

**PELICAN BAY SERVICES DIVISION ADVISORY BOARD AND PELICAN BAY FOUNDATION
STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE JOINT WORKSHOP SUMMARY MINUTES
WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 9, 2009**

LET IT BE REMEMBERED that the **Pelican Bay Services Division Advisory Board and the Pelican Bay Foundation Strategic Planning Committee** conducted a **Joint Public Workshop, Wednesday, December 9, 2009, 10 o'clock in the morning at the Community Center at Pelican Bay, 8960 Hammock Oak Drive, Naples.** The following members were present:

Community Improvement Plan Update Presentation by:

Kevin Mangan, Principal & Landscape Architect, Wilson Miller
Steve Sammons, Sr. Associate and Landscape Architect, Wilson Miller
Jeff Perry, Sr. Project Manager, Transportation Planning, Wilson Miller *absent*

Pelican Bay Services Division Advisory Board Members

Mary Anne Womble, Chairwoman	Keith Dallas, Vice Chairman <i>absent</i>
John Iaizzo	Tom Cravens <i>absent</i>
Michael Levy	Geoffrey Gibson <i>absent</i>
Gerald Moffatt	Hunter Hansen <i>absent</i>
Theodore Raia	Jill Kobe <i>absent</i>

Pelican Bay Foundation Strategic Planning Committee Members

Bob Uek, Chairman	Rose Mary Everett <i>absent</i>
Merlin Lickhalter, Co-Vice Chair	Noreen Murray <i>absent</i>
Ralph Ohlers	Carson Beadle <i>absent</i>
Ronnie Bellone, Co-Vice Chair <i>absent</i>	Mary Anne Womble

Pelican Bay Services Division Staff

Neil Dorrill, Administrator <i>absent</i>	Mary McCaughtry, Recording Secretary
Kyle Lukasz, Field Operations Manager	Lisa Resnick, Administrative Assistant

Pelican Bay Foundation Staff

Jim Hoppensteadt, President	Suzanne Minadeo, Executive Assistant
-----------------------------	--------------------------------------

**WILSON MILLER COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENTS PLANNING TEAM PRESENTATION OF THE
COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENTS PLAN PHASE ONE 100% BASE DATA REPORT**

Mr. Kevin Mangan introduced the Community Improvement Plan Phase One 100% Base Data Report. He will engage questions and comments at the time of presentation.

Madam Chair Womble asked if they have determined an immediate fix for the North Tram Station crosswalk.

Mr. Mangan said he and Mr. Lukasz have been working with the County to determine permit requirements for temporary signage and with contractors for pricing. Once they determine technical and legal details, the challenge will be how to bring better visibility to the crossing area, as well as conform to the community's aesthetic standard. Any flashing lighting improvements would be supplemental to the ultimate solution, not a temporary solution. They should have enough feedback by tomorrow and can provide an update at that time by email.

The planning team has not found any limiting or noncompliance issues that would delay the planning process from moving forward. Based on conversations with Turrell Hall & Associates and the County, both made recommendations to avoid improvements to areas that are adjacent to associations, especially when the improvements are relative to environmental permitting. A possible exception would be an overriding circumstance, such as a safety or

**Pelican Bay Services Division Advisory Board & Pelican Bay Foundation Strategic Planning Committee
Joint Workshop Summary Minutes
December 9, 2009**

security issue, but none at this point. The community covenants are challenging to some of their designs in terms of maintenance and operational issues on private land owned by the Foundation and some associations. For example, the Foundation covenants dictate hedges cannot be higher than six feet; however, in some areas it is appropriate for hedges to be higher than six feet. They will be discussing further with Lisa Warren, Foundation Covenant Manager on how to proceed with those types of issues. They are recording the design-limiting factors, including the location and applicable standard(s), i.e., there are individual association covenants, Foundation covenants, or County Land Development Code regulation.

The focus today is on landscaping in roadways. The first major task to tackle is streetscape plans for landscape and irrigation. Landscaping improvements will touch on every project because associated with many areas of community concern. Landscaping improvements in the roadway medians should maintain plant heights compatible with driver visibility and pedestrian safety. Overgrowth also causes safety and security concerns in parks and other common areas blocking visibility and lighting from the roadways and pathways. Consideration should also be given aesthetic and interest considerations. The larger material should serve as a backdrop and layered with smaller material. Even the County is making better landscaping choices. They should incorporate better management practices by eliminating sod in the right of way, as well as relocate or remove plant material in other areas. Eliminating sod will lower maintenance and irrigation requirements. They support best management practices for fertilizer utilization, such as Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council Fertilization resolution discussed at a recent Services Division meeting. They want to implement commonality of use of plant material, as well as add color, but keep it uniform.

Mr. Moffatt asked Mr. Mangan to clarify whether the area referred to for the park setting enhancement is a designated park.

Mr. Mangan said the areas are open spaces in the community, and not officially designated as parks, i.e., not Ridgewood Park. These open spaces provide an opportunity to employ the same types of improvements that they would recommend for a real park.

Mr. Lickhalter said some of the items refer to coordination with homeowner associations and from his understanding, applies to where a public right of way interfaces with association property and asked Mr. Mangan to clarify.

Mr. Mangan said the property line delineation is the public right of way, or County land, with the association on the other side. Legal property lines are extremely important, but landscaping merges and blends across those lines. They

**Pelican Bay Services Division Advisory Board & Pelican Bay Foundation Strategic Planning Committee
Joint Workshop Summary Minutes
December 9, 2009**

will work with associations because there are areas in the community where the legal line should not necessarily delineate whether the landscaping begins, ends, or blends.

Mr. Lickhalter referred to improvements recommended in public right of way locations. He stated an association on the other side of the legal property line does not have a say in the decision making process, but regardless, they may object to an improvement recommended by the Pelican Bay Services Division.

Mr. Mangan said yes and it will be a challenge to tackle the task, but the best solution will be the most attractive one for the community.

Mr. Moffatt referred to Mr. Mangan's comments about plant removal and asked if they would remove trees in order to widen the pathways.

Mr. Mangan said they recognize the conflicts with the pathways and the landscape. Should a tree not have proper room to grow, being too close to the road, or too close to the path, ill health is reasons to remove. This is not the case for all the trees in the pathways because in some cases, they might suggest relocating the pathway. They will recommend solutions based on the scenario.

Mr. Moffatt said the roots of an oak tree crushed the feeder line for one of the fire hydrants in his neighborhood and it took four or five days to dig out roots alone. The fire department is going to recommend to his association that they remove all oak trees near feeder lines because the trees will destroy the lines eventually.

Mr. Hoppensteadt said the root system will destroy a golf course greens, cart paths, and tee areas.

Dr. Ted Raia said regarding safety issues and line of sight suggested they draw to scale recommended lines of sight that plant height cannot exceed what the department of transportation recommends as maximum and identify what the safety issue is, where and who owns the property, and the kinds of plants for replacement.

Mr. Mangan said traffic-calming studies address line of sight safety issues.

Dr. Raia said to include driveways of associations.

Mr. Mangan said for example, the Commons driveway has issues that they are addressing. The application of a department of transportation sight line to someone travelling in the roadway is going to be different from driveway and curb cuts. A single standard should apply to driveways, but most driveways and associated landscape conditions are on private property, however they will be addressing the driveways in the public right of way. They developed a list of recommended and appropriate landscape material.

**Pelican Bay Services Division Advisory Board & Pelican Bay Foundation Strategic Planning Committee
Joint Workshop Summary Minutes
December 9, 2009**

Dr. Raia asked about irrigation.

Mr. Mangan said regarding irrigation the most effective work they can do is recommend a better way to deliver water and reduce water consumption by moving to micro irrigation rather than a broadcast irrigation. They recommend not to water property during the day. They looked at how different plant material choices may provide better water delivery and less water consumption, i.e., remove sod from areas along medians on Pelican Bay Boulevard alone, or 2.5 acres of land, and deliver micro irrigation will fulfill that goal.

Dr. Raia said the Pelican Bay water management system predicated on the fact that there shall be no increase in discharge of water into Clam Bay between pre and post development. Assuming that is accomplished, they bring in millions of gallons of water for irrigation. Pervious land should absorb any excess water however, that is not the case. Excess water not absorbed by the pervious land flows into Clam Bay. He suggested they look into improving the water management system to capture and absorb irrigated water. He also suggested they develop a better system to prevent cars from driving over and destroying sprinkler heads. Excess irrigation water draining into Clam Bay may be causing problems and suggested they address.

Mr. Hoppensteadt asked if the runoff goes into the water retaining lakes and only released at a certain level.

Mr. Lukasz said during the dry periods the excess runoff that goes into the streets does go through the water management system, but there is more impervious land and when the excess runoff reaches a controlled elevation it may not flush through the system and can reach Clam Bay.

Chairwoman Womble said they chose Wilson Miller because Wilson Miller understands Pelican Bay's water management system.

Mr. Mangan made lighting recommendations to provide more light, redistribute, and conserve energy consumption. They want to use what is already there and make it better. For example, replacing the current fixture to a LED fixture provides benefits by reducing energy usage 30 %. Lighting for aesthetics, i.e., at the entrances, can highlight landscape features, different poles for aesthetics, as well as relocation or redistribution for better functionality; some plant growth is blocking light. Lighting affects signage and many areas such as crosswalks.

Ms. Cora Obley asked what the life expectancy of a metal pole is.

Mr. Mangan said there are several types of metal, but the focus is on sustaining for next 20 years.

Mr. Levy said existing poles are only seven years old.

**Pelican Bay Services Division Advisory Board & Pelican Bay Foundation Strategic Planning Committee
Joint Workshop Summary Minutes
December 9, 2009**

Mr. Mangan said they are looking at what they can do to make the concrete poles aesthetically pleasing. One third of the lighting has landscape blockage.

Mr. Lickhalter said on page 12, south side, it does not look like there are streetlights on Crayton Road, Myra Janco Daniels Boulevard, and Ridgewood Drive.

Mr. Mangan said from his understanding those areas are not a part of the scope of study.

Mr. Levy said those locations should be included because they are part of Pelican Bay.

Mr. Lickhalter said that is his mistake for not including and suggested the Board and Committee reconsider. Is there not some pathway lighting in areas across Hammock Oak, should that be part of this scope? He made a motion to modify the scope of services to include the three public roads, Crayton Road, Myra Janco Daniels Boulevard, and Ridgewood Drive, the south side of Vanderbilt beach road on County property under Pelican Bay Services Division purview, and pathway lighting in Foundation parks

Mr. Moffatt seconded the motion.

Chairwoman Womble said the Services Division did not have a quorum.

Mr. Mangan said based on the thought processes to date, they could add those areas at the schematic design level now.

Mr. Lickhalter suggested Mr. Hoppensteadt to get a proposal from Wilson Miller for a change order to determine cost of adding to the scope and when appropriate the respective organizations can take action.

Mr. Uek said Foundation has a meeting next week and possibility to take a vote.

Dr. Raia said Mr. Lickhalter could amend the motion as a recommendation to study and execute.

Mr. Hoppensteadt said if they amended the motion to include a request for a proposal and change order from Wilson Miller for consideration and approval by the Pelican Bay Services Division and Foundation Strategic Planning Committee.

Mr. Uek offered to take blame with Mr. Lickhalter for missing the locations.

Mr. Hoppensteadt queried the Strategic Planning Committee and all voted in favor of the motion.

Due to lack of quorum, the Pelican Bay Services Division Board did not vote and this item will be brought back to both the Board and Strategic Planning Committee for consideration at subsequent meeting.

Mr. Lickhalter made a motion to recommend modifications to the scope of services. Modifications include adding additional locations along Crayton Road, Myra Janco Daniels Boulevard, and Ridgewood Drive; County property along the south side of Vanderbilt Beach Road; and address pathway lighting in Foundation parks and request a proposal and change order from Wilson Mille for consideration by the Pelican Bay Services Division Board and Foundation Strategic Planning Committee. Due to lack of quorum, the Pelican Bay Services Division Board did not vote and this item will brought back to both the Board and Strategic Planning Committee for consideration at a subsequent meeting. Mr. Hoppensteadt queried the Strategic Planning Committee and voted unanimously to approve the motion.

Mr. Mangan said regarding pathway lighting that there is an inconsistency amongst locations. Adequate lighting should be in many more locations. There are a few hundred light bulbs in the community they recommend upgrading to LED fixtures and bulbs. There may also be possible different designs and other issues with poles.

Mr. Mangan discussed observations made regarding sound and security along the U.S. 41 berm. From his observations, the US 41 berm is broken. They can recommend modifications to increase safety and security including fencing, landscaping, and lighting along US 41, with continuity through community entryways along Pelican Bay Boulevard and Gulf Shore Drive. They want to make sure the solutions recommended so that when you turn the corner they enter the property as well. The berm has many elements, including landscaping, fencing, walls, and the choice for proper solution should be common to the entire berm as well as when one is turning into the community.

Regarding noise pollution, the community expressed concerns about creating a “highway” of sound retention walls and he assures they do not envision as a recommendation. If a sound wall recommendation comes forth, it would be no higher than eight feet and should be lost in the surrounding landscape. Another possible long-term solution is to place speakers in the parks amongst the landscape creating white noise. They will make recommendations based on the Crime Prevention through Environmental Design or CPTED principles. The Sheriff’s office endorses CPTED.

Mr. Moffatt asked if Mr. Carmine Marcino of the Collier County Sheriff’s office or CCSO shared with Wilson Miller the Pelican Bay incident report.

Mr. Mangan said no, but they have requested the information from the CCSO. He said from his observations, they may find security holes in locations not reported in the CCSO report. The CCSO report may show areas that the Community Improvements Planning Team missed, in which case they will go back and recheck. They observed the berms and the height rises and falls from a minimum of eight feet to maximum of twenty-six feet, whereas the roadway elevation does not change, so in some places there is an eight-foot difference in elevation between the berm and the roadway. In Ridgewood Park, one can stand and watch the traffic, as well as hear it. The CCSO report may show

**Pelican Bay Services Division Advisory Board & Pelican Bay Foundation Strategic Planning Committee
Joint Workshop Summary Minutes
December 9, 2009**

otherwise, but it appears that the berm serves its purpose in terms of security. Once they receive the report, they will be able to hone in and recommend improvements.

They observed the pathways by foot and bike. They believe eight feet wide paths would serve the community better than the current five feet width. Eight feet wide would allow for a better allowance of activities.

Mr. Ohlers asked if they counted the number of pedestrians, or did they just make observations.

Mr. Mangan said recommendation based on observation and good experience walking the area.

Mr. Ohlers said the reason he asked is because some walkways are more heavily used and he wonders whether all pathways throughout the community need to be eight feet wide, i.e., Pelican Bay Boulevard has the most activity with walking and bikes to get to the berm. The closer one gets to U.S. 41, more walking, less bicycling, less conflict of activities.

Mr. Mangan said good point. There is a street use hierarchy. He prefers to bike in the road, not the pathways. He supported Mr. Ohlers comment and the best course of action to improve pathways will initially be to the Boulevards, and secondarily to the local or side streets. They believe the pathways need more work to improve the transition where they intersect with the road and curb lines because of the many different materials. Improving the transition areas is more important than widening. Pathway improvements will be by priority on the side streets is a wiser choice.

Mr. Lickhalter asked what Mr. Mangan recommends for a solution for wheel traffic, i.e., rollerblading and biking and whether they should separate activities from pedestrians.

Mr. Mangan said it gets difficult when one tries to find a space for every activity by rule because it creates other issues. He is a biker and would be in the street, and believes they should encourage this. They should consider bike lanes on pathways, but separating them by rule creates other issues. Width gives activities the opportunity to coexist, but separation could cause functional difficulty because people get confused about where they are supposed to go and question whether the activity, i.e., biking, or rollerblading, is accepted. Width is best solution but he cautions against making an overall statement regarding separation of activities.

Mr. Levy referred to Mr. Mangan's suggestion to widen pathways to a minimum of eight feet and asked if the total width would be ten feet wide pathways along Pelican Bay Boulevard.

Mr. Mangan said one way to look at a solution is to widen one side of Pelican Bay Boulevard to eight or ten feet wide pathways, and keep the other side as it is, or other varying combinations. Ten feet may be too wide because there is not enough traffic now. Eight feet wide is a good dimension and allows three people side by side.

**Pelican Bay Services Division Advisory Board & Pelican Bay Foundation Strategic Planning Committee
Joint Workshop Summary Minutes
December 9, 2009**

Mr. Levy said in regards to widening eight feet or ten feet, they should consider both in their recommendation.

Mr. Mangan said that was a good point and would consider all possibilities. Unless there is an extraordinary circumstance, he does not believe they would recommend widening pathways more than ten feet.

Current signage on public streets and entryways speaks of time and place and recommendations made should be timeless. Certain improvements by application may be great for traffic calming and they will approach the county for uniform roadway signage based on scenic highway signage criteria, without the designation, for example, of Pelican Bay Boulevard, and without creating visual clutter. They cannot change some elements such as uniform traffic control devices. Signage and other improvements can be more aesthetically pleasing however, as well as serve a purpose, i.e., traffic calming.

Mr. Lickhalter asked about entryway signage at Seagate and Myra Janco Daniels Boulevard. He recalled acknowledging that entrance as increasingly important because of Waterside Shops.

Mr. Levy said that area was not a part of the study.

Mr. Mangan agreed and said in addition to entryways at Seagate and Myra Janco Daniels Boulevard they will review entryways at Gulf Park Drive and Ridgewood Drive.

Mr. Lickhalter asked if they should consider entryway signage at Hammock Oak Drive.

Mr. Mangan said yes. They are looking at crosswalks communitywide, as well as locations where they do not exist or need improvement. Traffic calming and safety solutions at crosswalks should meet transportation department standards as well as provide continuity and consistency communitywide. He and Mr. Lukasz are reviewing the short term, temporary possibilities and they want to make sure the short term solutions are done well and meet transportation standards, and must be fitting to the community. Mapping driver sight lines will be a part of individual intersections studies done in the next phase of work.

Mr. Ohlers asked if the transportation department standard allows substituting pavers to for striping.

Mr. Mangan discussed substituting pavers for striping and the County is open to the idea. Applied well, substituting pavers for striping, although expensive, is the best solution. At a crosswalk, paver blocks should be set in mud over top a concrete foundation creating a rigid whole system from curb line to curb line.

Mr. Lickhalter asked if said Merlin is layout of paving of the North Tram station current.

Mangan said no, the drawing is not current. The ultimate crosswalk solution at North Tram station is to modify the turn lane and remove vegetation from the median. This will align traffic relationships as they are expected and

**Pelican Bay Services Division Advisory Board & Pelican Bay Foundation Strategic Planning Committee
Joint Workshop Summary Minutes
December 9, 2009**

designed for and open up visibility for a long way. Currently the visibility is very poor and he observed the point where the crosswalk becomes visible by parking a Sheriff Deputy's vehicle at the crosswalk. When drivers could see the Deputy's car, which was, more or less at the curb line, they would brake and start to slow down. They would like to get a sense of how much further back recognition can be. In terms of visibility, pavers treated with high visibility color combinations and high friction surface or HFS application and installed directly to the asphalt, will provide the best crosswalk solution.

Community park destination improvement plans should have passive and active recreation areas. Recommendations made may require a higher level of maintenance for security and safety reasons, i.e., sod, low lying vegetation for visibility purposes. Parks are places for social gatherings and effort made to increase interest and people using facilities for multiuse purposes, for example, community photography or painting classes. Furnishings and other standard elements should be commonly themed. They should consider parking, nearby communities, multiple activities, and signage.

Berm and boardwalk improvement plans must first pass non-environmental permitting requirements, and then consider phasing implementation. Hardscape elements will be part of the solution and includes landscaping and pathways.

Mr. Moffatt referred to the list of exotic nuisance plants. He said they did not label Mexican Petunia as an exotic or a nuisance plant and asked what the classification is.

Mr. Mangan said he would look into classification of Mexican Petunia and report back.

In the schematic design phase, they are looking for improvements that will provide function, as well as be representative of the community's aesthetics. They will be looking into existing public art program to consider potential and reasonable locations communitywide; new technologies, such as video surveillance equipment for security purposes;

At 60%, ideas for improvements to north tram stations include additional locations for shade and shelter. Reorganization of the Commons site is right on target, separating pedestrians from automobiles, moving tram station from "back of house activities, provide a heightened finish, a vehicle drop off point, separating pedestrians from delivery services and screening "back house" activities, reorganize for better functionality, circulation, and use. Preliminary indications are that the preserve area is a wet area, so if that is confirmed, they will not challenge improvements there or attempt any environmental permitting.

**Pelican Bay Services Division Advisory Board & Pelican Bay Foundation Strategic Planning Committee
Joint Workshop Summary Minutes
December 9, 2009**

They have been more involved with the community and are providing many opportunities to communicate updates. They wrote an article regarding the Community Improvements Plan for an upcoming issue of the Pelican Bay Post. Other opportunities to communicate include providing a presentation to the Men's Coffee, additional community site walks. They are open to suggestions.

Mr. Sammons said Mr. Hoppensteadt suggested they follow up with consultant Dolly Roberts for steward assistance.

Mr. Mangan agreed and with Ms. Roberts' assistance, the goals for advertising in the Sunday paper real estate section.

Madam Chair Womble said she still believes they need to put comment cards in the trams because people read them and remember. "Once on the way out to the beach and once on the way in," provides reinforcement.

Mr. Mangan said by the end of this week, another set of announcements will go out and he agreed to follow through with Madam Chair's suggestion to put comment cards on the trams. The current phase is the springboard for ideas, and the forthcoming schematic design phase will bring forth a variety of total design solutions and the timing for implementation. He asked if anyone had any comments or questions.

Mr. Ohlers said what may help people visualize improvements and solutions are to present media, i.e., pictures or a video of the roadway and as one moves along it, show the transition, how the roadway has changed from how is now to what it can be after implementing the improvement or solution.

Mr. Mangan agreed Mr. Ohlers idea was a good one. Their staff is simulating results for their own reference, and if they can utilize the same technique for the public, they will.

Mr. Uek said on Pelican Bay Boulevard medians, there are very tall stately palm trees and asked what the lifespan of the palms are.

Mr. Mangan said the Sabal palms are the state tree. He said the problem is not the palms' life expectancy, but the large number of them requires a lot of maintenance and they will take some corrective action in the medians. The trees in the medians are generally older and in other areas, they are younger and starting to bloom. Sabal palms are readily available, some they will relocate and many in the medians they will remove.

Mr. Uek said some of the Sabal palms look diseased and unattractive

**Pelican Bay Services Division Advisory Board & Pelican Bay Foundation Strategic Planning Committee
Joint Workshop Summary Minutes
December 9, 2009**

Mr. Mangan said there are pockets of areas worse for wear, and he likes to use Sabal palms, but the focus and challenge is on sight visibility in the roadways. If they can collect and reuse, they will, and if no other way, they will remove.

Mr. Uek referred to Mr. Mangan's comment about specifications and additional cost to install pavers and using mud and concrete, vs. a sand base.

Mr. Mangan said the factor is between two - three times more. There is additional excavation and concrete costs more than sand. He thanked everyone, not just for today's efforts, but also for their efforts during the life of the project.

Mr. Uek said the next meeting is December 21 and due to the holidays, attendance may be sparse. He added that does not mean that no one cares; they just have other priorities.

Mr. Mangan said he does understand and appreciates the comments and advice this group provides. He thanked everyone and concluded the presentation.

Mary Anne Womble, Chairwoman

Minutes by Lisa Resnick 1/28/2010 10:06:20 AM