

Howell Park Board of Directors Meeting Minutes
January 5, 2026, 10:30 AM
Howell Park Office

Call the meeting to order

Denise Chavez called the meeting to order at 10:30 am.

Approval of December 22, 2025 meeting minutes

Denise asked for a motion to approve the December 22nd meeting minutes. So moved by Dave Townsend. Second, by Craig Waterstrat. The Board of Directors unanimously approved the minutes.

President's Comments

This meeting was specifically held to address the asphalt mill and resurfacing project. Finance needs to present a report from Building Facilities, which they must then recommend to the board.

Asphalt Mill and resurfacing proposal presented by Bildg and facilities Committee-Gary Supnick

Gary Supnick discussed the way forward for the mill and resurfacing of the parking lot. Estimates were solicited, and three were received at \$88,000, \$107,000, and \$110,000. The Building Finance Committee compared these estimates based on various considerations, including site assessment, compliance communication, and milling processes.

All three proposals met standard project development considerations, but the decision was made to select Specialty Construction and Building, which offered the \$107,000 proposal. Key factors in this decision included their use of a larger minimum aggregate size in the asphalt, which is crucial for durability, especially at high-traffic pivot points where trash trucks and moving vans operate. Additionally, this contractor addressed issues related to repair discrepancies rather than just filling them, as was indicated by the other quotes. Therefore, the committee recommended Specialty Construction and Building.

Finance Committee-Jennifer Stutts

Jennifer Stutts wanted to formally confirm who is on the finance committee. The finance committee members are David Townsend, Len Kisner, Craig Waterstrat, Mike Rugers, Gary Supnick, and Stephen Bowles. She wanted it to be clear that these are the people on the committee. ,

A roll call was requested for our meeting All seven Board members were present. David Townsend, Mary Estes, Len Kisner, Denise Chavez. Craig WaterStrat, Sarah Supnick and Carlos del Castillo. Also, Property Manager Chris Kelly is here. In addition, in attendance David Dees, Helen Reader and Jennifer Stutts present at this meeting.

There were no questions from the finance committee for clarification. The Finance committee voted on the recommendation of Specialty Construction based on Gary Supnick's presentation with the amount being \$107,000.

Jennifer Stutts pointed out the following:

- **Current SIRS Funds:** \$188,367 allocated for SIRS expenditures at year-end.
- **Projected Expenditures:** ~\$108,000 anticipated expenses, leaving approximately \$80,000 remaining.

- **Growth of Funds:** The remaining amount will continue to increase due to ongoing deposits throughout the year.

Maintenance Fee Allocation:

- **51%** of the maintenance fee is allocated to SIRS.
- **49%** is allocated to reserve funding.

Discussion Points:

- There is an interest in revisiting, discussing and better understanding the allocation percentage of the maintenance fee at a later time.

Craig Waterstrat inquired whether the building and facilities committee consulted with three contractors or their previous clients regarding their satisfaction with past work. Gary Supnick noted that Specialty, the contractor who handled previous repairs, has established a trustworthy relationship and demonstrated integrity in managing the projects. Carlos del Castillo and Gary Supnick, both members of the building and facility committee researched this issue before the Christmas holidays, during which the contractor verified performance standards related to the building facilities.

Jennifer Stutts distributed paper for a voting process regarding recommendations from the building and facilities. Committee members expressed their agreement or disagreement by marking yes or no. The votes were tallied, and since all of the finance committee members present (a majority) voted to approve Specialty Construction and Building, the motion carried. This recommendation will be forwarded to the board.

A question was raised pertaining to the last building facilities meeting regarding moving forward with updated SIRS recommendations to the finance committee. It was emphasized that many building facilities projects require SIRS funding, which necessitates a careful planning process that includes company selection, scheduling, review, and budget consideration for the next year. The recommendation is for the committee to outline a timeline for moving ahead. Agreement was expressed on the need for a thorough SIRS report and a solid study, with a willingness to pay approximately \$10,000 for it. It was noted that the budget can accommodate this expense. Chris Kelly was tasked with identifying three suitable candidates to begin this process as soon as possible. It was clarified that the study would not be implemented until January 1, 2027, due to the completion of the current year's budget planning.

The Board then voted on the record. Sarah Supnick proposed a motion for the Board of Directors to approve Specialty Construction for the mill and resurfacing project. Carlos del Castillo seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved by the Board.

Decorating Committee-Sarah Supnick

- Sarah Supnick reported that the pool furniture has been ordered and payment has been sent. The furniture is expected to arrive in approximately six weeks.

Old Business:

- No discussion noted.

New Business:

Storing items in building carports

- Concern was raised about residents storing bicycles on sidewalks, in front of entrances, and underneath the parking area, which may pose a liability and tripping hazard.
- One resident acknowledged storing their bicycle near their covered parking area due to issues with dirt in that space.

- It was mentioned that Chris Kelly and Elvis are in the process of emptying the shed, which may provide more storage options.
 - Discussions included the presence of multiple bicycles stored in areas that may block pathways.
 - A consensus is needed on whether bicycles and other items blocking sidewalks or parking spots should be addressed.
 - Concerns about the need for clear rules on storage to prevent hazards were discussed, as well as the impact of items like walkers and shopping carts being left out after use.
- Overall, the meeting focused on responsible storage of personal items to ensure clear access and safety for all residents.

Mary Estes inquired if the raised sidewalk area is considered common area, while the parking lot, where cars are parked, is not. The response clarified that everything is essentially common area, but individuals have exclusive rights to their designated parking spots.

In a discussion regarding the shed management, a resident expressed concerns about the accumulation of unwanted items and complaints from other residents who prefer a tidy environment. Chris Kelly noted that there are approximately 60 to 75 paint cans in the shed to dispose of, emphasizing the difficulty in doing so due to disposal restrictions. The plan includes throwing out rusted items, tools, and old fans, while aiming to reorganize the shed for better use. The goal is to create space for residents' bikes in the shed, with plans to add shelves and repaint the shed's interior in white for a brighter appearance. A homeowner expressed frustration about the key to the shed being with the security office, preferring easier access for bike retrieval. The discussion concluded that issuing copies of the key might resolve some concerns about accessibility and security. David Townsend mentioned that he has two bikes locked on a wall not facing the park mound. That said, he was compliant in moving to the shed if that becomes the requirement.

Discussion ensued related to Parking of Mobility Aids:

- Concern about people temporarily parking their walkers and other mobility aids for short periods (e.g., during a doctor's appointment) versus leaving them for multiple days.
- Emphasis on the need for convenience for those who may not have the strength to carry their devices to their vehicles.

There was discussion of Definition of Temporary:

- Questions surrounding how to define what constitutes "temporary" parking. Is it a quick trip to the grocery store or a longer outing?
- Concerns about items being left for extended periods, leading to unsightliness and potential liability issues (tripping hazards).

Further discussion included - Agreement on the need for a clear, unambiguous policy regarding the parking of mobility devices.

- Suggestion to communicate the policy clearly to residents, possibly with a notice versus just the meeting minutes.

Additional discussion revolved around Community Communication:

- Proposal to inform residents about ongoing issues and upcoming actions, including cleaning areas where parking has become problematic (e.g., dirty back parking areas due to pavement work).
- Helen's note on maintaining a positive message that reassures residents about the protection of their property.

Resulting Action Items for further review and completion included that within the month of January, efforts would be made to clean out the specified areas in the shed and revisit the handling of other items that may cause concern for safety, potential theft and maintaining a sightly property.

During a recent Building and Facilities meeting, a discussion arose regarding the potential installation of an EV charging station. The speaker expressed concern about the need for such a facility, acknowledging that the world is evolving and more people are likely to purchase electric vehicles (EVs) in the future. However, it was pointed out that, currently, the costs associated with installing EV charging stations are prohibitive. The board discussed the matter and identified several challenges, including metering issues that could result in shared costs for residents using a common area charger.

It was mentioned that at another property, four separate metered spots were installed for EV charging, which was quite expensive, and the installation process was overwhelming for the contractors involved. Concerns about safety were also raised, particularly regarding the risk of fire if EVs were contaminated by saltwater during hurricanes. It was noted that there are existing EV charging stations nearby, which could be a preferable solution.

The board ultimately decided against pursuing the installation of charging stations, considering the low percentage of potential buyers with EVs in the 56-unit complex. This decision was supported by board member Jennifer, who emphasized the need to weigh the costs against the benefits for the majority of residents.

Discussion ensued related to cleaning out of storage areas in lobby closets and the attics plus the shed. It was suggested that Chris Kelly reach out to a contact provided by Helen Reader to possibly pick up all of the items at a reduced rate

Seeing as there was no other new business, Denise Chavez asked for a motion to adjourn. Motion made by Len Kizner and seconded by Sarah Supnick. Meeting adjourned at 11:15 am

Minutes provided by Secretary-Carlos del Castillo