

Boynton Waters Homeowners Association Inc.
SPECIAL EMERGENCY MEETING REGARDING GATE ACCESS CONTROL
Board of Directors Meeting
Tuesday, August 31, 2010
Meeting Location: 9367 Aqua Vista Blvd. (Lofaro Residence) – 6pm

Call to order.

The meeting began at 6:05 pm

The general members present were **Bobbie** Bobbi Malkin, Eric Malkin, Florin Tudor, Leonard Da Costa, and Sally Ann Putney.

The following board members were present:

Larry Lofaro, President

Larry Berdoll, Vice President

Maura Slaughter, Communications Director

Kip Brandrup, Special projects

Robert Uhrie, Treasurer

Charles Mucciolo, Secretary

Mark Halmo, Special Projects

A quorum is present.

Larry Lofaro introduced Carlos Barrett with Atech of Pompano Beach, as the guest speaker who will explain about gate access systems.

Carlos Barrett spoke about the following:

- He has surveyed our existing system and determined it to be inoperable and out of date.
- His company is a full service company offering the products, installation and service.
- The current system is obsolete and does not offer the current standard of management options.
- The proposed system would consist of a telephone entry system, clickers, key fobs, cards or transponders as we desire.
- He explained the various options available with the newer software most notably the ability to manage the access.
- He offered options for pedestrians to gain access, most importantly, children who are now forced to be in the street when accessing the community because we have no pedestrian gate.
- The option for a car trap consisting of gate arms and dividing the entry into separate resident and guest lanes via the use of slender plastic cones to try and eliminate the piggy backing.
- He offered the evaluation of the current system to determine the extent of the work to be done on a time and materials basis rather than a fixed fee in an effort to save us some money.
- He suggested the use of a key fob as the device that people would have on their key chain in the event they left the community without their car or for children to keep on their person for after school access.

Larry Lofaro asked several questions of Carlos Barrett:

- Are you considered to be an expert in your field? Answer: Yes.
- How long have you been in this field? Answer: 15 years
- Have you evaluated the existing system? Answer: Yes
- How would you describe our existing system? Answer: Obsolete
- Is the system antiquated? Answer: Yes it is.
- Would you recommend spending money to repair the system? Answer: I would not, however I would be able to further evaluate the system and make recommendations but since the system is not currently working and it is antiquated I would not recommend putting any more money into it as there is no guarantees the repairs will last considering the condition of the system as a whole.
- Further discussion regarding the individual components of the gate access control system was had between the Board and Carlos Barrett. The option of including a camera in the phone access keypad so that the resident could have the option of seeing who is at the keypad upon received a modulator from Comcast which should be little or no cost. The current wiring is not up to code and the pedestal is loose in the ground.

Repairing the system, if possible, would still leave it completely obsolete in just a few years due to the changeover from the existing POTS system.

Larry Lofaro opened the discussion up to the general members.

Questions arose regarding:

- Options for those who do not have Comcast with regards to the ability to view a visitor at the gate.
- How much information on each homeowner will need to be stored in the data base; we can limit the info to name and phone number.
- Ability to provide specific times for access; yes the system can do this.
- Cameras for license plate recognition; available at various levels of sophistication. A rough estimate of a basic license plate camera was given as \$800 and would be an option for a later date.
- Can eliminate clickers; by use of transponder which automatically 'reads' your car as it approaches the gate eliminating the need for the driver to do anything manual.
- Necessity for turn-around; an option to be discussed by the board later in the meeting.

This concluded the presentation by Carlos Barrett and the portion of the meeting open to the general members.

Larry Lofaro made a presentation with the following points:

- We have a gate access control system which has been severely damaged by the lightening storm
- We have spoken to Howard Siegel, our current gate serviceman, and he confirmed the damage done to both the gate controllers and the access control system.
- We can take the approach of putting a 'band aid' on the current system for approximately \$1,000.
- Howard Siegel has informed us that taking this approach does not guarantee the full operation of the system due to the poor quality of the original installation and subsequent repairs by others.
- The current system was never equipped with a lightening suppressor system.
- We must provide a lightening suppressor as part of whatever we do.
- All of the consultants we have spoken with have commented that taking a 'band aid' approach would be a waste of money.
- The system is 14 years old with technology that is also that old.
- We have been advised that in 2-3 years the system would be out of date again due to the switch from POTS to a cable based communication system by the telecommunications industry.
- The front gate problems are an example of what we need to avoid; the current Board has already spent this year to date over \$8,500.
- Since 2007 the community has spent \$16,323 on gate repairs. That amount would have been approximately 2/3 of replacing the four gate controllers with a 1 year guarantee; we have no guarantees currently.
- It is likely that we will have to spend additional monies on gate repairs before the year is out.
- The current Board finds itself in somewhat of a gray area with respect to the definition of repairs.
- The Board has an obligation to maintain the gates as operable since we are designated a gated community.
- The Board is obligated to provide safety and security and to work in the best interest of the community with respect to the use of funds.
- We are obligated to maintain, repair, whatever word you want to use, the gate system as a whole.
- We have a clear picture that spending certain monies now will not alleviate us from spending more in the near future if we take a 'band aid' approach.
- Some people in the community are not in favor of spending the additional money while others are in favor of updating the system in an effort to curb the waste of money.
- We get some advantages with a new system with respect to managing the access.
- Our community does in fact experience crime.
- We would like to stop the tailgating of unauthorized visitors.
- In order to achieve a better system we will have to spend more money than just on repairs.
- We may have issues with permits based on the Board's findings while doing our preliminary investigations. Charles Mucciolo has done some of this investigation and will elaborate.

Charles Mucciolo explained that while researching what is on file at the building department it is apparent that even the county is not sure of what has been permitted. It is possible that when a contractor applies for the permits to install any system he will find that other elements of the entry will need to be addressed as the permit runs through the

various departments. It is possible that the county will require a turn around or that we may desire a turn around to accommodate some of the restrictions we want for unauthorized access.

Larry Lofaro stated that several interested parties including homeowners and previous Board Members expressed that we must be prudent in what we do when spending the community's funds. He explained that in an effort to be certain that the Board was within its rights to make the changes to the gate access he contacted Louis Caplan of counsel. He read an email to the Board that he sent to the attorney regarding our current situation with respect to the gate access and the desires of the Board to make certain changes. He also read the response from the attorney which stated that the Board, based on the information we have gained from experts in the field of this type of work and the duty to be fiscally responsible to the homeowners, has the right to authorize work to the access control system which is not simply a repair but a replacement of same for which the community will benefit. The replacement of the equipment is not considered a capital improvement requiring the approval of the general members. Options, such as turn around, barrier gates and pedestrian gate, are considered to be capital improvements and must have the approval of the homeowners. The funding of the maintenance portion of the work is up to the Board and the Board alone.

The second part of the issue involves optional improvements which are considered capital improvements and will be discussed by the Board for a recommendation to the general membership for a vote.

It was further clarified based on discussions with Howard Siegel by several Board members that the repairs are unknown at this time and may involve more than simply repairing the telephone access because of the shoddy condition of the existing system.

Robert Uhrig reminded everyone that we will have to replace the gate controllers at some time in the near future and we must be cognizant of that pending expense.

Larry Lofaro made a motion that we replace the existing telephone keypad with a new one that has a camera, to eliminate the existing card reader and replace it with a key FOB system and to replace the existing clickers with ones that are compatible with the new management software. Maura Slaughter seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

The board discussed the fact that we must review the proposals we have so far in order to organize the various components proposed into a format that compares everything on an apple to apples basis. Kip Bandrup, Charles Mucciolo and Mark Halmo will be in charge of this review. Once we have this information the Board will be responsible for deciding how to assess the community for these expenses.

General discussion regarding the aforementioned among the Board members to understand the issues we face with regard to possible permit issues, concerns that the original developer did not pull the appropriate permits, the possibility that the county may require a pedestrian gate and/or a turnaround if we are found to not be in compliance with certain codes.

Kip Bandrup gave a brief description of his findings when he visited 27 communities in the area and took notes and measurements as to what those communities employed with regards to access control and gates. Kip Bandrup stated that based on his findings he is in favor of a single arm gate to control tailgating.

Larry Lofaro took an informal poll of the Board members to see who is in favor of adding a pedestrian gate and approximated the cost to be \$5,000. General discussion regarding the pro's and con's of a pedestrian gate.

Charles Mucciolo made a motion that we provide a line item cost for the pedestrian gate along with the other optional elements, seconded by Mark Halmo, all but one member was in favor, the motion passed with a majority vote.

Maura Slaughter stated that her observations indicate that the majority of kids seem to be driven into the community by their parents and do not walk in. Kip Bandrup stated that he spoke to several kids at the entry who indicated that they use clickers to get in the community. Kip Bandrup has also seen kids push open the gates to gain access. There was more general discussion regarding the various types of gates available.

Charles Mucciolo made a motion to present to the general membership line item costs for several options for the pedestrian gate, seconded by Kip Bandrup, all but one member was in favor, the motion passed with a majority vote.

Further discussion regarding the pedestrian gate and the fact that it does relieve us from some liability. Perhaps the members will vote for some option to be done at a later date.

The second option to consider for presentation to the general members is the gate arm for controlling tailgating.

Charles Mucciolo made a presentation of the various components to consider by displaying a scale drawing of the entry along with cutouts representing optional gates, vehicles and the turnaround area needed for a pickup truck and lawn maintenance trailer. A general discussion regarding the positioning of the keypad, turnaround, divider cones, etc. would have on each other and how they would need to be located relating to the existing gates and guardhouse. It was discussed that no matter what access control system we select it will not have an effect on the gate arm or turnaround and vice versa.

There was general discussion regarding the possible liability associated with not installing a turnaround whether or not the county will require it. We also discussed the positioning of divider cones and what effect they might have on both the turnaround and the positioning of the keypad. The visual appeal of the current entry was discussed with regard to the look that a gate arm and cones will create. Kip Bandrup stated that what he saw at the other communities was not appealing and the other members agreed.

The Board concluded that there is not enough information for us at this time to make a clear presentation to the homeowners until we see what the permitting process develops.

Larry Lofaro made a motion that all options in part two (barrier gate, pedestrian gate and turn-around) not be presented to the homeowners at this time because we do not have adequate information, seconded by Mark Halmo, passed unanimously.

Larry Lofaro made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Mark Halmo, all in favor. Meeting adjourned at 8:30pm.

Larry Lofaro made a motion to have Howard Siegel make temporary repairs to the gate access control if the permitting and installation of the new system were to take more than several weeks, no member seconded, all members were opposed, the motion did not pass.

General discussion regarding who will review proposals; decided that Kip Bandrup, Mark Halmo, Larry Berdoll and Charles Mucciolo will assist.

Larry Lofaro moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Larry Berdoll, all in favor, motion passed unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at ~~8:13pm~~ 8:30 pm.

End of tape

Transcribed by Chuck Mucciolo, Secretary