

Naples, Florida

February 18, 1987

LET IT BE KNOWN, that the Pelican Bay Improvement District met on this date in Regular Session at 4:00 P.M., in the Naples Federal Savings & Loan Building, Fifth Floor, 5801 Pelican Bay Boulevard, Naples, Florida, with the following members present:

PRESIDENT:	Miles Scofield
SECRETARY:	Sue E. MacAlister
TREASURER:	Sylvia A. Moll
	Ramer B. Holtan
	James D. Hake

ALSO PRESENT: Mr. Gary L. Moyer, District Manager; Mr. James P. Ward, Assistant District Manager; Messrs. Byron Koste, Jack McKenna and Charles Penn of Westinghouse Communities of Naples, Inc.; Mr. Tom Peek and Steve Means of Wilson, Miller, Barton, Soll & Peek; Mr. Tracy Bolesky, Attorney for the District; Mr. Neil Fagan of Goldman, Sachs & Co.; Mr. Harmon Turner, Consultant to the Board; Messrs. John Petty and Robert Parmelee of the Pelican Bay Improvement District; Mr. Jack Portman and Mr. Carl Bowen, Representatives of the Pelican Bay Property Owner's Association and Jean Smith, Assistant Secretary.

AGENDA

1. Roll Call.
2. Approval of Minutes of the Meeting held January 21, 1987.

AGENDA (CONT.)

3. Consideration of Grant of Easement for water lines constructed to connect the District System with City of Naples.
4. Consideration of Engineering Proposal from Post, Buckley, Schuh & Jernigan, Inc. for revised compensation and services relative to construction inspection of the Wastewater Treatment Plant.
5. Engineer's Report.  
A) Certificates of Payment.
8. Manager's Report.
9. Confirmation of Invoices.
10. Supervisor's Requests and Audience Participation.
11. Adjournment.

ROLL CALL

Ms. MacAlister called the meeting to order at 4:00 P.M. and asked the record show Mr. Miles Scofield absent with all other members present. (Mr. Scofield arrived for the meeting at 4:10 P.M.)

MINUTES OF JANUARY 21, 1986 - APPROVED AS SUBMITTED

Ms. Moll moved, seconded by Mr. Holtan and approved unanimously, the Minutes of January 21, 1986 as submitted.

CONSIDERATION OF GRANT OF EASEMENT FOR WATER LINES CONSTRUCTED TO CONNECT THE DISTRICT SYSTEM WITH THE CITY OF NAPLES

Mr. Moyer advised that with the completion of the lines that interconnect the District's water system with the City of Naples, it was now necessary for the District to consider acceptance of an easement for the operation and maintenance of these lines. By way of a map, Mr. Moyer pointed out to the Board the routing of the water lines connecting the two systems.

At this time, Mr. Hake moved, seconded by Mr. Holtan and approved unanimously acceptance of the Grant of Easement from Westinghouse Communities of Naples, Inc. for the water lines constructed to connect the District System with the City of Naples.

CONSIDERATION OF ENGINEERING PROPOSAL FROM POST, BUCKLEY, SCHUH & JERNIGAN, INC. FOR REVISED COMPENSATION AND SERVICES RELATIVE TO CONSTRUCTION INSPECTION OF THE WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT

Mr. Moyer recalled that at a previous meeting the Board had approved a Proposal with Post, Buckley, Schuh & Jernigan, Inc. for Professional Services during the construction and post construction phase of the Wastewater Treatment Plant. He explained that since this approval he had been informed by Post, Buckley, Schuh & Jernigan, Inc. that the original Proposal had not covered the necessary inspection fees for PBS&J to certify that the plant was constructed in accordance with their plans and specifications. Mr. Moyer told the Board that it was staff's opinion that the original agreement did cover this certification and they had expressed this opinion to PBS&J. However, he stated PBS&J has stood firm in expressing their view that their fees for these services were not outlined in the original Agreement and subsequently had provided another Proposal which identified their services during the construction phase of the Wastewater Treatment Plant.

Mr. Moyer stated that this Agreement called for a "not to exceed" fee of \$54,500.00 and would also cover the fees of professional associates, out-of-pocket expenses and applicable service charges.

Mr. Hake stated that he thought the whole Contract was "a piece of garbage". Mr. Scofield suggested that the Contract contained too many provisions whereby PBS&J could charge additional fees.

Mr. Moyer suggested that he had held conversations regarding this Proposal with Wilson, Miller, Barton, Soll & Peek and based upon these conversations and his own personal knowledge, he advised the Board that the

fee as proposed seemed reasonable.

Mr. Scofield suggested that he did not like the language as outlined in Item 6, Page 2 of the Agreement which stated that PBS&J "would not be responsible for the construction procedures, safety precautions or failure of the Contractor to perform the construction as per approved plans". Mr. Moyer explained that the Engineer could not take on this responsibility and you could not hold the Engineer responsible for the omissions of the Contractor.

Mr. Peek of Wilson, Miller, Barton, Soll & Peek explained this item in more detail. Mr. Peek suggested that this was standard language in Engineering Contracts and advised that the Engineer was not responsible for building the structure, that he was only on-site to observe what was being built and to act as the Owner's Representative to report if the Contractor was complying with the plans and specifications. He advised that the Engineer had no control over telling the Contractor how or what to build and the Contractor by his Contract was responsible for building what was on the plans and specifications. He explained that if you were to put the Engineer in the position of being responsible for the construction, the Engineer would have to become the Contractor so that he would have full control over everything being built and the Engineer was not in the contracting business.

Mr. Hake asked who the Owner's Representative would be for this contract. Mr. Moyer replied that it would most likely be Mr. John Petty, a current employee of the District. Mr. Hake asked what Mr. Petty's qualifications were to enable him to supervise construction of the plant.

Mr. Peek suggested that the District's representative on the site would not supervise the actual construction; that the Contractor was responsible for having a designated supervisor of construction on the site. He explained that the District's day-to-day representative would monitor the daily activities of the contractor.

Mr. Moyer explained that PBS&J's original Proposal, previously approved by the Board, included approximately \$33,000 to perform construction related services for the Wastewater Treatment Plant. He explained, however, that PBS&J did not interpret the original Proposal to include certification of the project.

After discussion of PBS&J's fee for travel compensation, Mr. Hake suggested that the proposal be amended to read that travel compensation would be limited to reimbursement from PBS&J's Fort Myers office to the Naples site and the return.

Mr. Scofield had a question regarding PBS&J's 150% surcharge for overhead and profit. Mr. Peek advised that this was a reasonable and standard rate in the engineering business. Mr. Ward advised that this surcharge had been standard on all past Proposals from PBS&J and he would contact PBS&J to obtain an updated personnel rate schedule.

Mr. Hake also suggested that the way the Agreement currently read, if PBS&J had invoiced incorrectly and there was a dispute regarding an invoice, even if PBS&J was incorrect in the dispute they had the right to charge the District for attorney fees, etc. Mr. Ward suggested the sentence in Item IV under Invoicing Procedures that read, "The Owner agrees that unpaid monthly invoices shall accrue interest based on the rate of 15%

per annum, after they have been unpaid for 30 days subsequent to said Board meeting in the month in which the invoice is submitted", be amended to "..... in the month in which the invoice is approved". Mr. Scofield also suggested that the Agreement be amended to read that if a problem with the invoicing was caused by the Engineer, the Engineer would not be reimbursed and the District could collect Attorney's fees from the Engineer.

Mr. Hake asked why Wilson, Miller, Barton, Soll & Peek couldn't be hired to certify the project and forget about PBS&J. Mr. Moyer advised that there would be more recourse against PBS&J should the need arise if PBS&J certified that the project had been constructed in accordance with their plans and specifications. He also stated that staff had held many discussions with Mr. Harmon Turner and Mr. Tom Peek on this same subject and they all had agreed that it would be in the best interests of the District to have PBS&J certify the project. Mr. Peek advised that if there was any possible way to live with PBS&J for the duration of the Contract the District would be better off since PBS&J was the firm who designed the plant, knew the intent of their design and were in the best position to review those things that needed to be reviewed during the course of construction and to make appropriate recommendations. He suggested that it would cost the District more money if WMBS&P were put in the position of having to certify construction of the plant because they would need to go through a learning process to bring themselves up to speed on the project.

Mr. Peek told the Board that he felt PBS&J's Proposal was basically a good Proposal and he did not feel the amount of the Contract was out of line if you looked at the complexity and magnitude of the

project.

Following further discussion, Mr. Hake moved, seconded by Ms. Moll and approved unanimously the Engineering Proposal from Post, Buckley, Schuh & Jernigan, Inc., in an amount not to exceed \$54,500, subject to: obtaining a current hourly rate schedule; there be no charge to the District for problems or errors caused by the Engineer; charges for travel be limited from PBS&J's Fort Myers office to the job site in Naples, and that unpaid invoices accrue interest after they have been unpaid for 30 days subsequent to said Board meeting in the month in which the invoice was approved.

ENGINEERS REPORT

At this time the following Certificates Of Payment were presented for approval by the Board:

<u>CERTIFICATE NO.</u>		<u>CONTRACTOR</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
City of Naples Interconnect - Contract D-24 Construction Serv.	No. 102	Denco Construction Co.	17,022.06
City of Naples Interconnect - Contract D-24 Engineering Serv.	No. 100	Post, Buckley, Schuh & Jernigan	1,504.74
1985 Bond Proceeds WWTP - Construction Services	No. 101	Post, Buckley, Schuh & Jernigan	1,345.75
1985 Bond Proceeds WWTP - Construction Services	No. 103	Metro Equipment & Construction	77,400.00
1985 Bond Proceeds WWTP - Construction Services	No. 105	Metro Equipment & Construction	36,549.00
Unit VI Street Lights Design Services	No. 4	Post, Buckley, Schuh & Jernigan	584.15

<u>CERTIFICATE NO.</u>		<u>CONTRACTOR</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
Contract D-17 - Oakmont - Additional Services	No. 3	Post, Buckley, Schuh & Jernigan	746.71
Wellfield Expansion Construction Serv.	No. 104	Stevens & Layton	24,862.76
TOTAL AMOUNT ALL INVOICES			\$ 160,015.17

Following this discussion, Ms. Moll moved, seconded by Ms. MacAlister, and approved unanimously, that the Certificates of Payment be approved as presented.

MANAGERS REPORT

Mr. Moyer stated that over the past few weeks he had held discussions with Goldman, Sachs & Co. regarding the possibility of refunding a portion of the 1985 bonds. Mr. Moyer advised the Board that by refunding a portion of these bonds there could be a gross savings to the District of approximately \$825,741.00. At this time, Mr. Moyer introduced Mr. Neil Fagan of Goldman, Sachs & Co. who was in attendance to discuss an analysis that had been prepared by his firm for the refunding of a portion of the 1985 Water/Sewer Bond Issue.

Mr. Fagan advised the Board that his firm had been monitoring this bond issue, as they do for all of their clients, and his firm projected that for the next 90 to 120 days interest rate levels would remain stable. He advised that at this time an economic savings on this issue was possible and it was their recommendation that the District take advantage of the significant improvement in the municipal market which had

occurred since the summer of 1985 and advance refund a majority of the 1985 bonds. He stated that this would not completely refund all of the bonds that were issued in 1985 but would leave outstanding some of the serial bonds which carried the lower interest rates. He stated that they were recommending that \$7,350,000 in bonds be refunded, beginning on March 1, 1997. This would leave \$1,785,000 in bonds that would remain unrefunded covering the years March 1, 1988 through March 1, 1996. He explained that because of the mechanics of refunding, it did not make economic sense to issue more bonds to advance refund the bonds from March 1, 1988 through March 1, 1996 because the margin of savings would be very minimal.

Mr. Holtan asked Mr. Fagan to explain the mechanics of refunding. Mr. Fagan explained that as a result of the original bond issue the District has total sources of funds of \$8,772,125.00. He stated that the vast majority of bond proceeds are placed in an irrevocable escrow account and invested in U.S. Government Securities and the proceeds can only be used to pay the debt service requirements on the refunded bonds. He explained that the funds would no longer be a debt of the District because provision would have been made for the payment of interest, principal and call premiums on the bonds. He stated that in the place of the refunded bonds the District would have new bonds and these bonds would bear the much lower interest rates that exist in the market today.

Mr. Fagan advised that the underwriters discount would be 1.5% and other cost of issuance fees would entail legal fees, printing costs, consulting engineers fees, escrow agents fees and insurance premiums. Mr. Holtan asked whether these costs were standard throughout the industry.

Mr. Fagan replied that in the previous issue Goldman, Sachs had presented a Pricing Booklet to the Board which contained an analyses of different issues and reflected the fact the Goldman, Sachs & Co.'s underwriting discount was consistent with other bond issues that had been marketed at the same time. Mr. Holtan asked Mr. Fagan if he would supply him with such a Pricing Booklet. He told Mr. Holtan he would be more than happy to supply him with a Pricing Booklet. Mr. Fagan explained that for each underwriting Goldman, Sachs & Co. prepares a pricing analysis in which they try to anticipate every question the Board might have and which would give them a comparison of fees.

Mr. Hake asked whether there would be any transfer of proceeds penalty. Mr. Fagan explained that normally the transfer of proceeds penalty is reflected as a deduction to the net present value debt service savings. He told Mr. Hake that there was no transfer of proceeds penalty in their Advance Refunding Analysis, however, he would check on this matter in more detail.

Mr. Scofield asked if the total amount of the District's bonding capacity would remain the same if the District proceeded with this refunding. Mr. Fagan replied that the District would be dipping slightly into the authorized but unissued bonds. He explained that to advance the proposed \$7,350,000 in bonds the District would be required to issue \$8,820,000 in new bonds.

Mr. Hake asked whether there would be any material change in the proposed bond indenture. Mr. Fagan explained that Goldman, Sachs would have difficulty in making changes unless the District advance refunded all

of the outstanding debt because when the previous bonds were issued the District in essence entered into a contract with the bond holders and if the District desired to change any of these provisions they would need the consent of 2/3 of the bond holders. Mr. Fagan stated that in his opinion the program his firm was recommending made the most sense.

Mr. Hake asked if this refunding program was an attempt to defease the Bond Indenture. Mr. Fagan replied that this proposal was purely an advance refunding for economic debt service savings and was not an attempt to defease the Bond Indenture.

Mr. Hake asked Mr. Fagan whether he was aware that the previous Board of the Pelican Bay Improvement District had changed the method of receiving revenue without notifying Bond Counsel. Mr. Hake stated that the terms of the Bond Indenture had been changed because the Bond Indenture stated that WCN would pay stand-by fees on the water line to the Ritz. Mr. Moyer replied that the Bond Indenture had not been changed and it merely states that the District will charge adequate rates, fees and other charges to cover the principal, interest and 110% of the debt service and this is what the District had done. Mr. Moyer showed Mr. Hake the Rate Covenant in the Bond Indenture and stated that there was nothing in the Rate Covenant which stated that WCN had to pay stand-by fees. He explained to Mr. Hake that the Official Statement was not the same thing as the Bond Indenture.

Ms. Moll stated that the Board is required to collect sufficient fees to cover the District's indebtedness and that is what the Board has done.

Mr. Fagan explained to Mr. Hake that the Rate Covenant is one of the key items that every prospective bond holder should look at. He stated that a prospective bond holder should look at the amount of existing debt, the amount of proposed new debt, the Rate Covenant and the issuance test for additional parity bonds. Mr. Fagan explained that the District's Rate Covenant states that the District has covenanted "that it will make, impose, charge and collect thru its rates, charges, fees and tolls in respect to all direct or indirect connection with and all uses of the system and as often as it appears necessary the rates, charges, fees and tolls shall be adjusted so that revenues in each Fiscal Year together with other monies available therefore will be not less than the amount expected to be required for the payment of operating expenses of the system plus 110% of the bond service for such Fiscal Year plus the requirements established for reserves...". Mr. Fagan explained that these Bond Covenants are very standard. He also stated that he was not a lawyer but he would think if the District was doing anything to the detriment of bond holders, the flag would have been raised with the Trustee, Bond Registrar and Paying Agent. Mr. Hake stated that he had held discussions regarding this issue with an unnamed source and when this person found out that the rates were changed without notifying Bond Counsel he inferred to Mr. Hake that the whole thing might be fraudulent. Mr. Moyer advised Mr. Hake that the Rate Covenant is what you commit to the Bond Holders and by which you run the District and this is what the District has done, i.e, established rates, fees and charges which are sufficient to make the debt service payments on the bonds. Mr. Moyer stated that he would be more than happy

to write Bond Counsel for their opinion regarding Mr. Hake's allegations.

At this time, Mr. Hake moved, seconded by Mr. Holtan and approved, with Ms. Moll and Ms. MacAlister voting nay, that Mr. Moyer write to Bond Counsel to obtain their opinion whether what had been done regarding the new rate structure was fitting and proper.

Following this motion, the Board agreed to table approval of the refunding until the next meeting and until Mr. Hake's concerns had been addressed.

Mr. Moyer stated that during this interim period he would like the Board's approval to contact Bond Counsel to determine their fee for their services should the refunding occur. The Board gave Mr. Moyer approval to contact Bond Counsel.

Mr. Portman stated that it would seem to him that before the Board made a decision on the Bond refunding: the Board should know the status of all the Bond Funds and what commitments had been made against these funds; that instead of swelling the issue and increasing the debt, the Board hold the issue down and not raise additional capital; that it would be prudent to accept other proposals for refunding; determine whether the statutory requirements of the rate change had been met; and obtain an audited Financial Statement.

Mr. Fagan explained to Mr. Portman that via this refunding the District is not raising additional capital, that whenever you go from high interest rates to low interest rates you always issue more principal amount of refunding bonds; that there is no way to come up with the necessary escrow for deposit without doing so.

Following this discussion, Mr. Moyer thanked Mr. Fagan for his presentation.

SUPERVISORS REQUESTS

At this time, Mr. Hake thanked PBID staff and WCN for their efforts in cleaning up the lakes in Pelican Bay but stated that he was upset by the remarks from PBID staff in which they stated that they were not concerned about the aesthetics of the lakes but rather with the water quality. It was his point of view that PBID should be concerned about the appearance of the lakes as well as the water quality; that it would be to everyone's benefit. Mr. Moyer advised that the District system is run according to permits granted to the District by the SFWMD. He advised that there is a difference between lakes for aesthetic purposes and lakes for water management purposes and water quality is of the utmost concern to the District and in order to obtain water quality within a lake area you have to have aquatics. He advised that if you didn't have aquatics you would not have the absorption of the nitrogen and phosphorus that is needed. He stated that if the District violated certain parameters of the permit they would be cited. Mr. Moyer advised Mr. Hake that the lakes in Pelican Bay would always contain aquatics however, staff would strive for a balance between aquatics and appearance.

Mr. Scofield told the Board that debris from the construction sites had been blowing into many of the lakes and in discussions with Collier County he had determined that any time a Contractor was not cleaning up and maintaining his site, Collier County could withhold an inspection until the site was maintained. Thus, there was a certain amount

of recourse to the District to keep the Contractors from throwing debris into the lakes.

Mr. Scofield also told the Board that he had visited Bears Paw to observe their lakes and was highly impressed with regard to the appearance of their lakes. He stated that he had held discussions with their personnel who told him that they use a hybrid grass eating carp to control the weeds in their lakes. He offered this as a possible solution to the problem with the lakes in Pelican Bay.

Mr. Petty stated that grass eating carp tend to eat all of the aquatics in a lake and to date there is no perfect hybrid to handle the needs of Pelican Bay. He also stated that staff had investigated the possibility of using plants to control nutrients as well as using a type of carp to minimize the aquatics. Mr. Scofield asked Mr. Petty if he would visit Bears Paw and report back to the Board. Mr. Petty said he would be happy to do so.

Mr. Hake asked when the Board could expect to hear from Coopers & Lybrand. Mr. Moyer told the Board that they could expect to hear from them at the March Meeting.

At this time Mr. Byron Koste of WCN asked to address the Board. He told the Board that he had been coming to the meetings longer than any of the present Board members and in the short period of time since the seating of the new Board he had seen a great change which concerned him. He stated that never before had he seen one Board member attack another Board member who was trying to help. He suggested that the Board members were all volunteers who were trying to help. He stated that he has also

seen an attitude change in the audience which greatly disturbed him. He said that Pelican Bay works only if everyone works together and the more everyone fights the less everyone works together. He was concerned that the feelings being generated were not positive and stated that Pelican Bay was built on being constructive not destructive. He wasn't suggesting that everyone had to agree all the time, but felt that everyone should take the time to listen to the other person and be civilized. He told the Board that this meeting was the least civilized meeting he had ever attended and to him this was regrettable. He also stated that he had never heard an accusation of defeasance by a Board member. He said this was okay if it was indeed what had happened, however, the suggestion of defeasance was a serious allegation and he knew of no professional involved in Pelican Bay, i.e., engineers, management, Bond Counsel, Developers, etc. who would ever do anything to defease these Bonds. He said that if indeed something had happened and everyone is human and errors could have been made but he could not believe that the professional teams involved in Pelican Bay would be a part of a covert effort to deceive. He stated that the way things were going would not lead to the ultimate development of Pelican Bay especially with the prevailing attitude. He thanked the Board for allowing him the time to speak.

CONFIRMATION OF INVOICES

Water/Sewer Operating Summary and Invoices For January 1987 - Approved As Presented

At this time, Ms. MacAlister moved, seconded by Ms. Moll and carried unanimously, that the Water/Sewer Operating Summary and Invoices for January, 1987, be approved as presented.

Pelican Bay Improvement District  
February 18, 1987

---

Water Management Operating Summary and Invoices For January 1987 -  
Approved As Presented


At this time, Ms. Moll moved, seconded by Mr. Holtan and carried unanimously, that the Water Management Operating Summary and Invoices for January, 1987, be approved as presented.

Following approval of the invoices, Mr. Hake asked whether the residents of PBID were going to need filters on their water systems when the District started purchasing bulk treated potable water from the City of Naples.

Mr. Petty replied that filters should not be necessary.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned. Time: 6:05 P.M.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
MR. MILES B. SCOFIELD  
PRESIDENT  
PELICAN BAY IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT

PELICAN BAY IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT  
WATER/SEWER INVOICES  
JANUARY 1987

<u>PAYEE</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
U.S. Postmaster	Postage Stamps	22.00
Bill Smith Appliance	Refrigerator	459.00
Joe Stevenson	Reimbursement - Freight Charges	19.80
B-B Builders	Fencing Material	1,427.08
Florida Power & Light Co.	W/S Portion December Electric	10,475.04
Robbins Answering Service	W/S Portion Jan. Answering Service	32.45
Tracy H. Bolesky	Legal Services 12/2/86 Thru 12/23/86	2,300.00
Sarlo Power Mowers, Inc.	Lawn Mower - Utility Site	519.00
The Office	Shipping Charging	14.92
B & H Sales	Meter Supplies	222.90
File One	W/S Portion Dec. Office Supplies	31.73
Qualicom Electronics	Repair Radio	20.00
Sunshine Pipe & Supply	R.O. Plant Supplies	55.73
Stevens & Leupold, Inc.	Recorder & Accessories Repair - Wellfield Repairs	1,141.54
Naples Daily News	Help Wanted Advertising	68.00
PB&S Chemical Co.	R.O. Plant Chemicals	2,446.00
United Telephone	W/S Portion December Telephone	278.24
J.N. Environmental	December W/W Analyses	140.65
Sunshine Ace Hardware	December Office Supplies	67.50
Coral Springs Improvement District	W/S Portion January Health & Dental Insurance	384.25
Bob Dean Supply, Inc.	Rewind 60 H.P. Motor - HSP Irrigation Pump	1,306.67
Harn R/O Systems, Inc.	Flocon	1,838.55
Davis Meter & Supply	Backflow Preventers	1,620.00
Community Electric	Repair Damaged 3-Phase Breaker Junction Box At Wellfield	617.55
J.C. Drainfield Repair	Pump D-14 Lift Station	475.00
Neptune Water Meter Co.	Meters	2,036.63
Coast Pump & Supply	Irrigation Supplies	59.95
Department of Highway Safety & Motor Vehicles	State Tags 1987 Ford Ranger	18.40
Tamiami Ford	1987 Ford Ranger	10,927.00
Robert M. Parmelee	Film W/S Inspection	21.90
B & H Sales	Meters & Meter Supplies	1,396.40
J.C. Drainfield Repair	Pump Sludge Sewage Treatment Plant	750.00
Coral Springs Improvement District	W/S Portion December Office Supplies & Services	101.48
Sears, Roebuck & Company	W/S Portion Employee Uniforms	141.96
Coast Pump & Supply	Irrigation Supplies	195.82

PELICAN BAY IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT  
 WATER/SEWER INVOICES  
 JANUARY 1987  
 (PAGE 2)

Calgon Corporation	Polymer For Wastewater Treatment Plant	1,882.08
Bay Electric of Collier	Repair 100 H.P. Breaker R.O. Train #1	180.00
Underground Supply Co.	Distribution & Collection Supplies	1,143.80
Southwest Electric Supply	Electrical Supplies	65.16
Coral Springs Improvement District	W/S Portion October & November Office Supplies & Services	165.57
Coral Springs Improvement District	Water Quality Testing - W/W Samples	420.00
Tri-County Blueprint	Office Supplies	20.50
Pine Ridge Rental	Rent Generator & Auger	164.00
Carl Eric Johnson, Inc.	R.O. Chemical Drum Pumps	875.00
File One	W/S Portion January Office Supplies	17.86
J.C. Drainfield	Pump Sludge Sewage Treatment Plant	1,350.00
Weavers	W/S Portion December & January Office Supplies	27.75
Calgon Corporation	High Viscosity Pump - Polymer For Wastewater Treatment Plant	699.51
Florida Water Processing Company	R.O. Chemical Pump	244.83
Federal Express	W/S Portion December & January Courier Service	62.50
PB&S Chemical Co.	R.O. Plant Chemicals	2,234.10
B & H Sales	Meter Supplies	30.00
Hyatt Sprinkler Supplies	Pressure Gauge For Potable Storage Tank	9.17
Wesco	Circuit Breaker For R.O. Train #1	227.00
Thomas E. Schwartz	Reimbursement For Office Supplies	4.10
John Petty	Reimbursement For Office Supplies	12.90
Tri-County Blueprint	Mylars	27.00
Underground Supply Co.	Irrigation Supplies	103.20
Purolator Courier Corp.	December Courier Service	9.30
Motorola, Inc.	Hand Held Radio & Charger	770.00
Sewer Viewer, Inc.	T.V. W/S Line - Contract D-17	492.45
Signs & Things	Letter Office Door	275.00
U.S. Postmaster	Postage Stamps	44.00
Department of Highway Safety & Motor Vehicles	State Tags 1/2 Ton Pickup	18.40

PELICAN BAY IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT  
WATER MANAGEMENT INVOICES  
JANUARY 1987

<u>PAYEE</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
PBID W/S Account	R-O-W Maintenance 9/15 to 11/15/86	2,479.59
U.S. Postmaster	Postage Stamps	22.00
James Giles, Clerk of Court	Recording Fees - PBID Easements	13.50
Florida Power & Light Co.	Crayton Road Sprinkler Clock - Dec.	9.00
Robbins Telephone Answering Service	W/M Portion Jan. Answering Service - R.O. Plant	32.45
Naples Federal Savings & Loan	Meeting Room Rental - December 17, 1986 Board Meeting	50.00
File One	W/M Portion December Office Supplies	31.73
United Telephone	W/M Portion December Telephone	180.06
Sunshine Ace Hardware	W/M Portion Office Supplies	67.49
Coral Springs Improvement District	W/M Portion January Health & Dental Insurance	384.25
Helena Chemical Co.	Lake & Swale Maintenance Chemicals	1,417.50
Coral Springs Improvement District	W/M Portion December Office Supplies & Services	101.48
Richardson & Associates	Retainage Due 1986 R-O-W Maintenance Contract	28,608.88
U.S. Postmaster	Postage Stamps	22.00
Helena Chemical Co.	Lake Maintenance Chemicals	850.50
Boat Haven Naples, Inc.	Miscellaneous Hardware	97.00
Naples Daily News	Notice of Public Meeting	13.25
Sears, Roebuck & Co.	W/M Portion Employee Uniforms	141.96
W.H. Turner	Consultation Services - December 1986	450.00
PBID W/S Account	R-O-W Maintenance 11/15 to 12/15/86	830.37
Coral Springs Improvement District	W/M Portion Oct. & Nov. Office Supplies & Services	119.23
Coral Springs Improvement District	Lake Samples	990.00
File One	W/M Portion January Office Supplies	17.86
Weavers	W/M Portion December & January Office Supplies	27.75
Federal Express Corp.	W/M Portion December & January Courier Service	62.50
Naples Daily News	Notice of Public Meeting	16.75
Jacaranda Landscape	Repair Gulf Park Right-Of-Way At Cart Crossing	94.25
Motorola, Inc.	Hand Held Radio	770.00
Westinghouse Communities of Naples, Inc.	Sprinkler Repair - Slashpine Court	118.00
U.S. Postmaster	Postage Stamps	44.00

PELICAN BAY IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT  
WATER AND WASTEWATER OPERATING SUMMARY  
JANUARY 1987

	<u>MONTH TO DATE</u>				<u>YEAR TO DATE</u>		
	<u>FISCAL YEAR 1986 BUDGET</u>	<u>BUDGET</u>	<u>ACTUAL</u>	<u>VARIANCE FAVORABLE (UNFAVORABLE)</u>	<u>BUDGET</u>	<u>ACTUAL</u>	<u>VARIANCE FAVORABLE (UNFAVORABLE)</u>
<u>CHARGES FOR SERVICES</u>							
Connection Fees	\$ 830,750	20,920	6,960	(13,960)	74,680	426,871	352,191
Meter Use Fees	28,250	2,000	500	(1,500)	6,500	60,880	54,380
<u>USER REVENUE</u>							
Water	482,866	39,826	39,363	(463)	155,768	158,145	2,377
Sewer	395,998	32,588	33,870	1,282	127,945	129,157	1,212
Irrigation	368,298	30,139	29,927	(212)	120,514	108,590	(11,924)
<u>TOTAL REVENUE</u>	<u>\$2,106,162</u>	<u>125,473</u>	<u>110,620</u>	<u>(14,853)</u>	<u>435,407</u>	<u>883,643</u>	<u>398,236</u>
<u>PROFESSIONAL FEES</u>							
Engineering	\$ 18,000	0	0	0	0	0	0
Legal	15,000	1,250	2,300	(1,050)	5,000	7,650	(2,650)
Audit	5,000	0	0	0	0	0	0
Trust	6,050	0	0	0	2,023	2,023	0
<u>SYSTEM OPERATING EXPENSES</u>							
Office	23,367	1,947	1,862	85	7,788	9,698	(1,910)
Billing	2,484	207	0	207	828	0	828
Insurance	18,562	18,562	24,258	(5,696)	18,562	24,491	(5,929)
Payroll	130,238	10,018	8,086	1,932	45,081	38,122	6,959
Transportation	9,750	813	37	776	3,250	335	2,915
Water Quality	18,183	1,515	561	954	6,060	4,965	1,095
Repairs & Maintenance	55,100	10,092	12,892	(2,800)	22,366	29,713	(7,347)
Electric	116,703	9,621	10,475	(854)	37,895	40,649	(2,754)
Chemicals	28,011	5,965	8,401	(2,436)	11,896	17,089	(5,193)
Contingencies	5,000	0	0	0	5,000	0	5,000
City of Naples Conn.	180,197	14,970	0	14,970	57,836	0	57,836
Meters	6,272	512	5,306	(4,794)	1,664	9,203	(7,539)
<u>TOTAL EXPENSES</u>	<u>\$ 637,917</u>	<u>75,472</u>	<u>74,178</u>	<u>1,294</u>	<u>225,249</u>	<u>183,938</u>	<u>41,311</u>

PELICAN BAY IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT  
WATER MANAGEMENT  
OPERATING SUMMARY  
JANUARY 1987

	<u>MONTH TO DATE</u>				<u>YEAR TO DATE</u>		
	<u>FISCAL YEAR 1987 BUDGET</u>	<u>BUDGET</u>	<u>EXPENSES</u>	<u>FAVORABLE (UNFAVORABLE) VARIANCE</u>	<u>BUDGET</u>	<u>EXPENSES</u>	<u>FAVORABLE (UNFAVORABLE) VARIANCE</u>
<b>MEETING EXPENSE</b>							
Supervisors Fees	\$ 6,000	500	500	0	2,000	2,000	0
Travel Reimbursement	300	25	0	25	100	33	67
Legal Notification	500	42	30	12	167	199	(32)
<b>PROFESSIONAL FEES</b>							
Engineering	10,800	2,500	2,500	0	2,500	2,500	0
Legal	6,000	500	0	500	2,000	730	1,270
Audit	4,500	0	0	0	0	0	0
Trust	1,500	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SYSTEM OPERATING EXPENSE</b>							
Office	18,007	1,501	892	609	6,003	7,332	(1,329)
Payroll	108,211	8,324	8,337	(13)	37,458	37,852	(394)
Transportation	4,334	362	0	362	1,445	270	1,175
Swale Maintenance	4,000	333	134	199	1,333	1,430	(97)
Lake Maintenance	17,340	1,445	3,911	(2,466)	5,780	5,111	669
Water Quality	6,720	560	990	(430)	2,240	1,540	700
Insurance	10,694	10,694	12,096	(1,402)	10,694	12,096	(1,402)
Rights-Of-Way	263,117	20,864	13,216	7,648	76,664	63,556	13,108
Water Connection	70,719	0	0	0	0	0	0
Water Use	17,908	1,492	3,319	(1,827)	5,969	3,621	2,348
Renewal & Replacement	6,000	500	0	500	2,000	0	2,000
Contingencies	8,000	667	1,220	(553)	2,667	1,820	847
<b>TOTAL EXPENSES</b>	<u>\$ 564,650</u>	<u>50,309</u>	<u>47,145</u>	<u>3,164</u>	<u>159,020</u>	<u>140,090</u>	<u>18,930</u>