads need to be replaced because of new construction/changes, it would then be the responsibility of the owner. Strongly encourage owners to get multiple bids on any work needing to be done to sprinkler heads as a result of new construction.

**Adjournment**

No further discussion so motion to adjourn was made. Meeting was adjourned at 11:58 a.m. EST