

Naples, Florida December 2, 1987

LET IT BE KNOWN, that the Pelican Bay Improvement District Street Lighting Committee met on this date at 2:00 p.m. in the offices of the Pelican Bay Improvement District, 801 Laurel Oak Drive, Suite 510, Naples, Florida, with the following members present: Mr. James D. Hake, Supervisor of the Board; Mr. James P. Ward, Assistant District Manager; Mr. Walter C. Carter, Westinghouse Communities of Naples, Inc.; Mr. Stephen A. Means, Wilson, Miller, Barton, Soll & Peek, Inc.; Mr. F. Joseph McMackin, III, Legal Counsel for the District; and Mr. Seymour Sekuler, Representative of the Pelican Bay Homeowner's Association.

Mr. Hake began by discussing the test results of the samples taken from the street lighting poles and sent to Lehigh Testing Laboratories, Inc. He advised he received a verbal report on November 30, 1987, and that the written report would be received in approximately ten days to two weeks.

Mr. Carter reviewed the history of the purchase of the street lighting poles. He indicated he had spoken with Mr. David Caldwell and Jerry Schmoyer, of Westinghouse Communities of Naples, Inc. regarding

the poles. Mr. Carter indicated both gentlemen advised that representations had been made by both Sterner and particularly by a Sterner supplier in Miami (whose name they could not recall), that corten steel was the best available material for the job.

In Mr. Hake's opinion, the final decision to purchase the corten poles was made by Westinghouse Communities of Naples, Inc., prior to the establishment of the Street Lighting District, since the first street lighting poles had been purchased and installed at the entrance of Pelican Bay Boulevard, by Westinghouse, and subsequently the Pelican Bay Municipal Street Lighting District purchased the poles from Westinghouse. Mr. Hake went on to say, however, that this did not mean that the poles were Westinghouse's responsibility.

Mr. Hake read from the Minutes of the Pelican Bay Improvement District's Board Meeting of June 12, 1979, Pages 603-604, (which are attached hereto and made an official part of the Street Lighting Minutes), in which Mr. Charles Turner of Coral Ridge-Collier Properties, Inc., made a presentation on the type of street lights to be used in Pelican Bay, which were purchased from Sterner Lighting Systems.

Mr. Hake then summarized the Minutes of September 19, 1979, Page 628, in which the Board discussed a Lease Purchase Agreement with Westinghouse Communities of Naples, Inc. for the street lights, as the District was short of funds. At that time, the Board also discussed the Advertisement for Bids. Mr. Hake requested copies of Advertisement for Bid for the installation of the poles.

Mr. Hake then read from the November 14, 1979, Minutes, Page 637-638, (which are attached hereto and made an official part of the

Street Lighting Minutes), in which the financing alternatives for the Pelican Bay Lighting Special Municipal Taxing District were discussed.

Mr. Hake stated there was much more information concerning the Sterner poles, but he felt the above referenced material was the most important.

Mr. Hake discussed the July 22, 1981, Minutes, Page 880, which reviewed the Engineer's installation and specifications for the Street Lighting System on Crayton Road, Ridgewood Drive and Laurel Oak Drive. He noted that Westinghouse Communities of Naples, Inc. had received all correspondence relating to the Street Lighting System.

Mr. Hake referred to the August 26, 1981, Minutes, Pages 899-890, in which the Engineering Design Proposal for the Unit IV Street Lights was presented and approved.

Mr. Hake referred to a letter dated August 24, 1981, from Mr. Jerry Eckert, Regional Manager of Post, Buckley, Schuh & Jernigan, Inc. at that time. Mr. Ward explained that this particular letter was not pertinent to this discussion.

Mr. Hake reviewed the verbal response of Mr. Ron Crooks of Lehigh Testing Laboratory, Inc. in which Mr. Crooks doubted that there would be any electrolysis involved with the rusting of the poles, due to the fact one needed an introduction of two different kinds of metal for electrolysis. Mr. Hake advised that since Mr. Crooks now was aware the poles were corten steel, he would be able to eliminate several unnecessary tests. Mr. Hake went on to explain Mr. Crooks indicated from the piece of steel that he had in his possession, that all of the rusting was taking place from the inside of the poles to the outside of

the poles. Mr. Crooks also indicated to Mr. Hake that water must not be allowed to lay in pockets of corten steel, corten steel must not be submerged in water, and cannot be placed in a damp musty condition, as problems will arise with the corten steel.

Mr. Hake distributed copies of a Report from U. S. Steel that were received from the Sanctuary, who is also having problems with a bridge that was installed at the Sanctuary. The letter summarized that the contents of the analyzed lake water, in which the bridge is located, or the location of the bridge in relation to the Gulf, one and a half mile away, would not contribute to the problems of the corten steel bridge. The letter went on to state that the corten steel should not be submerged in water, water or damp debris should not be allowed to stand in any pockets, or be buried in soil.

Mr. Hake described the hole in the bottom of the poles, which currently have no cover or gasket to protect the interior from rain or sprinkler water. This fact confirms the Report from Lehigh Testing Laboratories, Inc. that rusting is taking place from the inside out. It also makes a point that the design of the installation could be at fault if the plans and specifications did not specify the foundation should be a certain height above grade level, which would subject the poles to moisture. Mr. Hake further advised the poles are designed so sunlight cannot dry out any moisture that has formed in and around the poles.

Mr. Sekuler asked whether the original presentation of the Street Lighting Poles by Westinghouse Communities of Naples, Inc. was entirely factual or whether the properties of "weathering" corten steel were

misrepresented.

Mr. McMackin questioned what the warranty actually stated, and asked whether there was a Guarantee, and the life expectancy of the corten poles. Mr. Hake reminded the Committee that Mr. Moyer had previously suggested that life expectancy of corten poles is approximately twenty (20) years.

Mr. Sekuler raised a question concerning the advertising for public bids for the street lighting poles. Mr. Ward clarified this question by stating the Pelican Bay Municipal Street Lighting District is a dependent District of Collier County, and via a Resolution by the Board of Collier County Commissioners, the poles were declared a sole source item and thus were not subject to the bidding procedure.

Mr. Means explained the specifications for the installation of the poles, i.e., the top of all concrete bases should be 1" to 3" above finished grade. He stated that one of the problems was that when the contractor installed the bases, the grading was normally not completed, and thus, the finished grade was hard to define.

Mr. Hake felt Post, Buckley, Schuh & Jernigan, Inc. had a responsibility for the problems as their specification differed from U.S. Steel's specification. Mr. Means then interjected that the 1" to 3" above finished grade may have been the manufacturer's specification.

Mr. Hake showed photographs taken at the Utility Site of the poles after they had been removed by the District. Mr. Sekuler asked why the covers on the poles were not sealed, which allows water into the poles. Mr. Hake then explained, as shown in the photographs, that the deterioration is consistently four (4) inches above the base plate,

which is exactly the height of the square covering, and where most of the covers were disintegrating. He went on to state that on four (4) of the poles there was no apparent rusting from inside to outside, but on the other three (3) poles, it was very evident that there was rusting from the inside to the outside, so there were two different conditions occurring which were causing the same results.

Mr. Hake questioned the one (1) year warranty if the pole was designed with corten steel and the buyer was told it was maintenance free. He suggested the design was wrong, and although the flaw in the design did not show up for four to five years, would not the warranty be in question. Mr. McMackin stated the warranty does not cover parts and lamps that are not manufactured by the company, and these are subject to standard manufacturer's guarantee, and presumably the metal was manufactured by U.S. Steel, not by Sterner. Mr. Hake disagreed saying the fixtures were the parts not covered.

Mr. McMackin asked if poles had been installed within the last year, and advised that the District should carefully examine the poles still under the warranty period, to see if there were any defects before the warranty period ran out. Mr. Ward stated Law Engineering tested the six (6) month old poles in the Oakmont area for thickness and the poles showed no damage. Mr. Hake stated the Oakmont poles would probably hold up, due to the surrounding ground area. Mr. Ward commented that at least twenty (20%) percent of the poles in Unit I, which were installed in 1979, had a reduction of forty (40%) percent in thickness of the steel at the base and higher up the pole.

Mr. Hake suggested the deterioration had slowed due to the fact the

covers on the poles had been removed, and the inside of the poles had dried out. He then suggested there were three different entities involved, and Westinghouse Communities of Naples, Inc. must inform the District of their selection process for the purchase of the corten poles. Mr. Ward remembered a gentleman by the name of Craig Haden from Sesco in Tampa, who was a distributor of Sterner poles, and suggested he could be contacted regarding the original purchase of the poles.

Mr. Hake discussed the price of the poles, and advised that he just learned he could buy the same the pole and arm for approximately, \$550.00, which was twenty (20) to thirty (30) percent less than the District's cost. Mr. Hake read the letter which stated the poles were not stock, but could be specially ordered, however more information was needed for specifications for purchase. Mr. Ward asked if they were the actual Manchester Luminare Series product as a standard, as he had a letter from Sterner certifying this fact. He went on to state that to his knowledge, no other company has attempted to manufacture this type of pole, due to the substantial investment involved. The Committee discussed purchasing the poles through Mr. Hake's contact, as the difference in price would be approximately sixty-five (65%) percent less. Mr. Carter questioned if the gauge of the steel was the same. Mr. Hake commented that according to the letter he had received, it was exactly the same. Mr. Ward said he would give Mr. Hake a specification list so he could obtain the price of a pole from his contact.

Mr. Ward responded that replacement installation costs would be approximately \$100.00 per pole, compared to the original installation cost of approximately \$1,000.00 per pole.

Mr. Hake made suggestions concerning the installation of the replacement poles as follows: (1) raise the base one foot; (2) create a foundation for the base to sit on; (3) extend the existing bolts into the sleeve and add additional bolts. He went on to say the height of the poles seemed to make no difference, but he would like to save as many poles as possible, in the least expensive way. Mr. Sekuler concurred with Mr. Hake's suggestion that the damaged poles be cut off six (6) inches at the base of the pole and then placed on a raised concrete base of six (6) inches.

Mr. Hake hoped Mr. McMackin could legitimately hold another company responsible for these design defects in the poles.

Mr. Sekuler suggested all the information that had been gathered concerning the poles and the District's intent in the future, be sent to U.S. Steel for their reaction, as in five (5) more years, the entire process may have to be done again. Mr. Hake concurred with Mr. Sekuler, and suggested a representative from U.S. Steel visit Pelican Bay to physically inspect the poles. Mr. Ward agreed with Mr. Hake's suggestion.

Mr. McMackin, in reference to the repairs of the poles, explained that a corten steel paint is available which is patented along with the steel and could prevent further corrosion of corten steel. He said his research did not state if the paint was clear or pigmented, but the effect was to keep the oxidation, or "floating" rust from coming off of the poles upon touch, and to prevent further oxidation of the poles.

It was Mr. Sekuler opinion that if the covers were removed, and weep holes were drilled, it would relieve the moisture. Mr. Hake

disagreed since grass clippings would still sit in the hole and hold moisture.

Mr. Hake asked if the poles were insured. Mr. Ward stated the poles were insured for liability and property damage only, but asked the question, "if the poles fell from rust, would it be considered property damage?"

Mr. McMackin restated that there were three entities involved: Sterner Lighting, U. S. Steel, and Post, Buckley, Schuh & Jernigan, Inc. A discussion concerning Post, Buckley, Schuh & Jernigan, Inc.'s liability followed, as they were hired subcontractors for the installation of the poles.

Mr. Ward asked if the District should consider hiring an expert to inform the District if there was an inherent problem in the design of the poles. Mr. Hake felt Sterner Lighting Systems, Westinghouse Communities of Naples, Inc., Post, Buckley, Schuh and Jernigan, Inc., and U.S. Steel, all or in part, could be held responsible for the problems. Mr. McMackin asked Mr. Hake whether he felt one or all of the parties mentioned above should inspect the poles. Mr. Hake said he would ask a representative of U.S. Steel to visit Pelican Bay to inspect the installation of the poles and the poles themselves. Mr. McMackin suggested a representative from Sterner should also be present during U.S. Steel's inspection of the poles. Mr. Sekuler disagreed with Mr. McMackin's suggestion, stating that U.S. Steel should inspect the poles alone, as they would be more objective.

Mr. McMackin asked if any of the defective poles were actually purchased by the District, and Mr. Hake replied the first four (4) poles

Pelican Bay Improvement District
December 2, 1987

had been purchased by Westinghouse Communities of Naples, Inc. and in turn, purchased by the Pelican Bay Municipal Street Lighting District. Mr. McMackin asked if the defective poles had been purchased directly from Sterner; Mr. Ward replied in the affirmative.

It was concluded that the Committee's recommendation to the Board would be to ask a representative from U.S. Steel to inspect the street lighting poles.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Committee, the Meeting was adjourned. Time: 3:30 P.M.

DISCUSSION RELATIVE TO THE STREET LIGHTING DISTRICT - ITEM TO BE BROUGHT BACK
BEFORE THE BOARD AFTER MORE RESEARCH

In giving a review of the item of street lights, Mr. Moyer stated that the Board of County Commissioners had assigned to the Pelican Bay Improvement District Board the responsibility of operating and maintaining the street lights, pursuant to a previously signed agreement. At this time, he introduced Mr. Charles Turner of Coral-Ridge-Collier, Inc. who made the presentation on the type of street lighting that will be used.

Mr. Turner gave each Board member a photograph of the kind of installation that has been selected and identified the manufacturer as Sterner Lighting Systems - the unit being discussed as the Manchester Line. Mr. Turner stated the Sterner Lighting Systems is a sole source supplier and is the largest supplier of custom outdoor fixtures in the United States. He went on to explain that the units, as shown in the photograph, have poles of 30' height; they are made of "core 10 steel" which requires absolutely no maintenance; they have a clean simple design with a very low glare factor and because of these stated characteristics - they provide a wide range of lighting that can be used for the development in a number of locations. He concluded his presentation with the statement that the rust-colored units are very energy efficient.

Following discussion, Mr. Moyer asked for the Board's approval to negotiate with Mr. Turner to provide some kind of purchase plan for the street lights. Mr. Varnadoe, at this point, distinguished between the "two hats" the Board wears, saying this item would come under the Pelican Bay Lighting Municipal Service Taxing District and as such, the Board would act only as an administrative agency for the County, which includes bidding by the County's

purchasing policy. He continued that the County policy regarding purchasing does include an exception to bidding when there is only a "sole source supplier" for the item and because this purchase could fall under this category, the County could authorize the Board to negotiate with the single source supplier. Attorney Bolesky asked that the design approval be deferred until he could do some more research and bring his findings back to the Board at the next meeting.

It was the consensus of the Board that the item be more fully researched and brought back at the next meeting.

SUPERVISORS' REQUESTS

Mrs. Wenzel inquired into the possibility of the District hiring its own accountant as the time grows nearer for reimbursing the developers. In answer, Mr. Moyer stated there should be a department head holding the title of "bookkeeper/accountant" which will include the responsibility of being office manager and distributor of reimbursements to the developers. This person would report to him, Mr. Moyer continued, and the position should be filled within the next three (3) months.

Mr. Turner moved, seconded by Mrs. Wenzel and carried unanimously, that Mr. Moyer be authorized to begin looking for such a person, ^{the} ~~their~~ position to include the responsibility of caring for the office and the books of the District.

ENGINEER'S REPORT

Mr. Fred Biery reviewed the project progress report (See attached.). Following the report, he gave photographs of the project and explained the physical location of each one - i.e. water/sewer pipeline; utility facility;

Mr. Turner moved, seconded by Mr. Brown and carried that the President and the Secretary be authorized to execute the above-referenced Agreement between Coral Ridge-Collier Properties and the District.

DISCUSSION OF STREET LIGHTING DISTRICT AND LEASE-PURCHASE AGREEMENT

Mr. Moyer reviewed the discussion held during the August meeting concerning the lease-purchase agreement between the District and a third financing party for the provision of street lighting equipment from the Sterner Company and stated that today's packet included a warranty from the manufacturer. In answer to President Scuderi's question regarding the subject warranty, Attorney Bolesky stated he had received a letter from Coral Ridge-Collier Properties indicating there would be more information forthcoming but in making a determination from the material he had on hand, he found the warranty to again be too vague.

Discussion followed and it was the consensus of the Board that the manufacturer will be the source to look to for a more comprehensive warranty through the lessor/financier and that the letter from Coral Ridge-Collier Properties concerning said warranty be followed through.

Mr. Moyer asked that he be allowed to advertise for bids for the installation of the street lighting equipment, saying the District could in no way be placed in jeopardy as the District reserves the right to reject all bids. He also said that the advertisement for bids could include not only the specifications but the type of installation warranty that is desired, making it known to the bidder that no purchase has been made yet.

Mr. Turner moved, seconded by Mrs. Wenzel and carried unanimously, that the advertising for the installation of lighting fixtures with the conditions that the District can reject any and all bids; that the bidders know that no purchase of Sterner equipment has been made but will be contingent upon the contract with Sterner - be authorized.

PRESENTATION OF FINANCING ALTERNATIVES FOR THE PELICAN BAY LIGHTING SPECIAL MUNICIPAL TAXING DISTRICT - LOAN METHOD APPROVED IN CONCEPT

Mr. Moyer stated the item was a continuation of previous discussions regarding the financing of street lights for the Pelican Bay Lighting Special Municipal Taxing District and indicated that a booklet had been included in each members' agenda packet which gives the history and past considerations of the Board concerning this project. He said there were two areas of concern - (1) warranty conditions and (2) the type of financing. In way of explanation, Mr. Moyer continued, both Mr. Varnadoe and Mr. Bolesky had done some research on the Uniform Commercial Code in the state of Florida which resulted in the enclosed memo from Mr. Varnadoe to the Board members and covers the subject of "expressed and implied warranties". On the basis of this information, Mr. Moyer said he had written a letter of conditions regarding the installation of street lights for Pelican Bay to the Sterner Company and had received a reply from the President of Sterner's indicating that his company could meet the required conditions. It is from the contents of this letter, Mr. Moyer said he felt certain implied as well as expressed warranties had been answered according to the specifications of the Uniform Commercial Code. At this time, Mr. Moyer reviewed the expressed warranties contained in the Purchase Agreement - i.e. Sterner replacing and/or repairing any defects to the material that are supplied to the District for a period of one year. Attorney Bolesky commented that the "implied and expressed warranties" were indicated in the agenda packet and his only statement was that there were "too few warranties and less answers than questions".

The second area of concern, the purchase of said street lights, was addressed by Mr. Moyer, who stated that the method of lease-purchase had been under consideration but during the past month, he had had an opportunity to speak with a few lending institutions regarding the possibility of granting a loan to

the District and negotiating the resulting note which would negate using the cumbersome lease-purchase arrangement. He said his recommendation would be to use a simple unsecured note, between the District and the lighting institution, as the financing method for the installation of the street lights. The Exchange Bank of Collier County is agreeable to funding a loan in the amount of \$150,000 at an interest rate of 8½% per annum, subject to the Attorney's (for the District) opinion that the note would be tax-exempted and that there would be a guarantee from Coral Ridge-Collier Properties for the monies in the event that the District defaulted. Mr. Moyer asked for authorization to proceed with the funding of the installation of the street lights only after receiving the requested opinion by the District's Attorney Bolesky. Upon a call for the question, in the form of a straw vote, it was voted unanimously to support the concept as presented by Mr. Moyer. Mr. Moyer reaffirmed that if he could get a better option - i.e. rate of interest - with yet another banking institution, he would follow it through but in any event, he would see to the preparation of the necessary documents for the closing of such a loan.

PROPOSAL FROM MISSIMER AND ASSOCIATES, INC REGARDING SFWMD'S REQUIRED WELL MONITORING - APPROVED

In presenting the item to the Board, Mr. Moyer explained that the "consumptive use permit" given by the South Florida Water Management District to the Pelican Bay Improvement District brought with it a prerequisite of employing a "monitoring plan" for the water wells of the District. Such a monitoring plan should include (1) the quality of water; (2) the rate of withdrawal and (3) the effect the rate of withdrawal will have on the aquifer. For this purpose, Missimer and Associates, Inc. have submitted a proposal that will establish the necessary monitoring system at a cost of \$2,702 and includes the firm securing the approval of the SFWMD. It was Mr. Moyer's recommendation that the District employ Mr. Missimer to draw up the control plan with the District, itself, implementing the resulting monitoring system.

During discussion, the water/sewer easement was described as that portion of land adjacent to Gulf Park Drive and portions of the west boundary of Parcel "D"; the water/management easements were described as (1) that portion of land located on the west side of U.S. 41; the east side of Ridgewood Drive in Parcel "E" of Unit 4 and (2) that portion of land located along the east boundary of Parcel "D" in Unit 4 - being 20 feet in width. Because the presented easement documents were not signed by the Developer and, in themselves, contained some typographical errors, it was the consensus of the Board to approve such grants of easement conceptually with the final documents being brought back before the Board at the August 26, 1981 regular meeting.

COMPETITIVE BIDS FOR INSTALLATION OF STREET LIGHT ON CRAYTON ROAD, RIDGEWOOD AND LAUREL OAK DRIVES - AUTHORIZED FOR ADVERTISING

Following Mr. Moyer's review of the Board's previous authorization to the engineers to prepare the installation plans and specifications for the street lighting system on Crayton Road and Ridgewood and Laurel Oak Drives, Mr. Turner moved, seconded by Mr. Brown and carried unanimously, that the Engineers be authorized to advertise for competitive bids for the above-referenced street lighting.

STATUS REPORT ON SALES TAX

Copies of the District's current Status of Sales Tax were presented to the Board with Mr. Moyer's recapping of the information by stating that the District has, to date, paid \$73,392.99 for sales tax on water/sewer contracts and \$19,912.04 for sales tax on water management contracts. Mr. George Varnadoe, Attorney, explained that a request for the return of such monies has been filed with the Department of Revenue and even though there has been paid in approximately \$93,000.00 in sales tax, the most the District can expect to get back will be the difference between

Naples, Florida August 26, 1981

LET IT BE KNOWN, that the Pelican Bay Improvement District met this date in Budget Hearing at 4:30 P.M. in Building "F" in the Collier County Courthouse complex with the following members present:

PRESIDENT: Salvatore Scuderi
SECRETARY: Douglas Brown

Sylvia Moll
Harmon Turner

TREASURER: Stanley Brooks - Absent

ALSO PRESENT: Gary Moyer, District Manager; Jerry Eckert, Post, Buckley, Schuh & Jernigan, Inc.; Messrs. Koste, Caldwell and Stevens, Coral Ridge-Collier Properties; Tracy Bolesky, Attorney for the District and Jean Swindle, Recording Secretary.

AGENDA

1. ROLL CALL
2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MEETING HELD JULY 22, 1981
3. PUBLIC HEARING - FY 1982 BUDGETS FOR WATER MANAGEMENT, WATER & SEWER AND STREET LIGHTING
 - a) Presentation and discussion of budgets
 - b) Public Comments
 - c) Approval of Resolutions adopting the budgets and levying benefit and maintenance taxes.
4. PERMITS REQUESTS:
 - a) Bay Villas - temporary permit to construct a retaining wall in PBID easement area
 - b) Temporary permit to install power lines in PBID easement
5. CONSIDERATION OF ENGINEERING PROPOSAL TO PREPARE PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS FOR WATER MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS IV & V AS CONTAINED IN THE PROPOSAL DATED JULY 22, 1981
6. ADDENDUM TO OFFICE SPACE AGREEMENT WITH CR-CP, INC.
7. ACCEPTANCE OF EASEMENTS FOR UNIT IV, SINGLE FAMILY AREA
8. CONSIDERATION OF ENGINEERING PROPOSAL FOR DESIGN OF WATER & SEWER FACILITIES TO SERVE PARCEL "Q", OAKHURST.
9. STREET LIGHTING:
 - a) Consideration of engineering proposal for preparation of plans and specifications for Street Lighting Facilities, Unit IV, Single Family area

- b) Authorization to request the County Commission to amend the Street Lighting Ordinance establishing the Pelican Bay Special Municipal Street Lighting District to include Unit IV, Single Family area
- 10. AUTHORIZATION TO BID WATER AND SEWER SERVICE CONNECTIONS
 - 11. ENGINEER'S REPORT
 - a) Consideration of award of contract for construction of Booster Pump Station
 - b) Certificate of Payment
 - c) Status Report
 - 12. SUPERVISORS' REQUESTS & AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION
 - 13. MANAGER'S REPORT
 - 14. TREASURER'S REPORT
 - 15. ADJOURNMENT

ROLL CALL

President Scuderi called the meeting to order and asked the record show four members of the Board present with Treasurer Stanley Brooks absent.

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD JULY 22, 1981 - APPROVED WITH CORRECTION

Mr. Turner moved, seconded by Mr. Brown and carried 4-0, with Mr. Brooks absent, that the minutes of the meeting held July 22, 1981 be approved with the following correction:

Page 885 - Fourth line from the top should read "former Board member Mrs. Viola Barclay"

FY 1981-1982 BUDGETS FOR WATER MANAGEMENT AND STREET LIGHTING - APPROVED AS CORRECTED - WATER/WASTEWATER BUDGET FY 1981-1982 POSTPONED UNTIL SEPTEMBER, 1981 MEETING

Legal notice having been published in the Naples Daily News on August 7, 12, 21 and 23, 1981 as evidenced by the Affidavits of Publication, public hearing was held to consider the following budgets for FY 1981-1982:

- 1. Water Management Budget
- 2. Street Lighting Budget

Mr. Moyer explained the postponement in considering the Wastewater/Water budget until the meeting in September, 1981 was due to a substantial change in the absorption rate of new construction. This change having been made