



***Beacon Tradeport  
Community Development District***

---

**[www.beacontradeportcdd.com](http://www.beacontradeportcdd.com)**

**Pete Marrero, Chairman**

**Philip Procacci, Vice Chairman**

**Madelyn Bello, Assistant Secretary**

**Brett Houston, Assistant Secretary**

**Al Lara, Assistant Secretary**

**November 7, 2019**



# **Beacon Tradeport**

## **Community Development District**

---

5385 N. Nob Hill Road, Sunrise, Florida 33351  
Phone: 954-721-8681 - Fax: 954-721-9202

October 31, 2019

**Board of Supervisors  
Beacon Tradeport  
Community Development District**

Dear Board Members:

The regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Beacon Tradeport Community Development District will be held on **November 7, 2019 at 10:00 a.m. at the Dolphin Mall Management Office, 11401 N. W. 12th Street, Miami, Florida 33172.** Following is the advance agenda:

1. Roll Call and Pledge of Allegiance
2. Audience Comments
3. Approval of the Minutes of the August 22, 2019 Meeting
4. Update on the Status of Projects
5. Staff Reports
  - A. Attorney
  - B. Engineer
  - C. Manager
6. Financial Reports
  - A. Approval of Check Register
  - B. Balance Sheet and Income Statement
7. Supervisors Requests
8. Adjournment

*Meetings are open to the public and may be continued to a time, date and place certain. For more information regarding this CDD please visit the website: <http://www.beacontradeportcdd.com>*

**MINUTES OF MEETING  
BEACON TRADEPORT  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT**

The regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Beacon Tradeport Community Development District was held on August 22, 2019 10:00 a.m. at the Dolphin Mall Management Office, 11401 NW 12th Street, Miami, Florida.

Present and constituting a quorum were:

Phil Procacci	Vice Chairman
Madelyn Bello	Assistant Secretary
Al Lara	Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

Luis Hernandez	District Manager
Michael Pawelczyk	District Counsel
Juan Alvarez	District Engineer
Ed Prelaz	POA/ Cushman & Wakefield
Kathryn O'Leary Richards	O'Leary Richards Design

**FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Roll Call and Pledge of Allegiance**

Mr. Hernandez called the meeting to order and called the roll, and indicated the pledge of allegiance was recited.

**SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Audience Comments**

Mr. Hernandez: Moving on to Audience Comments, I would suggest if the Board will allow it to have Kathryn make her presentation so we can see if there is any effect to the budget, which means it would be best for us to deal with that first.

Mr. Alvarez: Let me tell you a little bit about Kathryn. Kathryn and I have known each other for a long time, since 1998. We did a roadway project in Bal Harbor and she specializes in urban design and planning streetscapes. This concept is called a complete street project where there is a lot of interaction between pedestrians and vehicles and bicycles. She has done a lot of public parks, public gardens, and she has a long list of plans for Miami Beach, Bal Harbor, Aventura, Palmetto Bay, Pinecrest, Cutler Bay, FDOT and many others. Kathryn was added to the design team for the landscape architect and this is the last component of the roadway project that is going to be added. Brett, Kathryn,

and I met at our office to discuss some conceptual designs, and I think we are at the level in which we thought it would be a good idea for Kathryn to come and inform the Board of Supervisors about the design so we can go ahead and start preparing construction drawings. This component is going to be added to the construction concepts that we have already. Kathryn, do you want to give some updates?

Ms. O'Leary Richards: Thank you. Juan is much too kind. We have been working on N.W. 17<sup>th</sup> Street and 110<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Those are the two streets that we are able to do any kind of landscape. Let me just start by telling you some of the parameters we are working with. We are meeting FDOT design criteria, so we do have a line of sight at the intersections that we have to adhere to. We have to adhere to the trunk size at the intersections and the spacing within the clear line of sight. On 17<sup>th</sup> Street, we have overhead utilities that we have to contend with. We also have proposed drainage that we have to contend with. That is located right behind the curb or along the curb on 17<sup>th</sup> Street. We had to play with the location of the planters as far as where they're located in the sidewalks and because of the proposed drainage on the north side of 17<sup>th</sup> Street, we had to push the planters back along the backside of the sidewalk adjacent to the right-of-way. On the north side of 17<sup>th</sup> Street, you will see that we are placing the planters approximately seven feet behind the back of the curb. On the south side of 17<sup>th</sup> Street, as well as 110<sup>th</sup> Avenue, the street trees are located approximately four feet behind the back of the curb.

Mr. Procacci: That is still in the public right-of-way?

Ms. O'Leary Richards: It is all in the public right-of-way, correct. FDOT designed the criteria. Along the north side of 17<sup>th</sup> Street, because we have the overhead utilities, we have proposed trees that are right in the right place according to FPL, and there are only a few species that FPL really recommends underneath powerlines. So, along 17<sup>th</sup> Street we are proposing for a good portion of 17<sup>th</sup> Street the crepe myrtle, which has a little white flower. It is a smaller tree and can be maintained underneath powerlines and does not get tall. At the entrance on 112<sup>th</sup> Avenue, we are proposing Bismarck palms, kind of like bookends as an entrance feature, as well as on 14<sup>th</sup> Street. We don't have any issues with powerlines here, so we can propose something that does get taller. Now as we move east, we are proposing double Montgomery palms. We have live oaks that were recently planted in front of this property here, so putting a tree within five feet or six

feet of those large live oaks on private property really didn't make sense, so we are proposing palm trees on both sides of the streets for continuity. Single palms within the limit of clear sight, and double trunked palms where it is outside of the clear sight. Along 110<sup>th</sup> Avenue, we are proposing the native wild Tamarind tree. At the intersections, to pick up the Montgomery palms over here because the trunk can't get greater than eleven inches in order to meet the criteria, we are proposing the Montgomery palms at the intersection of 17<sup>th</sup> Street and 110<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The size of the planters are four feet by six feet and with ground cover at the base. We are proposing a very bulletproof type of ground cover, which is the ficus green island. It is similar to what was used in Doral in the Doral streetscape and can be maintained at about eighteen to twenty-four inches. The medians are too narrow for any type of tree or palm, but we are proposing a shrub along 17<sup>th</sup> Street, we are proposing the horizontal coco plum, which is a native shrub that is a very durable type of shrub. Along 110<sup>th</sup> Avenue we are proposing the dwarf clusia nana, which is also a very durable type of shrub. At various locations along 17<sup>th</sup> Street and 110<sup>th</sup> Avenue, in order to make this a complete street, we are proposing benches and trash receptacles. Here are a couple alternatives we presented to Juan and Brett. I don't think the final decision has been made as far as aesthetics are concerned, but we are proposing aluminum benches and trash receptacles.

Mr. Procacci: Is that a requirement of the county or the city or is it just an election we are proposing on our own?

Mr. Alvarez: It is not a requirement from the county or the city. I think it is part of the environment we want to create in the area. I think Brett has specific ideas for that.

Mr. Pawelczyk: But the city is going to maintain all of that, right? That is outside of the District.

Mr. Alvarez: This presentation that Kathryn is giving was given in front of the city's engineer, Eric Gomez, and he doesn't think there will be any issue or problems with the city accepting the concept. He left open the idea that they would like to have a conversation about it with the CDD.

Mr. Pawelczyk: But it is not in District.

Mr. Alvarez: I know. In terms of the concept and the view of the city, this is going to be an area of active pedestrian area. That was part of the original concept because

we know there is a lot of pedestrian traffic between Dolphin Mall and the other mall to the east so creating this pedestrian environment is something desirable, but it is not actually a requirement.

Mr. Procacci: I guess I am just wondering because it is still a little rough over there whether that stuff is going to be in somebody's backyard in a couple weeks. Someone might want to put that by their pool in their backyard, take that trash receptacle and put it in front of their business. Initially I don't see anybody sitting there. I hadn't envisioned that. I don't know if anyone else had either?

Mr. Alvarez: These are extra wide sidewalks.

Mr. Procacci: The question I have, and maybe it is a legal question, we agreed to finance the improvements of the projects and the city is going to pay us back from the income they get from permit fees and all of that, but are they going to look to us to replace these and do things? I don't know that that is where we want to be.

Mr. Pawelczyk: The interlocal agreement contemplates the District to complete the roadway projects, including the landscaping here, and then turn it all over to the city saying it is yours. We warranty it for a year maybe, I am kind of going off the top of my head, but for the most part, we just turn it over and they are responsible to maintain it, they would be responsible if we put these trash receptacles in there, empty the trash, maintain the benches, etc.

Mr. Procacci: So, my follow-up question is are you the only one who knows that? What I mean is does the city know that?

Mr. Pawelczyk: Eric Gomez knows that because he has seen the agreement a number of times.

Mr. Procacci: Then they are aware that this is going to be their responsibility once everything is completed?

Mr. Alvarez: Yes, they are aware.

Mr. Procacci: I know what happens sometimes so I wanted to know what the rules of engagement were.

Mr. Pawelczyk: The next question I have is if the city doesn't perceive benches or trash receptacles being needed for three years, why would we install them now?

Mr. Procacci: Right. You are going to be doing construction there for three years.

Mr. Lara: Is there a detailed installation of the benches? We have specific benches here at the mall. They are good, but Phil's point, they might walk.

Mr. Procacci: And if we are going to have significant construction over the next three to four years, the question would be is now the time to have a placeholder, but do we put them in now or do we wait until the buildings get built around there and then we augment that? It will be pretty, and I am not trying to stop what we are doing here.

Mr. Pawelczyk: Having sat through numerous meetings in dealing with benches in other Districts, if it is a need to add this towards the end of our project or at some other time where the money is available in our construction account, Luis and Juan will tell you we can throw a bench out there very quickly. My concern is just that. If everything is not done out there and you don't need it, then once those properties are all developed and people get used to utilizing this pedestrian area or the county puts bus stops out there or whatever it is, then at that time I think you would install the benches. You kind of want them to look new when people are using them rather than three or four years old.

Mr. Alvarez: I think you only had them in select places, right, Kathryn?

Ms. O'Leary Richards: Correct. There are benches in only a few places.

Mr. Alvarez: If they are not needed or wanted, that is fine.

Mr. Procacci: You can leave it as part of the plan and if the place gets populated the way it could be, then it would be nice to have them there.

Mr. Lara: What is the lead time? About six to eight weeks for the benches?

Ms. O'Leary Richards: I would think so.

Mr. Procacci: I don't want to stand in the way, but I think it would be nice and I was happy to hear it was going to be the city's responsibility. My other comment is the rest of the city isn't maintained like what you guys try to do here.

Mr. Pawelczyk: That is really the concern from a legal perspective because this area is outside the District, but these improvements the CDD is making with respect to these roadways have been determined by the Board, the District's engineer, and through our methodology consultant to benefit the landowners within the District. Now whether the landowners within the District benefit from the maintenance of the landscaping, that is something I don't know the answer to, but you would have to build a record to show there is a benefit there, like for instance to the mall to maintain the trees or the streetscape

improvements. I don't think that is easy to do to make the landowners pay for the maintenance of the aesthetic improvements.

Mr. Procacci: So, is there a maintenance requirement, or is that the owner's responsibility? If each owner has to take their areas, some of them may not build for a while and have irrigation and all of that. Is there a plan for all of that? Who is going to take care of the trees and everything else?

Mr. Alvarez: Those are city right-of-way areas.

Mr. Procacci: Does the city know that? Because I don't think they do that anywhere else, do they? Do they know that it is their obligation?

Mr. Alvarez: Maintaining, yes. They know that. They know the design is still not finalized. Yesterday I had a conversation with Eric Gomez. He called me and he is willing to give the permit to begin construction of the project with the exception of the sidewalks because he knows there may be more conversations between them and the developers in this area and the CDD for the final design. So, if there is something that is of concern here about the type of trees, or the number of trees, or benches, or whatever that can still be discussed. We have time to discuss that with the city still, but the point is, like Mike said, these improvements are going to be given to the city, and then the city is going to be maintaining them.

Mr. Procacci: I would move forward with the plan. I wouldn't want to get into a lot of conversation and delay the project another six months to a year just by conversation. I think we need to move forward and we will figure it out when the time comes.

Mr. Pawelczyk: If you are going to leave those elements as part of the project, you can have them permitted, but we don't have to install them until later, and even as part of the turnover once we give a bill of sale, once everything is done, because it is part of our project, we could actually give them a bill of sale and give them a check for the amount so they can put them in when they are ready, or just give them a bill of sale with an agreement that when you tell us, the CDD will order and install the streetscape items.

Mr. Lara: You can do that, or order it, hand it to them, their maintenance shop is right there, and let them store and install them when they are ready to.

Mr. Alvarez: At this point what is important is to define the planters, so the irrigation system can be designed and installed as part of the utilities the contractor is working on.

Mr. Procacci: Do we need to make a motion or what else?

Mr. Pawelczyk: I think a motion to move forward with this plan and authorize District staff to move forward with the permitting process with this plan would be in order. Brett has looked at this already, too?

Mr. Alvarez: Yes, Brett has seen it.

On MOTION by Mr. Procacci seconded by Ms. Bello with all in favor the Board authorized District staff to move forward with the permitting process for the presented landscaping and streetscape plans.

**THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Approval of the Minutes of the June 6, 2019 Meeting**

Mr. Hernandez: Moving forward with our regular agenda, Item #3 is Approval of the Minutes of the June 6, 2019 Meeting. This would be the time for us to make any changes, additions, or deletions, and if there are none, a motion to approve the minutes would be in order.

On MOTION by Mr. Lara seconded by Ms. Bello with all in favor the Minutes of the June 6, 2019 Meeting were approved.

**FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Public Hearing to Adopt the Fiscal Year 2020 Budget**

**A. Motion to Open the Public Hearing**

Mr. Hernandez: Moving forward the next item we have is the Public Hearing to Adopt the Fiscal Year 2020 Budget. The first action I need from the Board is a motion to open the public hearing.

On MOTION by Ms. Bello seconded by Mr. Lara with all in favor the public hearing was opened.

**B. Public Comment and Discussion**

Mr. Hernandez: The part I want to discuss before I open it to the public is that everybody has received a copy of the proposed budget. You will find that under Section IV. It is the same as we presented three months ago. The part I do want to indicate for the record is that based on this proposed budget, there does not appear to be a need for any increase in the District's assessments for the operations and maintenance part, so the assessment level will be the same as were being charged in the prior year. At the

same time, you will find a copy of the status of the debt portion for the Series 2012 pertaining to the industrial side, Series 2014 pertaining to the commercial side, and the Series 2017 for the special projects that were being discussed earlier. After that brief presentation, does anyone from the audience have any comments? Ed, you are the only one from the audience with us. Do you have any comments in regards to the budget?

Mr. Prelaz: No.

Mr. Hernandez: Does the Board have any questions with regards to the budget?

Hearing none, we can move on.

**C. Consideration of Resolution #2019-04 Annual Appropriation Resolution**

Mr. Hernandez: The next step for the Board is to consider Resolution #2019-04, which is behind tab C. Resolution #2019-04 Annual Appropriation Resolution basically takes the District's proposed budget and makes it the adopted budget. So, by adopting the resolution you will be adopting the budget. With that being said, the recommendation from staff at this point is to approve Resolution #2019-04.

On MOTION by Mr. Lara seconded by Ms. Bello with all in favor Resolution #2019-04 Annual Appropriation Resolution was approved.

**D. Consideration of Resolution #2019-05 Levy of Non Ad Valorem Assessments**

Mr. Hernandez: The next item is Consideration of Resolution #2019-05 Levy of Non Ad Valorem Assessments, which is behind tab D. By adopting this resolution, the Board will be giving authority to once again levy on the Miami-Dade County tax bill. The recommendation from staff is to approve Resolution #2019-05.

On MOTION by Ms. Bello seconded by Mr. Procacci with all in favor Resolution #2019-05 Levy of Non Ad Valorem Assessments was approved.

**E. Motion to Close the Public Hearing**

Mr. Hernandez: Unless anyone has any questions with regards to the now adopted budget, a motion to close the public hearing would be in order at this time.

On MOTION by Mr. Lara seconded by Ms. Bello with all in favor the public hearing was closed.

**FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Ratification of Contract with Downrite**

Mr. Hernandez: Moving forward, Ratification of Contract with Downrite. The District has received from the engineer the list of items that have been approved, and it is my understanding that you have the original documents for the contract with Downrite, the hold harmless agreement between the CDD and the City of Sweetwater, and the agreement with NELCO for the geotechnical testing that needs to be done for the construction on 14<sup>th</sup> Street. So, at this point, it would be appropriate for the Board to ratify those agreements and once again, the originals of all of them are being kept and maintained by the CDD's engineer.

On MOTION by Ms. Bello seconded by Mr. Lara with all in favor the contract with Downrite, the hold harmless agreement between the CDD and the City of Sweetwater, and the agreement with NELCO for geotechnical testing on 14<sup>th</sup> Street were ratified.

**SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Consideration of Engagement Letter with Grau & Associates to perform the Audit for Fiscal Year Ending September 30, 2019**

Mr. Hernandez: Moving forward, next we have Consideration of Engagement Letter with Grau & Associates to perform the Audit for Fiscal Year Ending September 30, 2019. The District has been successful in getting the engagement letter from the auditing firm, and at this point, it would be appropriate for the Board to consider. I have reviewed the amount, and it corresponds with what was authorized, so approving it will authorize the appropriate officials to execute the document.

On MOTION by Ms. Bello seconded by Mr. Procacci with all in favor the engagement letter with Grau & Associates to perform the audit for fiscal year ending September 30, 2019 was approved.

**SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Staff Reports**

**A. Attorney – Discussion of 2019 Legislative Update Memorandum**

Mr. Hernandez: Moving forward to Staff Reports. Mr. Pawelczyk?

Mr. Pawelczyk: First, this is just the legislative update in the packages and I will be brief and you can just tell me if you have questions. There is really only one that is

really kind of interesting, at least to me, but for those of you who deal with CDDs or may deal with CDDs in the future, it is good to know what some of these changes are. All of these are from the 2019 legislative session, and they are all in effect as of July 1<sup>st</sup>, some later than that. The first one amends our charter, which is Chapter 190 to allow Districts when they are forming to include additional areas around the District for future expansions, even if you don't own that parcel. So, if you are creating a District that is a square and you might expand the District to add the parcel next to it, even though you don't own it, that parcel can sign off on it, and it basically makes the expansion easier should the developer end up owning that parcel or that parcel owner wants to come into the District. It makes the process of going through the county a lot of easier, no filing fees, and it is supposed to be an easier process in Miami-Dade County. It has not been implemented as of yet. It also makes the merging of Districts a little more streamlined, as well, if neighboring Districts wanted to merge. The next one deals with the auditor selection process. We have gone through the auditor selection process here a number of times. We always select the Board as the Audit Selection Committee. Some municipalities, for instance, might not use their governing Board as a committee, and in that case, the law has changed to say basically at least one member of the governing Board has to be on that committee, and the city manager and the finance director cannot be on the committee. They can go to the committee meeting and make recommendations, but they cannot be members of the committee as decision makers. They can certainly offer their opinions to the committee, though. That is not really going to affect us either unless you want to change the way you go through the auditor selection process. The next one deals with utilities and creates an exemption for public meeting requirements when the governing Board, either a municipality or a special District that has a water utility is addressing data technology and technology issues pertaining to how the water system operates. Maybe they should have this public meeting exemption about fifteen years ago, but I think it is really there just to prevent hacking and to prevent information from becoming available to the public. On the next page, it deals with your Form 1. I believe you have all complied with your Form 1 filing requirements. In 2023, the Commission on Ethics is obligated to have a new system in place now that will allow you to go on their website, pull up the form, fill it out, probably check an 'I Accept' button, and send it

electronically, and you will have immediate notice that you are in compliance with your Form 1. So, it will basically take the Supervisor of Elections out of the filing process, and apparently that takes three years to put that website together. We will see if that happens. The next one, for the developers in the room, local governments are now prohibited from collecting impact fees prior to the issuance of building permits, it revises the minimum requirements for the adoption of impact fees by certain specified local governments by codifying the dual rational nexus test, which is the legal test for the validity of impact fees, and the only exemption to that is that it doesn't apply to water and sewer connection fees. So, basically they can't condition the issuance of a building permit on you paying your impact fees. The last one is actually probably the most interesting, at least to my residential CDDs. This one deals with tree permits. You may have heard about this because it is actually making its rounds through local governments and even the news. Local governments are now prohibited from requiring a residential property owner from obtaining a permit to remove a tree that is a danger to persons or property if the residential property owner has first obtained certification of some sort from a Florida licensed landscape architect or a licensed certified arborist that that tree does present a danger to persons or property. So, basically if you own a tree and it is going to fall over because it was struck by lightning, you no longer have to get a permit from the city and you can just do it as long as you have that paperwork in your possession and the city cannot make you mitigate that tree, meaning they can't require you to write a check and they cannot require you to put a new tree in. Like if an oak tree falls from your property, supposedly you are supposed to put in four new trees depending on the size of the oak tree on your 70 by 70 foot lot, so, they no longer can require you to do that. It was actually being challenged somewhat by some local governments that have historic trees, and there are some city attorneys that are saying the Statute is vague. Just be advised that we don't really know where this is going to go. We will monitor that just so you know, and if there is anything further to report, we will report to this Board even though we have no residential property here just as we would any other Board. It is an interesting change so it is something we wanted to include in our report. That is all I have. Any questions? And if you need copies of those, Luis has them and I have copies.

Mr. Hernandez: Unless anyone has any questions for Mike, I will move forward.

**B. Engineer – Update on the Status of Projects**

Mr. Alvarez: The city is willing to give us the permit to begin the construction of 110<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 14<sup>th</sup> Street, but they are going to hold off giving a permit for the sidewalk, waiting for these final designs of the landscaping. That was the reason for this hold harmless agreement that was ratified. They said they would give us the permit, but wouldn't be held responsible if the landscaping affects some of the components that were permitted. We don't foresee any impacts, but that was the reason for the hold harmless agreement. The contract is a \$4 million contract and is going to take around a year, 325 days the contractor tells us. It is going to be a full year project and if the city gives us the go-ahead, very soon we are going to follow up with a notice to proceed and Downrite will be able to close 110<sup>th</sup> Avenue and begin with the surcharging. We are going to be needing some consultants during the construction. For example, geotechnical consultant, which we already ratified, and I also have a proposal here. Mike, do we need to have a formal agreement with them? This is a proposal that was just ratified. It does not have a limit because as the testing is required, they have a unit test, but it is not a major item.

Mr. Pawelczyk: And you are collecting their license and insurance information?

Mr. Hernandez: Yes.

Mr. Pawelczyk: It is really up to the Board. If you want us to prepare one, we can. We probably should too make sure NELCO is responsible for its negligent activity, should there be any. I think the interlocal agreement might require us for our contract to name the city as additional insured. We will prepare an agreement then.

Mr. Hernandez: Yes, let's do an agreement just to be safe.

Mr. Alvarez: I can email you a copy if you would like.

Mr. Pawelczyk: If I can have this copy, then that is all I need.

Mr. Alvarez: Very good. We have basically ratified it in a prior motion, but we will bring it back at the next meeting once the agreement is in place.

Mr. Hernandez: The District has hired them based on the hourly rate or description of the services they will be providing. The agreement will give us what will be for the future. Part of what needs to be said, and keep in mind is that typically with NELCO we only pay them as the service has been rendered. So, we don't pay them in advance, it is when they provide us with the report, so that simplifies the concerns from the District's

perspective. The main reason for needing to have an agreement is that since the improvements are going to be passed to a second entity, we better go ahead and make sure that everything has been properly addressed.

Mr. Alvarez: I think that is all I have for the project on 110<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 17<sup>th</sup> Street and 14<sup>th</sup> Street. There is another project that was discussed here before in several locations, which is the drainage improvements and repairs on 20<sup>th</sup> Street. At the last meeting, we had a set of plans to the county and the construction permit is going to be issued by the city. What we didn't have then was a contractor. So, we received proposals from three different contractors, one of them being the contractor who just finished the outfall at IKEA. I think he did a good job, and he happened to be the lowest bidder for \$119,444. I have his proposal here. Other bidders, Downrite was surprisingly high at \$215,000 and there was another one at \$180,488. We did not publicly bid this because we were under the threshold.

Mr. Prelaz: What is the scope of work?

Mr. Alvarez: Replacing the pipes that were affected by the utilities. We are leaving the utilities there, the cables, so we are not removing them because that would cause a disturbance to the usage now. We are going to leave them where they are now, and we are putting the new pipes in underneath. We are putting them under, in the same place. That makes the inlets connect between the pipes deeper.

Mr. Prelaz: Juan did manage that project with IKEA and it did run very smoothly. We didn't have any glitches. I don't know the ultimate effects of it yet, whether they are going to see the full effects of the drainage issues on the 20<sup>th</sup> Street area until we get both of these done, maybe somebody has a reference point for all of the rains we have had since then, but we won't really know the full difference probably until then.

Mr. Alvarez: We always thought it might cost around \$100,000 but the lowest bidder is around \$120,000, so it is a little higher than what we thought it was going to cost. The next step would be to accept the proposal and I will work on the contract so we can proceed if that is fine.

Mr. Hernandez: How long will it take to do approximately?

Mr. Alvarez: Three months. The IKEA project projected two weeks in the beginning, but it lasted three or four. This is bigger, so I would say at least three months.

Mr. Hernandez: Now from my understanding, everything you are presenting is coming out of the industrial side?

Mr. Alvarez: This is industrial, yes.

Mr. Hernandez: And the amount is \$120,000. Just for the Board to know, we have \$250,000 for that matter, so we have funds for that in the budget and it will not be affecting anything. We have already reserved \$250,000 to do this, so a motion from the Board would be appropriate to enter into an agreement. What is the name of the vendor?

Mr. Pawelczyk: Master Excavators, Inc., in an amount not-to-exceed \$120,000.

Mr. Alvarez: And the contract name is Drainage Improvements at N.W. 20<sup>th</sup> Street.

On MOTION by Mr. Lara seconded by Mr. Procacci with all in favor an agreement with Master Excavators, Inc. for the N.W. 20<sup>th</sup> Street drainage improvements was approved in an amount not-to-exceed of \$120,000.

Mr. Alvarez: The IKEA outfall is completed, accepted. IKEA hasn't sent a bill and have said they were going to be responsible for the costs. They said they might ask the CDD to pay for the difference in the size of one of the pipes that used to be 24 but we asked them to do 36. I have not received anything from them, though.

Mr. Hernandez: When they came to the District for the improvements for the outer ring road, there are some funds for that when the improvement was to be made, they need to reimburse the District, and we started the process and they asked for additional information. He needs to call them back, but it is probably something that can be negotiated within those funds.

Mr. Alvarez: Yes, that invoice was for about \$61,000. That is what is in the agreement and the maximum contribution they are going to make for the improvements of the entrance this year. Now the improvements we have done are also included in this maximum contribution. I don't think we are going to be able to bill them the full \$61,000. It might be half, it might be something more, but that is something.

Mr. Hernandez: Just for you to know, I prefer to take all of the money today, then finish tomorrow, but whatever we need to do, we will. Anything else, Juan?

Mr. Prelaz: I actually want to add a couple things if I can because they kind of overlap with what I am working on here. Do you have anything else, though, Juan?

Mr. Procacci: Maybe we are going to ask the same question, but I just want to know what is happening with the water feature?

Mr. Prelaz: That is on the list here. The last notes we had were to do some research about changing the name. I don't believe that has been completed yet. Basically we need to look and see if there are other Beacon Tradeports that have been trademarked. We talked about how they would be marketed to brokers, but the big picture item here is that we liked what Juan had presented and I think the last thing we talked about was looking at the maintenance aspects of certain materials that were being presented. I don't know if you have had a chance to look at that, if not, maybe at the next meeting we can narrow down the decision on where we are headed with the entry feature.

Mr. Alvarez: Probably select the type of material and colors, and we can have a vendor come here. I think that is what we talked about so they can address the maintenance aspect of it.

Mr. Prelaz: So, you and I want to get together maybe and try to narrow this down for the next meeting to present?

Mr. Alvarez: Okay.

Mr. Prelaz: Does anybody else want to be involved in that process? Should we maybe ask Brett?

Mr. Procacci: If not Brett let me know.

Mr. Pawelczyk: As long as it is only one of them.

Mr. Prelaz: Okay, great. Also, Juan, on a somewhat related, there are some irrigation issues we were having at the lakes, the lake pump was being overtaxed because we assumed there were leaks at the property levels. I sent out a pretty comprehensive email to all of the landowners, basically outlining the issues and the impact to them being additional costs and replacements if these items weren't taken care of, meaning that we were recommending first that all of the properties get a proper inspection by a qualified landscape irrigation company to make sure they didn't have leaks, and if that did not cure the problem, then we would have to go to the next step, which would be isolation valves at the lakes, which would cause some inconvenience and timing differences for them to be able to use the pumps, and again at a continued cost to them if the resolution wasn't resolved at the property level. The third and final was to put isolation valves on each of

the properties. This plan was developed between Research Irrigation and Juan and myself. I think the property owners so far have been pretty responsive. They have been sending reports and asking questions, and I hope that will take care of the problem. At what point how do we monitor to see how the pumps are doing at the lake? How does that get done?

Mr. Alvarez: We are checking readings of the water that is being used and reporting those to S.F.W.M.D. When the water usage goes below what has been permitted, we will know that things are under control. When we took a reading, we noticed the pump was always running. It shouldn't be. There are two pumps. One is small and supposed to keep the pressure, the other is the big one that delivers volume. The small one should be running to keep the system pressurized, but the big one shouldn't be running all the time. It is always running, and this is outside of times when the property are being irrigated. There are probably leaks. The CDD vendor who is in charge of the CDD mains, but what happens beyond on the private properties, we don't have control.

Mr. Procacci: Do we need to then go to each property where the water comes in?

Mr. Prelaz: I offered to the owners an opportunity to make all of these changes and get their reports done by September 30<sup>th</sup>. I think if we don't start to see a significant difference in the operations, absolutely that is our next step.

Mr. Alvarez: The two possible solutions are we put a valve at the entrance of each property that only opens on certain hours for irrigation. That is one solution. The other solution would be to put a valve at the exit of the pump so it only opens during irrigation.

Mr. Prelaz: I did send the message directly to the owners, not just the managers or managing agents, and I tried to let them know the costs would be coming back to them in what shape or form, and ultimately if we have to do the isolation valves at each location on the property that it will be costly.

Mr. Procacci: How much? Assess the owners if need be.

Mr. Prelaz: Yes, absolutely. It would be an assessment to the owners, I think it was \$3,000 to \$4,000 each, which isn't a huge amount, but it will impact them.

Mr. Procacci: We are spending a lot of money trying to mitigate that, though.

Mr. Prelaz: Absolutely. Repairs and maintenance, the wear and tear on the pumps, and all of that. That is the reason we initiated this. One other item related to your

bucket of projects here is also the telecom procedures and the access agreements. Mike, do you want to kind of give an update on that?

Mr. Pawelczyk: We prepared a draft agreement.

Mr. Prelaz: So, I guess the next step would be to review and approve that, correct? Does it need review, or do you think the draft is adequate?

Mr. Pawelczyk: I sent it out in June and I didn't get any comments whatsoever from anyone, so I wasn't sure where it was. It wasn't included in the agenda. I think it needs to be in the agenda package.

Mr. Prelaz: Okay. I will review that within the next few days because I am pretty familiar with the procedures that need to go in there. I had actually sent you a sample, too, did you work with that to begin with?

Mr. Pawelczyk: Yes, we used that as a rough draft. The question that I posed because I remember when we discussed this at the last meeting, is there going to be a fee schedule associated with this and do we need to adopt rules with respect to this procedure? I don't know the answer to those questions.

Mr. Prelaz: What I circulated I can circulate again. I did have kind of a checklist of things that needed to be done with that. It may have been incorporated already into the agreement. There were certain things that needed to be done, the permit we needed to have site drawings, the location of trenching, etc.

Mr. Pawelczyk: All of that should be included in the agreement. That is what I need, specifications. I need help on that part. My question was if the District is going to charge someone a fee, because they submit something for us to review, then we need to adopt a fee schedule.

Mr. Prelaz: Absolutely. Basically we discussed that last time and I think Phil agreed that we should do that. I will take a look to see what the number was at the last meeting, it was an administrative fee for the telecom. It is common to do that. I think it was around \$200 to \$300 as the administrative fee recommendation.

Mr. Pawelczyk: While you are talking about this, you should explain what it is.

Mr. Prelaz: It is basically a processing fee.

Mr. Pawelczyk: I understand that, but I don't make up rules and fees. I need someone to say to me, the fee is going to be \$200. This is the process, steps 1 through

4 or 1 through 5 that each property owner is going to have to go through and then we can put that in a rule format that the Board has to adopt. This is just because you are not familiar with what CDDs have to do, but we have to go through a rulemaking procedure where we adopt the rules by resolution and it is kind of a ridiculous process, but unfortunately that is what we are saddled with. In order to implement these policies, we have to handle it this way now. So, the question I have is depending on what you guys tell me is the process, then that may be adopted by resolution with a fee in accordance with Chapter 190, and I don't need to go through a rulemaking process but I don't know what the process is.

Mr. Prelaz: I have a checklist of things that may be done prior to or in conjunction with the agreement. I will get that to you.

Mr. Hernandez: Part of what needs to be kept in mind is when you are going to be assigning fees, it also needs to be understood what is going to be done for those fees. So, part of what is being described is creation of a criteria that will allow us to say \$200, \$250, whatever the number will be, and potentially depending on what is going to be offered for this particular service, this is the fee, it includes this, etc.

Mr. Pawelczyk: Any local government fee has to be rationally based on the cost providing the service that is paid. The way you are presenting it to me, if it \$200, that is not a problem because it is probably going to cost the District more to implement that by the time Juan looks at it, the rest of staff looks at it, goes through it, and makes sure the agreement is taken care of, so I am not worried about the amount of a \$200 fee, I think that is rationally based, but some Boards will say they want to charge \$1,000 for that. It doesn't cost \$1,000 to provide that service.

Mr. Prelaz: Then let me ask you this, what would be a rational based number if we are discussing it from that perspective?

Mr. Pawelczyk: Well, the Board can look at it a number of ways. To me, based on our discussion at the last meeting, the Board's main purpose of implementing this license agreement was to get a handle on what is going on there. So, in other words, if the Board wants to encourage people to pay a minimal fee of \$200 or \$300, even though it might cost the District \$500 to process it, that is a decision the Board has to make based on what they think.

Mr. Prelaz: I am with you on that, and I know a lot of people will charge up to the thousand dollar mark, but just also keep in mind that I have no problem with the minimal fee, but most people that are going to be applying for easements or access agreements and are large companies. So, I can go either way on that, \$200 is fine, it certainly makes it smooth and easy, and probably quicker to run through the process. I don't think we are looking at this as a revenue source or revenue gain.

Mr. Pawelczyk: We can even incorporate it into the rule that they can start the fee off at \$200 for the first year and then after the first year it will go up. We can do that by resolution. Like I said, it is really up to the recommendation that the staff is going to provide the Board with to make that decision.

Mr. Prelaz: Okay. I will get everything channeled to Luis in a manner you need for fees for the following services, with kind of a checklist of what needs to be done to get telecom access to the area.

Mr. Pawelczyk: I think we can do a resolution to adopt a policy of the Board. I don't think it is a rule, and the fee can probably be done through the Chapter 190 Statute. We can adopt it that way rather than a rulemaking item. I think that should work.

Mr. Procacci: Can we go back to the discussion about the irrigation to each property? I think if we implement that, I think that we need to make sure that there is only one vendor. We don't want the property owners going out and bringing whoever they want in there.

Mr. Prelaz: Yes, we will do that and charge it back to them, absolutely. We will take control of that and charge it back because you have to have an integrated system to do that. I can price that, I have already gotten some basic prices from Research Irrigation already. I don't have that off the top of my head right now, but I think it is probably \$2,000 to \$3,000 each. Do you think that would be a CDD expense, or an Association expense so I can build it into our budget if we need to?

Mr. Hernandez: Where is the valve going to be? At the entrance of each property?

Mr. Prelaz: Yes. We would probably do it on the common area level to where the common area water goes to the inside of the property.

Mr. Alvarez: So, the valve would be placed in CDD right-of-way areas?

Mr. Prelaz: Right.

Mr. Hernandez: Then it could be an expense of the District. The part is in the existing budget, there is nothing contemplated for that expense to be incurred.

Mr. Prelaz: I will take a look and if it can be wrapped into the next Association budget if needed.

Mr. Hernandez: It does not mean the District will not have ways to find the amount of money that is required. In order for me to be able to find sources of financing that, what I need to know is what is the total cost, but certainly if it is going to be installed within District property, then that would be a legit expense the District could finance.

Mr. Alvarez: I understand the agreement between the CDD and the POA is that they take care of the distribution system and the CDD takes care of the pump station.

Mr. Hernandez: Sure. They do all of the maintenance so the District is not responsible for any maintenance.

Mr. Prelaz: If you are saying it is part of the distribution system, you are saying it would be part of maintenance under the Association? Is that what you are saying?

Mr. Pawelczyk: Just to clarify, that is a maintenance agreement that basically says the POA maintains it, but I don't think it contemplates the capital costs, meaning the capital costs could be paid by either. Does the CDD want it, does the POA want it, since I think they both do, so it could be paid by either. It really doesn't matter.

Mr. Procacci: How many owners do you have roughly that it affects?

Mr. Prelaz: Maybe 25 to 30.

Mr. Procacci: If you don't have that in the budget, you might want to do it over a three or four year period. I don't know if we want to give them an option. If we make the determination that we are going to do it, and we have to assess them money and it has to be an increase of \$500 or whatever a year until it is paid up?

Mr. Prelaz: We are already collecting and may or may not use it against the reserves we have already collected, or we can do a special assessment for that.

Mr. Procacci: I don't think we want to ask, we just need to make the determination if that is what is necessary to make improvements to our irrigation system, then that is it.

Mr. Prelaz: That is the way I outlined it.

Mr. Hernandez: Bringing it back to the terms of the CDD, what I would suggest is for you to work out and define what is best suited for the property owners, and if you

believe something needs to be handled by the CDD, let me know. We can quantify it and see what can be done, and if needed, we will come back to the Board.

Mr. Pawelczyk: It is a CDD system, but by implementing this capital improvement, you are actually benefiting the CDD and the POA, and because the POA is responsible for the repairs and you are benefitting the property owners themselves because you are reducing the maintenance costs.

Mr. Procacci: Reducing the costs to the CDD means you will have less problems because it will be on their property and we are not going to hear about those problems. There will be an expense, but there will be an ongoing savings.

Mr. Hernandez: Anything else? Ed? Juan?

Mr. Prelaz: I am good, thanks.

Mr. Alvarez: I am finished.

**C. Manager**

**1) Mosquito Report**

Mr. Hernandez: Moving forward, under Manager, I have attached a copy of the mosquito control report just to keep the Board of Supervisors aware that is being taken care of and monitored closely to make sure that is being done as scheduled.

**2) Consideration of Proposed Fiscal Year 2020 Meeting Schedule**

Mr. Hernandez: Item #2 is the proposed meeting schedule for fiscal year 2020. We continue to suggest to have the 24 meetings, and as it has been done in the past, we will only have meetings when we need to, but the ability to have the 24 is that if any matters, especially on the construction side, require us to have a meeting we have already advertised it. So, with that suggestion to continue to have the meetings on the first and fourth Thursday of each month, at this location and time.

On MOTION by Mr. Lara seconded by Ms. Bello with all in favor the proposed fiscal year 2020 meeting schedule was approved as-presented.

**3) Discussion of Financial Disclosure Report from the Commission on Ethics – *everyone has filed***

Mr. Hernandez: Financial disclosure report shows that all of the Supervisors have filed, so I do need to congratulate you on that. The last item I have that was not included

is that the District has finally received from FEMA the final reimbursement. The District received in total \$65,142.78. The part that needs to be said is the list of submitted eligible expenses the District has presented to FEMA was \$70,407.50, which means the District has been reimbursed approximately 93% of what it had submitted. Based on the allocation of what was being spent, 70% of the total amount presented corresponds to industrial expenses and 30% corresponds to commercial expenses. What that means is the District needs to reimburse the industrial side \$45,599.95 and to the commercial side \$19,542.83. At this point, it would be appropriate to have a motion from the Board authorizing the District to reimburse those two entities for the expenses that were incurred from the last hurricane event.

On MOTION by Mr. Procacci seconded by Mr. Lara with all in favor the Board authorized the District to reimburse the industrial side in the amount of \$45,599.95 and commercial side in the amount of \$19,542.83 from funds received from FEMA for hurricane related expenses.

Mr. Prelaz: The \$45,000 will come back to the Association? Is that how that works?

Mr. Hernandez: Yes. It will be given to the Association. Basically, if you have an issue that was \$120,000, now you have an issue that is only \$80,000. You will get that money. With that being said, unless anyone has any questions for me, I will move on.

**EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Financial Reports**

**A. Approval of Check Register**

**B. Balance Sheet and Income Statement**

Mr. Hernandez: Moving forward, the last item I have on the agenda for the Board to consider will be the financial reports. Tab A contains the check register, and tab B has the balance sheet and income statement. Unless anyone has any questions, a motion to approve them would be in order.

On MOTION by Mr. Lara seconded by Ms. Bello with all in favor the check register and the balance sheet and income statement were approved.

**NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Supervisors Requests**

There not being any, the next item followed.

August 22, 2019

Beacon Tradeport CDD

**TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Adjournment**

Mr. Hernandez: Unless anyone has any other District business to discuss, a motion to adjourn the meeting would be in order.

On MOTION by Ms. Bello seconded by Mr. Procacci with all in favor the meeting was adjourned.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary Assistant Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman/ Vice Chairman

**BEACON TRADEPORT**  
**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT**

Check Run Summary

November 7, 2019

<i>Date</i>	<i>Check Numbers</i>	<i>Amount</i>
<u>GENERAL FUND</u>		
8/15/2019	1988-1991	\$15,189.09
9/9/2019	1992-2001	\$84,471.34
10/17/2019	2002-2010	\$35,322.90
<b>Total</b>		<b><u><u>\$134,983.33</u></u></b>

CHECK DATE	VEND#	.....INVOICE..... DATE INVOICE	...EXPENSED TO... YRMO DPT ACCT# SUB	SUBCLASS	VENDOR NAME	STATUS	AMOUNT	....CHECK..... AMOUNT #
8/15/19	00067	8/06/19 I0000415	201908 310-51300-48000		ALM MEDIA, LLC	*	174.26	174.26 001988
-----								
8/15/19	00046	8/01/19 3102	201908 320-53800-46800		ECO BLUE AQUATIC SERVICES, INC.	*	544.83	
		8/01/19 3102	201908 320-53800-49100			*	8,500.00	
-----								
8/15/19	00038	8/01/19 176	201908 310-51300-34000		GMS - SO FLORIDA, LLC	*	4,234.17	4,770.00 001990
		8/01/19 176	201908 310-51300-44000			*	200.00	
		8/01/19 176	201908 310-51300-35100			*	83.33	
		8/01/19 176	201908 320-53800-49300			*	250.00	
		8/01/19 176	201908 310-51300-42000			*	2.50	
-----								
8/15/19	00012	8/07/19 18591	201908 310-51300-31200		GRAU & ASSOCIATES	*	1,200.00	1,200.00 001991
-----								
9/09/19	00067	9/04/19 I0000423	201909 310-51300-48000		ALM MEDIA, LLC	*	96.85	96.85 001992
-----								
9/09/19	00019	9/04/19 5253	201908 310-51300-31100		ALVAREZ ENGINEERS, INC.	*	3,585.00	3,585.00 001993
-----								
9/09/19	00003	7/31/19 157525	201907 310-51300-31500		BILLING, COCHRAN, LYLES, MAURO & RAMSE	*	1,050.00	1,050.00 001994
-----								
9/09/19	00086	9/05/19 092019	201908 330-53800-46000		BEACON TRADEPORT INDUSTRIAL PARK	*	45,599.95	.00 001995
		9/05/19 092019	201908 330-53800-46000			V	45,599.95-	
-----								
9/09/19	00087	9/05/19 092019	201908 330-53800-46000		DOLPHIN MALL ASSOCIATES LLC	*	19,542.83	19,542.83 001996

BTRD BEACON TRADEPO SROSINA

CHECK DATE	VEND#	.....INVOICE..... DATE INVOICE	...EXPENSED TO... YRMO DPT ACCT# SUB	SUBCLASS	VENDOR NAME	STATUS	AMOUNT	....CHECK..... AMOUNT #
9/09/19	00046	9/01/19 3140	201909 320-53800-46800		LAKE MAINT 9/19	*	544.83	
		9/01/19 3140	201909 320-53800-49100		ADULTICIDE CONTROL 9/19	*	8,500.00	
								9,044.83 001997
ECO BLUE AQUATIC SERVICES, INC.								
9/09/19	00088	8/13/19 6-705-13	201908 310-51300-42000		POSTAGE	*	29.10	
								29.10 001998
FEDEX								
9/09/19	00028	8/26/19 52100-82	201908 330-53800-43000		ELECTRIC 7/25-8/26/19	*	620.38	
								620.38 001999
FPL								
9/09/19	00038	9/01/19 177	201909 310-51300-34000		MANAGMENT FEES 9/19	*	4,234.17	
		9/01/19 177	201909 310-51300-44000		RENT	*	200.00	
		9/01/19 177	201909 310-51300-35100		COMPUTER TIME	*	83.33	
		9/01/19 177	201909 320-53800-49300		WEBSITE ADMINISTRATION	*	250.00	
		9/01/19 177	201909 310-51300-51000		OFFICE SUPPLIES	*	17.50	
		9/01/19 177	201909 310-51300-42000		POSTAGE AND DELIVERY	*	2.50	
		9/01/19 177	201909 310-51300-42500		COPIES	*	114.90	
								4,902.40 002000
GMS - SO FLORIDA, LLC								
9/09/19	00086	9/05/19 092019	201908 330-53800-46000		REPAIRS/MAINT REIM	*	45,599.95	
								45,599.95 002001
BEACON TRADEPORT INDUSTRIAL PARK								
10/17/19	00019	10/07/19 5280	201909 320-53800-47400		SVCS THRU 9/27/19	*	6,250.00	
								6,250.00 002002
ALVAREZ ENGINEERS, INC.								
10/17/19	00003	8/31/19 158155	201908 310-51300-31500		SVCS THRU 8/19	*	2,790.00	
								2,790.00 002003
BILLING, COCHRAN, LYLES, MAURO & RAMSE								
10/17/19	00046	10/01/19 3181	201910 320-53800-46800		LAKE MAINT 10/19	*	544.83	
		10/01/19 3181	201910 320-53800-49000		ADULTICIDE MOSQUITO CONTR	*	8,500.00	
								9,044.83 002004
ECO BLUE AQUATIC SERVICES, INC.								

BTRD BEACON TRADEPO SROSINA

AP300R  
 \*\*\* CHECK NOS. 001988-050000

YEAR-TO-DATE ACCOUNTS PAYABLE PREPAID/COMPUTER CHECK REGISTER RUN 10/28/19  
 BEACON TRADEPORT CDD-GF  
 BANK A GENERAL FUND

CHECK DATE	VEND#	INVOICE DATE	INVOICE	EXPENSED YRMO	TO DPT	ACCT#	SUB	SUBCLASS	VENDOR NAME	STATUS	AMOUNT	CHECK AMOUNT	CHECK #
10/17/19	00044	9/11/19	9528	201910	310	51300	45000		INSURANCE ALLIANCE RENEW	*	7,511.00		
									EGIS INSURANCE ADVISORS LLC			7,511.00	002005
10/17/19	00008	9/24/19	6-747-01	201909	310	51300	42000		DELIVERIES 9/19	*	25.65		
									FEDEX			25.65	002006
10/17/19	00028	10/16/19	52100-09	201909	330	53800	43000		ELECTRIC 8/26-9/25/19	*	551.44		
									FPL			551.44	002007
10/17/19	00038	10/01/19	178	201910	310	51300	34000		MANAGEMENT FEES 10/19	*	4,361.17		
		10/01/19	178	201910	310	51300	44000		RENT	*	200.00		
		10/01/19	178	201910	310	51300	35100		WEBSITE COMPLIANCE	*	250.00		
		10/01/19	178	201910	310	51300	35100		COMPUTER TIME	*	83.33		
		10/01/19	178	201910	310	51300	51000		OFFICE SUPPLIES	*	3.00		
		10/01/19	178	201910	310	51300	42000		POSTAGE AND DELIVERIES	*	4.50		
		10/01/19	178	201910	310	51300	42500		COPIES	*	30.60		
									GMS - SO FLORIDA, LLC			4,932.60	002008
10/17/19	00012	9/30/19	18666	201910	310	51300	32200		AUDIT FYE 9/30/19	*	500.00		
									GRAU & ASSOCIATES			500.00	002009
10/17/19	00040	9/25/19	5500758	201910	310	51300	32300		ADMIN FEES 9/1/19-8/31/20	*	3,717.38		
									U.S. BANK			3,717.38	002010
TOTAL FOR BANK A											134,983.33		
TOTAL FOR REGISTER											134,983.33		

BTRD BEACON TRADEPO SROSINA

**BEACON TRADEPORT  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT**  
Special Assessment Receipts  
Fiscal Year 2019

							\$ 6,949.06	\$ 5,195,649.47	\$ 124,264.82	\$ 5,326,863.35
COMMERCIAL ASSESSMENT LEVY							ASSESSED THROUGH COUNTY			
DATE	DESCRIPTION	GROSS AMOUNT	DISC/PENALTY	COMMISSIONS	INTEREST	NET RECEIPTS	0.13%	97.54%	2.33%	100.00%
							O&M Portion	2014 DSF Portion	2017 DSF Portion	Total
11/30/2018	11/10/18-11/23/18	\$5,144,994.10	\$205,799.76	\$49,391.94	\$0.00	\$4,889,802.40	\$6,378.90	\$4,769,354.42	\$114,069.08	\$4,889,802.40
12/10/2018	11/24/18-11/30/18	\$179,808.28	\$7,192.32	\$1,726.16	\$0.00	\$170,889.80	\$222.93	\$166,680.36	\$3,986.51	\$170,889.80
12/21/2018	12/01/18-12/14/18	\$2,060.96	\$82.44	\$19.79	\$0.00	\$1,958.73	\$2.56	\$1,910.48	\$45.69	\$1,958.73
1/28/2019	INTEREST	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$4,048.16	\$5.28	\$3,948.44	\$94.44	\$4,048.16
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$5,326,863.34</b>	<b>\$213,074.52</b>	<b>\$51,137.89</b>	<b>\$4,048.16</b>	<b>\$5,066,699.09</b>	<b>\$6,609.67</b>	<b>\$4,941,893.70</b>	<b>\$118,195.72</b>	<b>\$5,066,699.09</b>

Assessed on Roll:

						Gross Percent Collected 100.00%	
	GROSS AMOUNT ASSESSED	PERCENTAGE	ASSESSMENTS COLLECTED	ASSESSMENTS TRANSFERRED	AMOUNT TO BE TFR.		
O & M	\$6,949.06	0.1305%	\$6,609.67	(\$6,609.67)	\$0.00		
DEBT SERVICE 2014	\$5,195,649.47	97.5368%	\$4,941,893.70	(\$4,941,893.70)	\$0.00	V#63 001.300.20700.10000	
DEBT SERVICE 2017	\$124,264.82	2.3328%	\$118,195.72	(\$118,195.72)	\$0.00	V#77 001.300.20700.10000	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$5,326,863.35</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$5,066,699.09</b>	<b>(\$5,066,699.09)</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>		

							\$ 137,960.10	\$ 1,335,810.47	\$ 213,839.68	\$ 1,687,610.25
INDUSTRIAL ASSESSMENT LEVY							ASSESSED THROUGH COUNTY			
DATE	DESCRIPTION	GROSS AMOUNT	DISC/PENALTY	COMMISSIONS	INTEREST	NET RECEIPTS	8.17%	79.13%	12.67%	100.00%
							O&M Portion	2012 DSF Portion	2017 DSF Portion	Total
10/19/2018	06/01/18-10/13/18	\$5,802.13	\$304.61	\$54.98	\$0.00	\$5,442.54	\$444.92	\$4,307.99	\$689.63	\$5,442.54
11/20/2018	11/01/18-11/09/18	\$41,884.64	\$1,675.38	\$402.09	\$0.00	\$39,807.17	\$3,254.19	\$31,508.95	\$5,044.03	\$39,807.17
11/30/2018	11/10/18-11/23/18	\$289,913.55	\$11,596.55	\$2,783.17	\$0.00	\$275,533.83	\$22,524.56	\$218,095.96	\$34,913.31	\$275,533.83
12/10/2018	11/24/18-11/30/18	\$768,192.99	\$30,727.75	\$7,374.65	\$0.00	\$730,090.59	\$59,684.02	\$577,895.67	\$92,510.90	\$730,090.59
12/21/2018	12/01/18-12/14/18	\$395,450.72	\$13,650.81	\$3,818.00	\$0.00	\$377,981.91	\$30,899.56	\$299,187.68	\$47,894.67	\$377,981.91
1/14/2019	11/02/18-12/31/18	\$57,055.38	\$1,711.66	\$553.44	\$0.00	\$54,790.28	\$4,479.04	\$43,368.68	\$6,942.56	\$54,790.28
1/28/2019	INTEREST	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$879.50	\$879.50	\$71.90	\$696.16	\$111.44	\$879.50
2/8/2019	01/01/19-01/31/19	\$8,729.79	\$166.66	\$85.63	\$0.00	\$8,477.50	\$693.03	\$6,710.28	\$1,074.20	\$8,477.50
3/8/2019	02/01/19-02/28/19	\$6,008.58	\$60.08	\$59.48	\$0.00	\$5,889.02	\$481.42	\$4,661.39	\$746.21	\$5,889.02
4/8/2019	03/01/19-03/31/19	\$76,122.06	\$126.82	\$759.96	\$0.00	\$75,235.28	\$6,150.39	\$59,551.71	\$9,533.18	\$75,235.28
5/3/2019	INTEREST	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$107.28	\$107.28	\$8.77	\$84.92	\$13.59	\$107.28
5/9/2019	04/01/19-04/30/19	\$2,682.80	(\$80.50)	\$27.63	\$0.00	\$2,735.67	\$223.64	\$2,165.39	\$346.64	\$2,735.67
6/20/2019	05/01/19-05/31/19	\$3,915.55	(\$117.46)	\$40.33	\$0.00	\$3,992.68	\$326.40	\$3,160.36	\$505.92	\$3,992.68
6/24/2019	06/11/19-06/12/19	\$31,852.06	(\$1,433.33)	\$332.85	\$0.00	\$32,952.54	\$2,693.83	\$26,083.24	\$4,175.47	\$32,952.54
7/23/2019	INTEREST	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$119.66	\$119.66	\$9.78	\$94.72	\$15.16	\$119.66
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$1,687,610.25</b>	<b>\$58,389.03</b>	<b>\$16,292.21</b>	<b>\$1,106.44</b>	<b>\$1,614,035.45</b>	<b>\$131,945.45</b>	<b>\$1,277,573.09</b>	<b>\$204,516.91</b>	<b>\$1,614,035.45</b>

Assessed on Roll:

						Gross Percent Collected 100.00%	
	GROSS AMOUNT ASSESSED	PERCENTAGE	ASSESSMENTS COLLECTED	ASSESSMENTS TRANSFERRED	AMOUNT TO BE TFR.		
O & M	\$137,960.10	8.1749%	\$131,945.45	(\$131,945.45)	\$0.00		
DEBT SERVICE 2012	\$1,335,810.47	79.1540%	\$1,277,573.09	(\$1,277,573.09)	\$0.00	V#58 001.300.20700.10000	
DEBT SERVICE 2017	\$213,839.68	12.6712%	\$204,516.91	(\$204,516.91)	(\$0.00)	V#77 001.300.20700.10000	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,687,610.25</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$1,614,035.45</b>	<b>(\$1,614,035.45)</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>		

TRANSFERS TO DEBT SERVICE:					
DATE	CHECK #	DSF 2014 COMMERCIAL	DSF 2017 COMMERCIAL	DSF 2012 INDUSTRIAL	DSF 2017 INDUSTRIAL
11/29/2018	1905/1906	\$0.00		\$35,816.94	\$5,733.66
12/7/2018	1908/1909/1910	\$4,630,277.38	\$110,742.76	\$218,095.96	\$4,913.31
1/4/2019	1919/1920/1921	\$163,674.64	\$3,914.63	\$920,452.02	\$147,348.13
2/13/2019	1929/1930	\$143,993.24	\$3,443.89	\$0.00	\$0.00
4/16/2019	1947/1948/1949	\$3,948.44	\$94.44	\$12,067.83	\$1,931.85
5/16/2019	1959/1960	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$59,551.71	\$9,533.18
7/31/2019	1984/1985	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$31,588.63	\$5,056.78
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$4,941,893.70</b>	<b>\$118,195.72</b>	<b>\$1,277,573.09</b>	<b>\$204,516.91</b>
Amount due:		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$0.00)

**BEACON TRADEPORT**  
**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT**  
**BALANCE SHEET-GOVERNMENTAL FUNDS**  
September 30, 2019

	Major Funds			Totals
	General	Debt Service Fund	Capital Projects Fund	Governmental Funds
<b>ASSETS:</b>				
Cash - Checking	\$177,079	---	---	\$177,079
Due From Other Funds	\$51,403	\$85,590	---	\$136,993
<b>Investments:</b>				
State Board - Operating	\$41	---	---	\$41
State Board - Reserves	\$354,226	---	---	\$354,226
State Board - Settlement	---	\$1,381,767	---	\$1,381,767
<b>SERIES 2012A</b>				
Reserve	---	\$604,313	---	\$604,313
Revenue	---	\$437,658	---	\$437,658
Bond Redemption	---	\$6,259	---	\$6,259
Cost of Issuance	---	---	\$6,237	\$6,237
<b>SERIES 2014A</b>				
Reserve	---	\$2,548,047	---	\$2,548,047
Revenue	---	\$803,234	---	\$803,234
Redemption	---	\$71,079	---	\$71,079
Construction	---	\$0	\$9,421	\$9,421
<b>SERIES 2017A</b>				
Reserve	---	\$32,120	---	\$32,120
Revenue	---	\$123,649	---	\$123,649
Construction	---	---	\$4,344,328	\$4,344,328
Prepaid Expenses	\$9,719	---	---	\$9,719
<b>Total Assets</b>	<b>\$592,467</b>	<b>\$6,093,715</b>	<b>\$4,359,987</b>	<b>\$11,046,169</b>
<b>LIABILITIES:</b>				
Accounts Payable	\$9,617	---	---	\$9,617
Due To Other Funds	\$72,187	\$64,805	---	\$136,993
<b>Total Liabilities</b>	<b>\$81,804</b>	<b>\$64,805</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$146,610</b>
<b>DEFERRED INFLOWS OF RESOURCES:</b>				
Unavailable Revenue - Special Assessments	\$160,000	---	---	\$160,000
<b>Total deferred inflows of resources</b>	<b>\$160,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$160,000</b>
<b>FUND BALANCES:</b>				
Nonspendable:				
Prepaid items	\$9,719	---	---	\$9,719
Restricted for:				
Debt Service	---	\$6,028,910	---	\$6,028,910
Capital Projects	---	---	\$4,359,987	\$4,359,987
Assigned to:				
Current Year's Expenditures	\$257,249	---	---	\$257,249
Maintenance Reserves	\$354,226	---	---	\$354,226
Unassigned	(\$270,531)	---	---	(\$270,531)
<b>Total Fund Balances</b>	<b>\$350,663</b>	<b>\$6,028,910</b>	<b>\$4,359,987</b>	<b>\$10,739,559</b>
<b>TOTAL LIABILITIES AND FUND BALANCES</b>	<b>\$592,467</b>	<b>\$6,093,715</b>	<b>\$4,359,987</b>	<b>\$11,046,169</b>

**BEACON TRADEPORT**  
**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT**  
**GENERAL FUND**  
Statement of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance  
For the Period Ended September 30, 2019

DESCRIPTION	ADOPTED BUDGET	PRORATED BUDGET THRU 09/30/19	ACTUAL THRU 09/30/19	VARIANCE
<b><u>REVENUES:</u></b>				
Special Assessments-On Roll	\$137,664	\$137,664	\$138,555	\$891
Special Assessments-Off Roll	\$160,000	\$160,000	\$160,000	\$0
FEMA Revenue	\$0	\$0	\$65,143	\$65,143
Interest Income	\$750	\$750	\$11,797	\$11,047
<b>TOTAL REVENUES</b>	<b><u>\$298,414</u></b>	<b><u>\$298,414</u></b>	<b><u>\$375,495</u></b>	<b><u>\$77,081</u></b>
<b><u>EXPENDITURES:</u></b>				
<b><u>ADMINISTRATIVE:</u></b>				
Engineering	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$63,166	(\$13,166)
Arbitrage	\$1,800	\$1,800	\$1,200	\$600
Attorney	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$12,760	\$17,240
Annual Audit	\$9,000	\$9,000	\$7,750	\$1,250
Trustee Fees	\$24,500	\$24,500	\$23,733	\$767
Management Fees	\$50,810	\$50,810	\$50,810	\$0
Computer Time	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	(\$0)
Telephone	\$250	\$250	\$6	\$244
Postage	\$425	\$425	\$172	\$253
Printing & Binding	\$1,250	\$1,250	\$617	\$633
Rentals & Leases	\$2,400	\$2,400	\$2,400	(\$0)
Insurance	\$8,058	\$8,058	\$7,325	\$733
Legal Advertising	\$500	\$500	\$636	(\$136)
Other Current Charges	\$500	\$500	\$546	(\$46)
Real Estate Taxes	\$3,500	\$3,500	\$8,758	(\$5,258)
Office Supplies	\$250	\$250	\$80	\$170
Dues, Licenses & Subscriptions	\$175	\$175	\$175	\$0
Website Design/Maintenance	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$0
Holiday Lighting	\$59,657	\$59,657	\$59,657	\$0
<b>TOTAL ADMINISTRATIVE</b>	<b><u>\$247,074</u></b>	<b><u>\$247,074</u></b>	<b><u>\$243,792</u></b>	<b><u>\$3,282</u></b>
<b><u>DRAINAGE SYSTEM:</u></b>				
Lake Maintenance	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$6,538	\$8,462
Storm Drain Cleaning	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$6,990	\$143,010
Mosquito Control	\$102,000	\$102,000	\$102,000	\$0
Contingencies	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$0	\$5,000
Capital Outlay	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>TOTAL DRAINAGE SYSTEM</b>	<b><u>\$272,000</u></b>	<b><u>\$272,000</u></b>	<b><u>\$115,528</u></b>	<b><u>\$156,472</u></b>

**BEACON TRADEPORT**  
**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT**  
**GENERAL FUND**  
Statement of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance  
For the Period Ended September 30, 2019

DESCRIPTION	ADOPTED BUDGET	PRORATED BUDGET THRU 09/30/19	ACTUAL THRU 09/30/19	VARIANCE
<b><u>IRRIGATION SYSTEM:</u></b>				
Electric	\$19,618	\$19,618	\$8,048	\$11,569
Repairs and Maintenance	\$3,500	\$3,500	\$65,143	(\$61,643)
Landscape Improvements	\$3,471	\$3,471	\$0	\$3,471
Contingencies	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$1,050	\$3,950
Capital Outlay	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$0	\$5,000
<b>TOTAL IRRIGATION SYSTEM</b>	<b><u>\$36,588</u></b>	<b><u>\$36,588</u></b>	<b><u>\$74,241</u></b>	<b><u>(\$37,653)</u></b>
<b><u>MAINTENANCE RESERVES:</u></b>				
Storm Drains	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Roadway Improvements	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Paving Outer Ring Roads	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>TOTAL MAINTENANCE RESERVES</b>	<b><u>\$0</u></b>	<b><u>\$0</u></b>	<b><u>\$0</u></b>	<b><u>\$0</u></b>
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</b>	<b><u>\$555,662</u></b>	<b><u>\$555,662</u></b>	<b><u>\$433,561</u></b>	<b><u>\$122,101</u></b>
Excess (deficiency) of revenues over (under) expenditures	<b><u>(\$257,249)</u></b>	<b><u>(\$257,249)</u></b>	<b><u>(\$58,066)</u></b>	<b><u>\$199,182</u></b>
Net change in fund balance	<b><u>(\$257,249)</u></b>	<b><u>(\$257,249)</u></b>	<b><u>(\$58,066)</u></b>	<b><u>\$199,182</u></b>
FUND BALANCE - Beginning	\$257,249		\$408,729	
FUND BALANCE - Ending	<b><u>\$0</u></b>		<b><u>\$350,663</u></b>	

**BEACON TRADEPORT**  
**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT**  
**SERIES 2012**

**DEBT SERVICE FUND**

Statement of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance  
For the Period Ended September 30, 2019

DESCRIPTION	ADOPTED BUDGET	PRORATED THRU 09/30/19	ACTUAL THRU 09/30/19	VARIANCE
<b>REVENUES:</b>				
Interest Income	\$0	\$0	\$3,542	\$3,542
Special Assessments	\$1,219,177	\$1,219,177	\$1,277,573	\$58,397
<b>TOTAL REVENUES</b>	<b>\$1,219,177</b>	<b>\$1,219,177</b>	<b>\$1,281,115</b>	<b>\$61,939</b>
<b>EXPENDITURES:</b>				
<b>SERIES 2012</b>				
Interest - 11/01	\$113,389	\$113,389	\$135,504	(\$22,115)
Interest - 5/01	\$113,389	\$113,389	\$137,811	(\$24,422)
Principal - 5/01	\$995,000	\$995,000	\$995,000	\$0
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</b>	<b>\$1,221,778</b>	<b>\$1,221,778</b>	<b>\$1,268,315</b>	<b>(\$46,537)</b>
Excess (deficiency) of revenues over (under) expenditures	<b>(\$2,601)</b>	<b>(\$2,601)</b>	<b>\$12,800</b>	<b>\$15,402</b>
Net change in fund balance	<b>(\$2,601)</b>	<b>(\$2,601)</b>	<b>\$12,800</b>	<b>\$15,402</b>
FUND BALANCE - Beginning	\$410,145		\$1,022,027	
FUND BALANCE - Ending	<u>\$407,544</u>		<u>\$1,034,828</u>	

**BEACON TRADEPORT**  
**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT**  
**SERIES 2014**

**DEBT SERVICE FUND**

Statement of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance  
For the Period Ended September 30, 2019

DESCRIPTION	ADOPTED BUDGET	PRORATED THRU 09/30/19	ACTUAL THRU 09/30/19	VARIANCE
<b>REVENUES:</b>				
Interest Income	\$2,580	\$2,580	\$125,974	\$123,394
Special Assessments	\$4,933,287	\$4,933,287	\$4,941,894	\$8,607
<b>TOTAL REVENUES</b>	<b>\$4,935,867</b>	<b>\$4,935,867</b>	<b>\$5,067,868</b>	<b>\$132,001</b>
<b>EXPENDITURES:</b>				
<b>SERIES 2014</b>				
Interest - 11/01	\$803,886	\$803,886	\$803,886	\$0
Interest - 5/01	\$790,779	\$790,779	\$790,779	\$0
Principal - 5/01	\$3,400,000	\$3,400,000	\$3,400,000	\$0
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</b>	<b>\$4,994,665</b>	<b>\$4,994,665</b>	<b>\$4,994,665</b>	<b>\$0</b>
Excess (deficiency) of revenues over (under) expenditures	<b>(\$58,798)</b>	<b>(\$58,798)</b>	<b>\$73,204</b>	<b>\$132,001</b>
Net change in fund balance	<b>(\$58,798)</b>	<b>(\$58,798)</b>	<b>\$73,204</b>	<b>\$132,001</b>
FUND BALANCE - Beginning	\$949,035		\$4,777,503	
FUND BALANCE - Ending	<u>\$890,238</u>		<u>\$4,850,706</u>	

**BEACON TRADEPORT**  
**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT**  
**SERIES 2017**

**DEBT SERVICE FUND**

Statement of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance  
For the Period Ended September 30, 2019

DESCRIPTION	ADOPTED BUDGET	PRORATED THRU 09/30/19	ACTUAL THRU 09/30/19	VARIANCE
<b>REVENUES:</b>				
Interest Income	\$0	\$0	\$553	\$553
Special Assessments	\$321,199	\$321,199	\$322,713	\$1,513
<b>TOTAL REVENUES</b>	<b>\$321,199</b>	<b>\$321,199</b>	<b>\$323,266</b>	<b>\$2,066</b>
<b>EXPENDITURES:</b>				
<b>SERIES 2017</b>				
Interest - 11/01	\$89,700	\$89,700	\$89,700	\$0
Interest - 5/01	\$89,700	\$89,700	\$89,700	\$0
PrincipaL - 5/01	\$140,000	\$140,000	\$140,000	\$0
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</b>	<b>\$319,400</b>	<b>\$319,400</b>	<b>\$319,400</b>	<b>\$0</b>
Excess (deficiency) of revenues over (under) expenditures	<b>\$1,799</b>	<b>\$1,799</b>	<b>\$3,866</b>	<b>\$2,066</b>
Net change in fund balance	<b>\$1,799</b>	<b>\$1,799</b>	<b>\$3,866</b>	<b>\$2,066</b>
FUND BALANCE - Beginning	\$107,171		\$139,510	
FUND BALANCE - Ending	<u>\$108,970</u>		<u>\$143,376</u>	

**BEACON TRADEPORT**  
**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT**  
**Long Term Debt Report**  
**FY 2019**

Series 2012A, Special Assessment Refunding Bonds (Industrial)		
Interest Rate;	2.980%	
Maturity Date:	5/1/2025	
Bonds outstanding - 9/30/2018		\$7,610,000.00
Less:	May 1, 2019 (Mandatory)	(\$995,000.00)
<b>Current Bonds Outstanding</b>		<b>\$6,615,000.00</b>
Series 2014A, Special Assessment Refunding Bonds (Commercial)		
Interest Rate;	3.3835%	
Maturity Date:	5/1/2028	
Bonds outstanding - 9/30/2018		\$46,485,000.00
Less:	May 1, 2019 (Mandatory)	(\$3,400,000.00)
<b>Current Bonds Outstanding</b>		<b>\$43,085,000.00</b>
Series 2017A, Special Assessment Refunding Bonds (Commercial)		
Interest Rate;	3.4500%	
Maturity Date:	5/1/2042	
Bonds outstanding - 9/30/2018		\$5,200,000.00
Less:	May 1, 2019 (Mandatory)	(\$140,000.00)
<b>Current Bonds Outstanding</b>		<b>\$5,060,000.00</b>
<b>Total Current Bonds Outstanding</b>		<b>\$54,760,000.00</b>

**BEACON TRADEPORT**  
**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT**  
**SERIES 2012**

**CAPITAL PROJECTS FUND**

Statement of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance  
For the Period Ended September 30, 2019

DESCRIPTION	ADOPTED BUDGET	PRORATED THRU 09/30/19	ACTUAL THRU 09/30/19	VARIANCE
<b><u>REVENUES:</u></b>				
Interest Income	\$0	\$0	\$16	\$16
<b>TOTAL REVENUES</b>	<b><u>\$0</u></b>	<b><u>\$0</u></b>	<b><u>\$16</u></b>	<b><u>\$16</u></b>
<b><u>EXPENDITURES:</u></b>				
Capital Outlay	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</b>	<b><u>\$0</u></b>	<b><u>\$0</u></b>	<b><u>\$0</u></b>	<b><u>\$0</u></b>
Excess (deficiency) of revenues over (under) expenditures	<b><u>\$0</u></b>	<b><u>\$0</u></b>	<b><u>\$16</u></b>	<b><u>\$16</u></b>
Net change in fund balance	<b><u>\$0</u></b>	<b><u>\$0</u></b>	<b><u>\$16</u></b>	<b><u>\$16</u></b>
FUND BALANCE - Beginning	\$0		\$6,221	
FUND BALANCE - Ending	<b><u>\$0</u></b>		<b><u>\$6,238</u></b>	

**BEACON TRADEPORT**  
**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT**  
**SERIES 2014**

**CAPITAL PROJECTS FUND**

Statement of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance  
For the Period Ended September 30, 2019

DESCRIPTION	ADOPTED BUDGET	PRORATED THRU 09/30/19	ACTUAL THRU 09/30/19	VARIANCE
<b><u>REVENUES:</u></b>				
Interest Income	\$0	\$0	\$25	\$25
<b>TOTAL REVENUES</b>	<b><u>\$0</u></b>	<b><u>\$0</u></b>	<b><u>\$25</u></b>	<b><u>\$25</u></b>
<b><u>EXPENDITURES:</u></b>				
Capital Outlay	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</b>	<b><u>\$0</u></b>	<b><u>\$0</u></b>	<b><u>\$0</u></b>	<b><u>\$0</u></b>
Excess (deficiency) of revenues over (under) expenditures	<b><u>\$0</u></b>	<b><u>\$0</u></b>	<b><u>\$25</u></b>	<b><u>\$25</u></b>
Net change in fund balance	<b><u>\$0</u></b>	<b><u>\$0</u></b>	<b><u>\$25</u></b>	<b><u>\$25</u></b>
FUND BALANCE - Beginning	\$0		\$9,396	
FUND BALANCE - Ending	<b><u>\$0</u></b>		<b><u>\$9,421</u></b>	

**BEACON TRADEPORT**  
**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT**  
**SERIES 2017**

**CAPITAL PROJECTS FUND**

Statement of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance  
For the Period Ended September 30, 2019

DESCRIPTION	ADOPTED BUDGET	PRORATED THRU 09/30/19	ACTUAL THRU 09/30/19	VARIANCE
<b><u>REVENUES:</u></b>				
Interest Income	\$0	\$0	\$93,465	\$93,465
<b>TOTAL REVENUS</b>	<b><u>\$0</u></b>	<b><u>\$0</u></b>	<b><u>\$93,465</u></b>	<b><u>\$93,465</u></b>
<b><u>EXPENDITURES:</u></b>				
Capital Outlay	\$0	\$0	\$127,980	(\$127,980)
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</b>	<b><u>\$0</u></b>	<b><u>\$0</u></b>	<b><u>\$127,980</u></b>	<b><u>(\$127,980)</u></b>
Excess (deficiency) of revenues over (under) expenditures	<b><u>\$0</u></b>	<b><u>\$0</u></b>	<b><u>(\$34,515)</u></b>	<b><u>(\$34,515)</u></b>
Net change in fund balance	<b><u>\$0</u></b>	<b><u>\$0</u></b>	<b><u>(\$34,515)</u></b>	<b><u>(\$34,515)</u></b>
FUND BALANCE - Beginning	\$0		\$4,378,843	
FUND BALANCE - Ending	<b><u>\$0</u></b>		<b><u>\$4,344,328</u></b>	