

**From:** [John Iaizzo](#)  
**To:** [ResnickL](#)  
**Subject:** Fw: Analysis of WilsonMiller CIP Final Report  
**Date:** Monday, August 30, 2010 1:17:28 PM  
**Attachments:** [Memo to PBF about WilsonMiller report 20100726.docx](#)

---

-----Original Message-----

From: VASUZIEDELIS@cs.com  
Date: 08/27/10 19:11:07  
To: iaizzo@comcast.net  
Subject: Analysis of WilsonMiller CIP Final Report

John,

Attached is our four page analysis of the 400 page W/M report (containing 57 recommendations and multiple options). I assume that you have a hard copy of the W/M document because reading it from the Foundation's web site is not a simple exercise. I wound up downloading most sections of the report and read the remainder, including another 200 pages of the Appendix at the Foundation office. Should you have any questions or comments please give me a call at 591-8177 or by e-mail to [vasuziedelis@cs.com](mailto:vasuziedelis@cs.com).

Regards, Vito

<<http://www.incredimail.com/index.asp?id=409&lang=9>>

## ANALYSIS OF WILSON/MILLER FINAL REPORT

July 26, 2010

TO: Jim Hoppensteadt, President – Pelican Bay Foundation  
FROM: Vito Suziedelis, President – St. Laurent Condominium  
SUBJECT: Community Improvement Plan (CIP)

This is a four page addendum to my letter of July 6, 2010, about the project elements identified in the 400 page final report by WilsonMiller consulting firm of Naples. As I had mentioned in my letter the report is poorly written and organized. I doubt that many residents will comment on this bulky product in which the numbering of pages in the digital download is inconsistent with the printed material. I reviewed the “bullet points” of the reported summaries in the order listed using the page references from the web site. My simple grading score (“Y”=yes; “N”=no/never; “M”=maybe/marginal; “P”=platitude) and recommendations follow:

**1. Traffic.** Analysis page 11, 10 items (M,N,Y,Y,N,N,Y,Y,P,N). Start with four key premises which may help to solve many problems without new costly and troublesome designs:

A. No brick pavers on public roads, at crosswalks, or other heavy traffic areas. This kind of surface is expensive, requires frequent cleaning and is more difficult to maintain than asphalt or concrete. Use high visibility thermoplastic paint striping where needed at stop signs and crosswalks.

B. No roundabouts. These relics from the 1950-60’s are dangerous in mixed traffic and are rightly banned in some states and cities. Roundabout approaches and center islands require more space than simple 3 or 4-way intersections with stop signs.

C. No bike lanes. The four-lane “collector” roads (Pelican Bay Blvd and Gulf Park Drive) cannot be widened from the present 24 ft (12+12) in each direction without costly rework affecting the trees and landscaping in the medians and along the street sides. Every few years the issue of adding a bike lane (4 ft or more) is raised by a few bureaucrats and bicycle club members. About 15 years ago some sections of the collector roads had been striped to accommodate a bike lane (10+10+4) on a test basis. This effort was soon abandoned as unsafe due to the false sense of security by the bikers. Our community is served daily by heavy trucks approaching 10 ft in width (trash collection, ambulances, fire trucks, construction vehicles, landscape services, furniture deliveries, auto transporters, etc). The national road vehicle width limit for trucks and buses is 8.5 ft with an added allowance of 0.5 ft on each side for mirrors and other safety devices; a 10 ft lane for large cars, trucks, trailers and buses is marginal at best. On this issue the flawed Kimley-Horn report of June 2007 and the current proposal by W/M are unacceptable. The Foundation also is not doing any favors to its members by publishing a politically slanted and technically weak article by Michelle Avola in the mid-May 2010 issue of Pelican Bay Post. Please be guided by the provisions of Florida Statutes Section 335.065, Chapter 8.1.1(b) and lighten the W/M report by dumping 20 pages of filler material (pages 370-389).

D. No traffic light signals inside the Pelican Bay boundaries (other than at the existing five controlled entry points).

Crosswalks. Some changes and additions may be justified but not necessarily at the locations and of the type indicated in the report. The monstrosity erected across the Boulevard at the North Tram Station consisting of a dozen ugly yellow signs (with some positioned in the traffic lanes!) should be dismantled and never duplicated elsewhere. We heard many negative comments, such as “overkill”, “driver distraction”, “unsafe for everyone”, “first of a kind on a public street in Naples”. Remove the “state law” signs, including those on Daniels Blvd. Consistency is important but excessive signage must be avoided. Plans for fourteen crosswalks are shown on pages 58-91. Do not create more crosswalks near any existing or proposed crossings (do not add #4, #5 and #9). Upgrade crosswalks only where there is a known volume of pedestrian traffic to the tram stations or community facilities (leave as is #3, #7, #8, #12 and #13). No pedestrian crossing signs are needed in places where vehicle stop signs exist (only striped walk lanes at #2, #6, and #14). Reluctantly, stop signs on the Boulevard at Ridgewood (#1) may be justified. Crossings #10 and #11 are needed but without redundant signs and stop bars. The entire upgrade plan as modified, including minor repair of pathway ramps at crosswalks, could be done for under \$100,000.

**2. Pathways.** Analysis pages 12-13, 12 items (Y,Y,M,N,N,M,N,P,Y,M,Y,Y). Start with four basic guidelines as in the preceding Traffic section:

A. Choose asphaltic surfaces whenever practical for workability and general consistency. This material is almost universal throughout the Pelican Bay pathways. Do not rely on any solid “pervious” paving materials. Install tree root barriers as needed when resurfacing or widening pathways.

B. No light bollards on main roads. Sufficient illumination exists at night if the maturing trees are properly pruned so there should be no need for enhanced lighting. Use these devices along the isolated pathways off the named streets.

C. Be judicious when widening paths to avoid disrupting underground utilities. When selecting segments to be upgraded consider the multitude of electric, telephone, cable, gas, water, irrigation, sewage and private conduits usually buried in these strips.

D. Dispense with gimmicks, such as direction signs, mile markers, named jogging loops, overlook stations, and covered benches. We already have too many vacant benches along the Boulevard.

The most densely populated area of the community from the Commons to the North Tram Station would likely benefit from widening the pathway to about 7-8 ft on the west side of the Boulevard. Reworking this pathway segment would require grading and leveling some sections in conformance to the ADA rules. Be cautious when embarking on this project because the bureaucrats may make it impossible or, at best, very expensive. This disruptive undertaking would require much manual labor and could double any original cost estimate and triple the planned work duration. Think of it as Immokalee Road widening in North Naples on a miniature scale.

Upgrading St. Raphael Beachwalk path is desirable but the estimated total cost of \$200,000 seems high. The estimate for Boulevard crossing #10 is reasonable at \$23,000 but the balance to complete this plan is not realistic. The asphalt path (10 ft wide x 700 ft long) already exists and only requires refurbishment by milling and overlay. Some adjoining trees need to be removed or trimmed. This overgrown path is invisible from the street and a small sign would help. Do not plant any more trees along this path or erect benches. Standard bollard lighting may be appropriate but forget the solar type in this shady place. The entire package, including the street crossing, resurfacing and lights, should cost no more than \$90,000.

Pathway repair and overlay should be the first option wherever possible to avoid ADA issues and disturbing the underground utilities. Survey the neighborhoods where there are no sidewalks whether there is a genuine desire by the home owners to accept this imposition near their property. Avoid fixing some private entrance/exit cases which may not be optimum but often exist for reasons not evident to the fly-by consultants (for example, two photos of Waterpark Place gates on page 126).

**3. Lighting.** Analysis page 14, 10 items (M,M,M,M,Y,Y,Y,Y,M,P). Start with pages 12-13 of the original report (not included in the final version) which show a large number of “major conflicts with tree canopies”. Too many trees had been planted during the initial planning phase over 30 years ago and many more had been added as the development progressed. Pelican Bay needs judicious thinning of all types of mature greenery including the removal of some canopy trees and palms. Mother Nature will solve it in a more drastic way if we do not address this problem with sensible planning (remember Port Royal five years ago). Many lighting issues on the main roads would benefit from professional trimming or removal of overgrown trees and perhaps by relocating a few street lights. More illumination is needed at North Station crosswalk. The convoluted SESCO “Energy Solution” is a worthless canned computer exercise that does not even connect with the rest of the cost analysis (disregard this filler material on pages 146-169). Undoubtedly the LED lamps are more efficient and last longer than existing MH/HID types. However, there is no economic basis to spend more than a million dollars now for new LED fixtures and bracket arms to be mounted on old concrete poles and then retrofit them a few years hence on new better looking poles. Establish the remaining useful life of the concrete poles (7-8 years?), budget an appropriate annual reserve amount for the replacement project and then implement it complete with all the bells, whistles and LEDs. Isn’t that how we manage our condo associations? There is little, if any, need to install expensive ground light bollards, especially not on North Pointe Drive or along Vanderbilt Beach Road. As stated previously, about a dozen bollards (50 ft apart) may be justifiable for the upgraded St. Raphael Beachwalk.

**4. Landscape.** Analysis page 15, 15 items (M,N,M,Y,N,P,P,M,M,M,M,M,P,P,M). Some of the landscape changes listed on pages 185-186 are reasonable but the overall scheme with a price tag of \$2.5 million is ridiculous. Removal and replacement of some aging palms and canopy trees is needed as stated in paragraph D4-A. Apply the general rule “one in for two out” to equivalent items, avoid overplanting and use better quality (such as royal vs. sabal palms). Do not replace sod in median nosings, or anywhere, with “low drought tolerant ground covers”. We already see some ugly examples of these plantings in a few areas. Do not touch the costly upgrade item D4-B and the planting of 125 new trees in item D4-D. No littoral type plantings along the berm and be selective about applying them at the edge of lakes and canals (item D4-C).

**5. US-41 Berm.** Analysis page 16, 8 items (N,N,N,N,N,N,P,P). Traffic noise in the area near U.S. Route 41 is unavoidable and cannot be realistically suppressed. The rationale that this main road appeared surprisingly in its present location does not recognize that it was and remains a major link through SW Florida. I worked in Tampa more than 40 years ago and often traveled the Tamiami Trail before the existence of Pelican Bay, Marco Island and Alligator Alley. This highway was never just a quiet two-lane country road. US-41 at times carried a lot of commercial traffic and had its share of congestion and accidents.

Spending \$2 million dollars for tearing out the present landscaping and any existing walls, building up the earth berm by 2-3 ft and erecting a 6-8 ft wall on top of it would be wasteful. Traffic noise is not attenuated by such minimal barriers except in the very small areas immediately behind the wall. There is no assurance that there would be any perceptible benefit at the residences beyond 200 ft from the road. The low frequency sound tends to carry over minor obstacles (article by Federal Highway Administration for non-technical readers on pages 262-271).

Installing water fountains in the adjacent ponds would just create more noise in their immediate vicinity thus presumably “masking” the more variable sound of traffic. It could serve as a relatively inexpensive band-aid. Someone at Wilson/Miller must have had a bad day to suggest masking traffic noise by introducing music in the Ridgewood and Oakmont parks through a system of loudspeakers.

The foregoing comments on noise abatement apply to the 12 ft wall suggested between Naples Grande and Serendipity. No great results should be expected from the disruption of existing hedge and \$62,700 expenditure. Why is this matter under consideration after 20+ years of coexistence between the Resort and the nearby condominium? Have new owners moved in without checking the current status?

**6. Community Berm.** Analysis pages 17-18, 17 items (Y,P,Y,P,Y,P,Y,Y,N,N,Y,N,N,Y,N,N,N). Learn a few basics from the past that evoked strong opposition by the residents in 2002-2003 when a small section of the berm was “beautified” at the North Station as a sample. The main arguments at that time for leaving the berm as is were as follows:

- a. Do not plant anything on the berm. Plantings and trees will obscure the natural life along the berm. Additional costly irrigation and upkeep will be needed.
- b. Birds and animals will no longer be visible. Movement of fish, turtles, alligators and wading birds is not predictable and varies with seasons and tides. Swamps may not be pretty but they are part of the coastal mangrove environment.
- c. Dense littoral vegetation could present danger to people by providing a close hiding place for animals.

Refer to the proposed plans on pages 284-301. Save \$160,000 by not planting any trees, palms or shrubs on the berm (D6-C) and by not erecting useless overlook platforms cantilevered off the berm or seating areas on it (D6-B). Widening of the 10 ft berm road is not necessary but resurfacing as outlined in D6-A at a cost of \$406,500 is needed. This work should be done in planned stages during the summer to minimize its impact on the residents. The engineering survey report in the Report Appendix, including sample borings, indicates that the berm structure is generally sound with the exception of a few areas where some settlement is evident. These areas would have to be addressed by excavating, filling and compacting before application of the asphaltic pavement. There is no reason to dredge the swale on the west side of the berm as long as the water drainage is not impeded. Avoid any work on the preserve side, other than trimming of encroaching growth, which would require permits from the State or Federal authorities. Do not under any circumstances install night lighting on the berm. Require property owners to clean up areas along the east side of the berm.

**7. Tram Stations.** Analysis page 19, 9 items (N,M,N,M,M,M,Y,N,N). The fuzzy suggestion of identifying stations with the names of birds is really for the birds. Call them by the physical location to assist the riders: 1-South End, 2-St Maarten, 3-South Beach, 4-Commons, 5-Sandpiper, 6-St Raphael, 7-North Beach, 8-North Station. Specific recommendations begin at page 309. Forget the \$900,000 revamping of the entire Commons complex which includes the tram station (D7-B). The North Station has been recently updated and does not require another \$180,000 overhaul (D7-A). Vehicle traffic to/from the new parking area has to be redirected as planned in the Traffic section. The parking lot has been poorly constructed with inadequate pitch for drainage and floods badly after moderate rain showers. The Sand Piper station needs an overhaul, including a new roof, but none of the plantings on the adjoining berm or in any kind of flower pots (D7-C and architect rendering on pages 316-317). A few benches are needed at the stations. Do not go for gimmicks such as tables, electronic bulletin screens or tram tracking systems. Tram users are interested in efficient transport to the beaches, bars and restaurants and not about lounging at the stations to socialize.

**8. Signage.** Analysis page 20, 4 items (P,Y,M,Y). We have far too many signs in and around the community. Remove the old wooden sign at North Pointe/Vanderbilt Beach and do not replace it. No one will notice the change (D8-A). Do not add signs listed in D8-B or at secondary entries and in the community under D8-C. Total savings so far will add up to over \$200,000. Replace three wooden signs at key locations along the Boulevard (Commons, Sandpiper and North Station) with signs to match the design of entry to our new Community Center (D8-D). Refurbish but do not replace the current three main entry signs on Tamiami Trail (D8-E). The NE and SE corner signs at US-41 need cleanup and removal of obstructing palms, especially at Seagate Drive (D8-F).

**9. Parks.** Analysis page 21, 10 items (P,M,N,N,N,M,N,M,M,N). This report element about the Ridgewood and Oakmont parks starts at page 347. These parks are very lightly used and poorly maintained. Many residents outside of the immediate vicinity do not even know these amenities exist. Ridgewood has five gravel parking spaces and Oakmont is basically only a narrow track around one of the lakes with access only by foot or bicycle. Undoubtedly some improvements could be implemented and the upkeep of overgrown pathways and vegetation is a must. However, it is ludicrous to think that these areas can become some sort of a social center even after expending several hundred thousand dollars as suggested in estimates D9-A1 thru D9-B2. Hopefully, we have heard the last of the suggested dog parks or vegetable gardens and will not be exposed to enhanced experiences, territorial reinforcement or CPTED principles.

**10. New Technologies.** Analysis page 22, 4 items (M,M,Y,M). This is a somewhat nebulous section because the cost effectiveness and capability of new devices is changing rapidly. Some suggested innovations (A) are already covered in previous chapters while others fall in the category of “don’t implement even if it is feasible” (B). Solar LED lights have been proven their use in remote locations (C) but solar sources are unreliable, costly and awkward in providing bulk power (D). “On demand” lighting control in wide open outdoor installations subjected to varying weather conditions has not been proven practical (E). Given the almost continuous presence of people at key locations and the ubiquitous use of cell phones there is no need of disguised towers with “code blue” emergency call stations and video camera surveillance (F). Pelican Bay is well equipped with private guard services, cameras and security systems. Review of County Sheriff’s records over the past two years shows minimal criminal activity and traffic violations spread pretty evenly throughout the community. There is no indication that the areas near US-41 are more prone to burglary or personal attack. A well structured network of card swiping stations may help to keep out unauthorized persons and provide statistics of attendance. The idea of installing a gate with a card reader at the entry to Ridgewood Park’s five car parking lot is a joke (G).

**11. Public Art.** Analysis page 23, 1 item (N). After clearing the web of pompous verbosity (on this page and page 366) the emerging idea has merit. Underline the statement in paragraph D about not funding this program as part of fees or tax base but by private or public contribution.