

Naples, Florida

April 19, 1989

LET IT BE KNOWN, that the Pelican Bay Improvement District met on this date in Regular Session at 3:00 P.M., in the Naples Federal Savings & Loan Building, Fifth Floor, 5801 Pelican Bay Boulevard, Naples, Florida, with the following members present:

PRESIDENT:	James D. Hake
SECRETARY:	Ramer B. Holtan
	J. Russell Mudge
	James R. Dunwiddie
	Walter B. Potter

ALSO PRESENT: Mr. James P. Ward, Assistant District Manager; Mr. Joe McMackin, Attorney for the District; Messrs. Tom Peek, Ron Orach and Steve Means of Wilson, Miller, Barton, Soll & Peek; Messrs. Lou Hoegsted, Ben Briggs and Edward Griffith of Westinghouse Communities of Naples, Inc.; Mr. Rudy Small, Chairman of the Conservation Advisory Committee; Mr. John Petty of the Pelican Bay Improvement District; and Ms. Jean C. Smith, Assistant Secretary.

AGENDA

1. Roll Call.
2. Approval of Minutes of the Meetings held March 15, 1989 and March 30, 1989.
3. Discussion of Proposed Fiscal Year 1990 Street Lighting Budget.
4. Presentation of Proposed Foundation Expansion.
5. Engineer's Report.
6. Presentation of Proposed Plat of Unit 13.
7. Attorney's Report.
8. Manager's Report.

AGENDA (CONT.)

9. Certificates of Payment.
10. Confirmation of Invoices and Operating Summaries.
11. Supervisor's Requests.
12. Adjournment.

ROLL CALL

Mr. Hake called the meeting to order at 3:00 P.M. and asked the record show all members present.

MINUTES OF MEETING OF MARCH 15, 1989 - APPROVED AS AMENDED

Mr. Dunwiddie moved, seconded by Mr. Mudge and approved unanimously, the Minutes of March 15, 1989, subject to the following correction:

Page 3149 - In the seventh line of the second paragraph the word, "conservations" be amended to, "conversations".

MINUTES OF MEETING OF MARCH 30, 1989 - APPROVED AS PRESENTED

Mr. Dunwiddie moved, seconded by Mr. Mudge and approved unanimously, the Minutes of March 30, 1989, as presented.

DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED FISCAL YEAR 1990 STREET LIGHTING BUDGET

Mr. Hake commented that there seemed to be no allowance in the Budget for the anticipated repairs to the existing street lighting poles and stated that even though the District hopes to recover all or part of the anticipated expenditures, he felt this expenditure should be included in the Budget. Mr. Ward advised that he had included \$100,000.00 in the Budget for repairs to the street lighting system and he had included this figure in the Phase VII proposed loan, in the amount of \$210,000.00, proposed for May of this year (Page 8 of the Budget).

Mr. Mudge commented that there had been some discussion at

previous meetings of the Board regarding the large increase in the millage rate from Fiscal Year 1988 to Fiscal Year 1989. Mr. Ward advised that on Page 3 of his Memorandum to the Board, dated April 7, 1989, he had provided a budget comparison for Fiscal Years 1988, 1989 and 1990 and the millage rate as shown on this comparison, would decrease from .4353 in Fiscal Year 1989 to .3977 in Fiscal Year 1990. He explained in this comparison he had used the same assessed valuation as in Fiscal Year 1989, as the new assessed valuation will not be available for a few months and this was probably a conservative estimate and the actual millage rate for Fiscal Year 1990 might decrease even lower than .3977.

Mr. Dunwiddie commented that he felt all of the District's Budgets are too conservative, the result of which the District makes more money than it should and he stated the District should not make money but rather breakeven. He remarked that the Contingency Funds keep going up, whether there is a good reason for this or not and as a result, the District ends up with large surpluses at the end of the year. It was his opinion that Mr. Ward should not budget as conservatively as he does, primarily because the amount of the expenditures always rise to reach the budget and unless the budget is reasonable, he felt the expenditures would be too loose.

Mr. Mudge asked whether District staff receives many comments from residents regarding the millage rate. Mr. Ward responded that he very rarely receives any phone calls regarding the rates. Mr. Holtan asked Mr. Ward whether he has ever received any calls regarding the building up of large surpluses in the budgets. Mr. Ward responded that he has not and

explained that in the Street Lighting Budget, the carryforward is used as a deduction to the tax levy requirement for the next ensuing Fiscal Year. Mr. Hake asked whether the carryforward of \$41,841 was an actual number. Mr. Ward replied that the \$41,841 is a projected number at September 30, 1989 and is based upon the expenditures as of the end of March, 1989 plus the anticipated expenditures for April, 1989 through September, 1989.

Mr. Dunwiddie asked if the Board approved the Budget, as presented, whether this would give staff the authority to spend \$100,000 for repairs to the street light poles. Mr. Ward responded that today's purpose was for the Board to review the Budget in detail and ask any questions they might have and to make any changes in the Budget, as proposed. He explained that the May meeting would then be a Public Hearing and at this meeting he would ask the Board to adopt the Budget and after the Board adopted the Budget, it then is submitted to Collier County for their review and final approval in September, 1989. He advised that he would ask the Board at the May meeting to also approve a loan for the repairs to the street lighting system and the purchase of the luminaires, etc. and the actual amount of the loan would depend on the bids received by Wilson, Miller, Barton, Soll & Peek, Inc. for the repair work, plus the cost of the fixtures. Thus, he explained, that the amount of the loan would be based on actual figures and the Board would have the chance to review the plans and specifications before the request for the loan is approved. Mr. Hake asked Mr. Ward how he arrived at the figure of \$100,000 for repairs to the Street Lighting System. Mr. Ward responded that this figure was based upon his conversations with Mr. Means and Mr. Peek on what

they felt the cost of the repairs were going to be. Mr. Hake commented that these figures had not been discussed with him and he asked Mr. Means how he arrived at this figure. Mr. Means explained that the \$100,000 was arrived at by taking the initial estimates they had received some months ago from Bay Electric, the contractor the District uses for electrical work, and multiplying these numbers by the number of light poles which needed to be repaired, with a contingency figure added. Mr. Hake commented that he had run his own numbers for these repairs and he had come up with between \$80,000 and \$110,000 so he felt WMBS&P's estimate was reasonable.

Mr. Mudge asked Mr. Ward how he arrived at the figure of \$12,000 for legal services. Mr. Ward advised he had budgeted \$1,000 per month and his thoughts were to try and determine whether or not the District was going to get into any litigation next year regarding the problems with the street lighting system. He did not know whether this figure was high or low. Mr. Dunwiddie asked Mr. Hake whether it was likely the District was going to sue anybody. Mr. Hake replied that he would hope not, however, it was possible.

Mr. Dunwiddie asked what was covered under "Other Professional Fees". Mr. Ward responded these were administrative fees and were outlined on Page Four (4) of the Budget.

Mr. Dunwiddie asked Mr. Ward to explain the \$7,800.00 in the budget for "Reserve Requirement". Mr. Ward advised this is a Statutory requirement and required to be budgeted and at the end of the year it becomes a part of the fund balance and is used to reduce the next year's tax levy.

Mr. Hake commented that at a recent meeting held at the Commons between the members of the Foundation, WCN and the single family homeowners, a majority of the meeting was dedicated to the matter of security. He explained that several homeowners had expressed that they were still unhappy with the street lighting, particularly within the single family areas. He stated that as a result of the meeting, he had asked Mr. Ward to furnish him with a copy of the Minutes of the meeting held on May 20, 1987, at which time this matter had been discussed at great length. He advised that at this meeting several options were discussed and if the District was going to make any changes or experiment with different types of lighting, the money in the Contingency fund of the Budget would be available. Thus, he could find no fault with the Contingency figure in the Budget because it would give the District some money to use, if they decided to do this type of experimenting. He suggested the District could put a certain type of lighting fixture in several different areas and this could then be discussed with the residents to see which type of light they preferred.

Mr. Dunwiddie commented that before he was a member of the Board, there were many discussions held as to whether the way the District is taxing the residents is fair and equitable. He stated the Phase I Street Lighting Loan is now paid off and all of the residents who lived in Pelican Bay during Phase I have now paid their fair share of the street lights, however, they will continue to pay off existing and future street lighting loans because of the rapid rate at which the street lighting loans are paid off. It was his opinion that the long time residents of Pelican Bay are

paying a disproportionate share of the costs of the Street Lighting District. While he admitted that when the District took in all of Pelican Bay into the Street Lighting District it solved a great deal of this problem, he asked whether the rest of the Board was generally satisfied with the current method of taxation, even though the original owners have paid and still continue to pay a disproportionate share even though it is much less than it was before.

At this time, Mr. Hake read Mr. Dunwiddie's comments regarding this issue from the Minutes of May 20, 1987. Mr. Hake commented since the time of Mr. Dunwiddie's comments, the Board is still confronted with the same method of payment, i.e, residents who originally bought in Pelican Bay are paying off loans for the Street Lighting District and are still paying off loans as they are added and he felt there was a great deal of merit to what Mr. Dunwiddie had to say. However, he suggested that rather than postpone action on the Fiscal Year 1990 Street Lighting Budget, the members of the Board think about this issue to consider how they might wish this matter to be resolved or whether they felt the way it is currently being done is equitable.

There being no further discussion, Mr. Mudge moved, seconded by Mr. Hake and unanimously approved the Proposed Fiscal Year 1990 Street Lighting Budget.

PRESENTATION OF THE PROPOSED FOUNDATION EXPANSION

Mr. Ed Griffith of WCN explained that a site plan of the Foundation Expansion had been included in the Agenda Package and that the plan had been reviewed by the Conservation Advisory Committee. By use of

the Site Plan, Mr. Griffith depicted the Hardwood Hammock areas and the PBID easement areas and explained the expansion will consist of six additional tennis courts and approximately 100 additional parking spaces and in order to accommodate the additional courts and additional parking spaces there will have to be some modifications to the existing on-site drainage system. He explained that these drainage modifications will consist of drainage pipes and catch basins and the water will be routed to a detention area located in System II.

Mr. Mudge asked whether there would be a buffer between St. Lucia and the Foundation parking facilities. Mr. Griffith advised that additional landscaping is planned for a buffer area that Mr. Griffith referred to on the Site Plan. Mr. Mudge was concerned that trees would need to be removed to accommodate the parking area. Mr. Griffith explained that when the parking area is constructed, WCN would make adjustments in the field to try and save as many of the trees as possible. Mr. Griffith advised that WCN would not encroach into the easement and thus would not tamper with any vegetation currently in the easement. Also, he stated WCN would provide the District with an access easement through the park and through a drive and would also provide a gate.

Mr. Hake asked the purpose of the District's easement. Mr. Ward explained that the easement divides Systems II & III and is an access easement into System III which allows the District to get its trucks into this area.

Mr. Small, Chairman of the Conservation Advisory Committee, advised he was not sure this plan was ready for Board approval. He stated

his Committee had expressed their concern over some of the same things as the Board had mentioned and had also raised some questions regarding the adequacy of the parking, the number of tennis courts and how the foundation expansion fit into any overall plan. He also advised it was a concern of the Committee that there were no plans for parking at the north Boardwalk. He advised that he had recently attended a Foundation meeting and at the meeting he asked whether there was any Comprehensive Plan for Pelican Bay to cover such things as the overall buildout requirements for tennis courts, parking spaces for boardwalks, parks, shuffleboard courts, etc. and had received an indirect answer that there was no such plan. He suggested that before the Board approved the Foundation plans, they should ask the Foundation for a Comprehensive Plan showing where these future facilities would be located and suggested that this Study be performed by an outside Consulting Firm. It was the recommendation of the Conservation Advisory Committee that the Committee should receive additional information before they were in the position to make their recommendation to the Board and the Board obtain more information before they approved this plan. Mr. Small advised that the Committee did not see any violations into District easements, but suggested final approval from the Board should come after approval from the Regulatory Agencies.

Mr. Ben Briggs of WCN advised that the plan before the Board was put together by the Foundation Expansion Committee and over a year ago the Committee began with two very strong premises; that the parking at the Commons was inadequate and that four tennis courts were nowhere near sufficient for the demand. He explained that there are currently ninety

(90) parking spaces at the Commons and the planned expansion would more than double this and it was hoped that when construction was complete there would be two-hundred (200) asphalt parking spaces and the Expansion Committee felt that this would be sufficient parking for this particular area. Mr. Briggs also advised the Expansion Committee felt the tennis facilities should all be located in the same area and that ten (10) courts should serve the residents of Pelican Bay at buildout.

Mr. Hake commented that the District's Enabling Act charges the Board with looking after the Conservation Areas and Mr. Small has advised the Conservation Areas would not be touched in the Foundation Expansion. Mr. Hake advised that if the expansion does not encroach upon the Conservation Area, the Board can have no other concern about this proposal and this is as far as the Board can go and whether or not this expansion conformed with the PUD, etc. had to be the concern of others and not the concern of the Conservation Advisory Committee. He advised that if this plan does not encroach upon the Conservation Areas or any District easements, then he did not feel the Board had any alternative but to accept what was being proposed.

Mr. Small reiterated that his Committee saw no areas of violations into District easements, however, it seemed to him that unless there was some Comprehensive Plan, then the Board could be asked down the road to give up an easement because property that should be used for parking at the north Boardwalk was already sold. He suggested that at the very least, the Board, ought to approve this plan on the condition and with the understanding that the Board will not give up any easements in the

future for meeting PUD requirements and to provide for parking in the area of the northern Boardwalk. Mr. Hake did not feel the Board could take a position that it would not give any easements in the future, however, if they did there would have to be a good reason why they should give up an easement and, furthermore, he did not feel the Board could pre-suppose what might happen, when they don't know what will happen. He did not feel the Board could make a general statement saying they won't give up any easements.

At this time, Mr. Hake commented he did not feel that the proposed Foundation Expansion needed to be voted on or needed any Board approval, that all the Board was concerned about was that there were no encroachment into a District easements and this requirement had been satisfied.

Mr. Hake asked whether Mr. Ward had received any plans for the north Boardwalk. Mr. Ward responded he had not received any plans to date. Mr. Hake commented that the northern Boardwalk would have to go across a portion of the Conservation Area and at the time these plans are reviewed, the Board could address the issue of the parking in this area.

#### ENGINEER'S REPORT

Mr. Steve Means recalled for the Board that on January 18, 1989 the Board had authorized WMBS&P to prepare a report on the Phase III Utility Expansion and the scope of services included examining the existing historical information on flows and land use; to project future flows and unit population, and to take these numbers and apply them to potable water, irrigation water and wastewater to produce recommendations as to the master

planning of the future facilities. Mr. Means remarked WMBS&P's first task had been to audit the water use in Pelican Bay to determine actual flows on a unit basis for Groups I through IV and commercial. He advised that their second task was to review the new D.E.R. rule that could change the scope of how the WWTP and the irrigation water and treated water distribution system is master planned and that WMBS&P is currently discussing this regulation with D.E.R. and hoped to be in a position to discuss this with the Board at the next meeting. He commented their third task was to produce a battery of tests on the WWTP to determine different design parameters that are going to be needed to produce a design for the WWTP.

Mr. Ron Orach of WMBS&P advised that he had evaluated water records for each of the four Group Types, plus the Commercial units, in Pelican Bay going back as far as August, 1986 and took a detailed statistical look at these records to estimate the peak monthly flows and annual averages of these units. He stated the peak flow per unit is important because the peak month is what the District sees during the peak season in the winter months and this is what the system must deliver in terms of potable water and respond to in terms of wastewater demand. He distributed three recap sheets to the Board which summarized the information which had been generated. He explained the first sheet listed the various unit flows which were derived from the District's water meter records and advised the flows for Groups I, II and III were higher than was used in the previous studies based on the District's water records and the flow for Group IV was six gallons per day less than what had been used. He added that the flows for the Hotels were about 50% higher than used in

previous studies. He advised that the peak month flow that WMBS&P calculated at buildout was 2.78 mgd, peak potable demand, and this would be the average daily flow during a sustained monthly period. Mr. Mudge asked whether WMBS&P had used the lower anticipated buildout units as recently revised. Mr. Orach responded that these calculations had been based on the latest projections furnished by WCN.

Mr. Orach stated they had done some correlation between the master meter used by the City of Naples to bill the District for potable water versus wastewater flows and arrived at a factor that the wastewater flows are equal to about 95% of the potable water consumed and this was the factor that was used to project the wastewater flows. Mr. Orach further explained that the irrigation demands, as outlined, were based on the peak month and the annual average consumption for the different Group Types and he inadvertently left off the Golf Course flows and thus another 0.8 mgd should be added to the total to bring the total to 7.729 mgd.

Mr. Orach advised that WMBS&P is currently preparing a water model which will actually take the individual flows from all the units and check the sizes of the pipes, pumps, etc. in order to project what will be needed to upgrade the system.

Mr. Orach stated that ultimately the ideal situation would be to use the existing oxidation ditch and two more rotors and the District would then convert from an extended aeration process to a conventional activated sludge. However, he advised this plan rests with D.E.R., as current regulations call for two oxidation ditches. He also stated some thickening and dewatering equipment needed to be added to the Treatment Plant and he

is actively pursuing manufacturer information to find out the dimensions and prices of these units.

Mr. Holtan asked whether Mr. Orach thought that at buildout the District would end up with more wastewater than they can get rid of. Mr. Orach responded that the calculations derived from the numbers so far, showed the District generally uses more irrigation water than they generate in wastewater, thus, under normal circumstances the District should be able to get rid of the wastewater.

Mr. Dunwiddie asked whether WMBS&P had performed any studies to indicate whether the irrigation demand can be met by what comes from the existing wellfield pipes, plus the effluent. Mr. Means advised that he had not looked at this in depth, however, simple arithmetic would indicate that supplies, as they stand, will not be adequate to meet future peak demands, however, would be adequate to meet average demand. He stated that this would indicate that the District would need to look at an additional source of supply or impose conservation measures during the peak months. Mr. Ward recalled that this issue had previously been discussed by the Board and at ultimate buildout there seemed to be a deficit in the irrigation supply versus irrigation demands and the District will have to grapple with the issue that the South Florida Water Management District is urging utilities, including Pelican Bay, towards a conservation method versus just finding a new source of supply. He suggested that the answer might be two-fold: whether the District really wants to find an additional supply or does the District want to start encouraging more conservation in Pelican Bay to meet the criteria of the Regulatory Agencies. Mr. Hake suggested that the

District immediately proceed with the conservation method.

As an aside, Mr. Ward indicated he had recently been contacted by the South Florida Water Management District who notified him that they are going to start strictly enforcing the Phase II water restrictions in Pelican Bay and he had also learned that the Sheriff's Department is going to start coming into Pelican Bay and issuing first day warnings and tickets, thus the residents need to be aware that they will see some active enforcement in Pelican Bay in the next few weeks.

Mr. Ward advised there are many devices on the market that will monitor the amount of moisture in the ground and regulate the irrigation system accordingly. Mr. Hake asked Mr. Ward to look into the various water conservation devices on the market, their prices and the cost of installation and the District could perform a service by recommending these devices to the residents and Condominium Associations. Mr. Dunwiddie asked whether the District had the right to mandate that residents install such devices. Mr. Ward replied that the District almost has an obligation to do this. Mr. McMackin concurred that this would be within the parameters of the Board's authority. Mr. Dunwiddie asked staff to gather all the information they could and make a presentation on this subject at the next meeting.

Mr. Small suggested that District staff look at its own irrigation system, as many of the sprinkler heads for the rights-of-way are such that over half the water is watering the street and in many areas the system is poorly designed. Mr. Dunwiddie agreed that this needed to be looked at.

Mr. Means advised that the second item he wanted to discuss with the Board was District staff had requested that he address the issue of fencing the Utility Site and recalled for the Board that this issue had previously been discussed at a meeting which took place at the Utility Site. Through the use of a site map, Mr. Means described the areas which are currently fenced and the perimeter to be fenced (approximately 1,700 L.F.). He commented that he had contacted some local fencing companies to try and obtain some prices and the prices ranged from \$5,300 for a standard, galvanized fence to \$13,000 for a heavy grade vinyl fence. Mr. Dunwiddie explained that this issue was being raised today because one Sunday afternoon he had walked over to the Site and although the gate was closed and locked, he walked down the eleventh fairway and entered the site. He was of the opinion that if children found out they could get into this area this easily, they could be harmed or the District would experience some real damage and, thus, he felt it was incumbent on the Board to fence this area. Mr. Means commented the quotes he had received were for a six foot fence and advised that if it was the desire of the Board, the fence could have barbed wire on the top. Mr. Potter asked whether the galvanized steel fence or the vinyl fence would last longer. Mr. Means responded that there are various qualities of vinyl covered fencing and it would depend on the gauge of the vinyl fence. Mr. Dunwiddie commented that he did not feel the galvanized fence would last as long as the vinyl. Mr. Hake suggested that Mr. Means take a look at what type of fence is currently in place and find out when it was originally put in and locate the original specifications. He also suggested that it might not be

a good idea to spend a lot on the fence because the fence was supposed to play a large part in shielding the Utility Site from the surrounding condominiums and the original idea was to use a clinging vine on the fence as part of the landscaping for the Utility Site.

At this time, Mr. Ward stated that if the Board concurred with the idea of fencing the site, WMBS&P would prepare the specifications and put this out for bids and in the bid specifications they could offer alternatives so the Board could determine which type of fence they desired. Mr. Hake suggested that when the bids are submitted to the Board, samples of the fence be submitted as well. Mr. Hake further suggested that no motion was needed at this time and the Board concurred that the fencing of the Utility Site be put out for competitive bids.

PRESENTATION OF PROPOSED PLAT OF UNIT 13

Mr. Griffith presented a Site Plan showing the proposed Unit 13 Plat and advised that at this time WCN was asking for the Board's comments and suggestions regarding the Plat and subsequently their conceptual approval. Mr. Griffith explained that the infrastructure that is part of the Plat consists of the remainder of the extension of Greentree Drive; the extension of Oakmont Parkway, the remainder of Pelican Bay Boulevard to U.S. 41 and the Vanderbilt Beach connector road. He advised there would be approximately seventy two (72) lots within Unit 13 and the plat would be bounded on the west by the Golf Course and Units 6, 7, 11, 9 and 5 on the east and south side of the plat. Mr. Griffith remarked that WCN would like to return to the May meeting with the final plat and the accompanying documents for the Board's final approval.

Mr. Mudge asked if there was a Turkey Oak Preserve in Unit 13. Mr. Griffith responded that there is a Turkey Oak preserve located in Unit 13 and when the Unit 11 Plat was platted the southern boundary of the Preserve was defined and when Unit 13 is platted the northern boundary of the Preserve will be defined.

Mr. Dunwiddie remarked that it looked to him like the lot lines for the lots in Unit 13 go into the middle of Lake Six (6) and this was the same type of problem the District experienced with Georgetown. Mr. Hoegsted explained that the setback on these lots would be from the top of bank which is different from the way Georgetown was done. Mr. Hake asked how WCN could sell a piece of property to someone who could build on the District's easement. Mr. Ward explained that the buyer would not take title into the easement but rather take title subject to the easement, i.e., he would own title to the land, however, the District would actually own the easement. To clarify this issue, Mr. McMackin explained that to build within an easement, there are two estates; the dominant estate and the servient estate and in the case of Lake Six, the District's easement is the dominant estate and the buyer would have the servient estate and the use of the property could in no way inhibit the District's use and enjoyment of the easement. Thus, the property owner could not build on the District's easement. In response to Mr. Hoegsted's comments, Mr. McMackin stated the question whether the setback is measured from the District's easement line or the property line and if Mr. Hoegsted's remarks were correct, i.e., WCN is going to impose deed restrictions for the lots which state that the property owner may not build within so many feet of the bank, not the

property line and if the District's easement goes to the top of the bank, then Mr. Hoegsted's statement would be a correct statement and the property owner must build so many feet from the top of bank. However, if WCN's deed restrictions state that the setback is from the property line, then the owner has two problems: first they can't build within so many feet of the property line and secondly they can't build on the District's easement if the setback and easement line are not the same. In other words, he explained, where the buyer can build depends on the deed restrictions. Mr. Dunwiddie remarked that the Board's approval should be subject to WCN's deed restrictions. Mr. Griffith advised that WCN would make the deed restrictions part of the plat submittal documents, so the Board could have the opportunity to review them.

Following further discussion, the Board concurred that this matter should be reviewed by the Conservation Advisory Committee and brought back to the Board at the May Meeting.

ATTORNEY'S REPORT

Mr. McMackin remarked that at the Workshop Meeting of March 30, 1989, he had been asked by Mr. Hake to review a letter written by Mr. Tracy Bolesky, former Attorney for the District, regarding the Street Lighting District. Mr. McMackin advised it was important how one read Mr. Bolesky's letter and that he had read it to say, in essence, that the District has the whole responsibility for street lighting in the District, but that the Board does not have to provide street lights throughout the District. He remarked that Mr. Hake had asked him whether he agreed with Mr. Bolesky's opinion and in coming to his conclusion, he read not only the County

ordinance which conveyed responsibility for the street lighting to the District but also the Agreement between the District and Collier County. He advised his conclusion was different than Mr. Bolesky's in that he believed that, while the Statute makes installing street lighting in the entire lighting District discretionary, the District's Agreement with Collier County makes it mandatory. Mr. Hake asked Mr. McMackin put his opinion in writing and to furnish each Board member with a copy and this, then, would become a matter of public record.

Mr. McMackin advised that at the same meeting, Mr. Hake had asked him if it was possible for the District, with the proper notification, to arbitrarily set a higher connection fee, subject to revision at the time of the Rate Study or, in other words, does the Board have the power, in the event of a perceived fiscal emergency, to increase its connection fees. He advised the Board that this is not purely a legal question but has to do whether this is necessary and whether the District's connection fees are going to be inadequate. As he understood it, the Board perceives that since WCN is building 1,000 less residential units, they are concerned that the present connection fee structure will be insufficient to repay the District for its capital investment. However, Mr. Ward had advised him that the connection fee is not based on the projected buildout of Pelican Bay, but is based on a number (4,444 units) sufficient to pay off the existing facilities. Also, the connection fee is based on a formula which is to pay the District for the unpaid minimum monthly service charge until the 4,444 units are built and connected to the system. Thus, the ultimate buildout of Pelican Bay will not affect the current connection fee

number. Mr. Dunwiddie agreed with Mr. McMackin's comments, however, stated that this did not mean the connection fee might not be adequate for other reasons. Mr. Ward continued that the connection fee will probably need to be raised when the District issues additional bond indebtedness to build the facilities to meet the PUD density and at that time the connection fee can be recalculated, based upon the additional debt and units that will come into the system.

Mr. McMackin referred to the District's Enabling Act, Section 44, Subparagraph 3, which stated, "such rates, fees, rental and charges shall be just and equitable and uniform for users of the same class and, where appropriate, may be based or computed either upon the amount of service furnished or the number of average number of persons residing or working or otherwise occupying the premises served or upon any other factor affecting the use of the facilities furnished or upon any combination for the foregoing factors that may be determined by the Board on an equitable basis." Thus, it was Mr. McMackin's opinion that the Board can base an increase in the connection fees on any other factor affecting the use of the facilities furnished, provided that the District subscribes to the just, equitable and uniform rule.

Mr. McMackin also recalled for the Board that at the Workshop Meeting, he had been asked whether the connection fee could be raised under the Guaranteed Revenue Agreement with WCN, and he referred the Board to Paragraph 1 of the Agreement which stated, "Developer shall request upon payment to the District of the service connection fee then in effect for the type of service connection ordered, service connections as used in this

Agreement are as of this date, and are subject to change by the District without amendment to this Agreement. Thus, it was his opinion that the Board's right to amend the connection fees is independent of the Guaranteed Revenue Agreement.

MANAGER'S REPORT

Mr. Ward had nothing to report at this time. Mr. Hake asked Mr. Ward whether he had received any response to his letter to Mr. Neil Dorrill. Mr. Ward responded he had received no response to date.

Mr. Mudge asked whether District staff had been in contact with the Manager of the Sanctuary regarding the complaint of sand in the potable water. Mr. Petty reported that staff had installed a filter on her water tap to try and obtain samples of the material in question and she is supposed to get in touch with District staff when the filter clogs and District staff will then take the sample to the lab in order to analyze the material.

CERTIFICATES OF PAYMENT

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>
1989 Refunding Issue Signature, Seal & Mounting	No. 183	Northern Bank Note Company	\$ 1,887.82
1989 Refunding Issue Financial Advisor Fee	No. 184	Fishkind & Associates	14,500.00
1989 Refunding Issue Trustee Counsel Fees	No. 185	Drinker, Biddle & Reath	5,500.00
1989 Refunding Issue Trustee Fees & Services	No. 186	First Pennsylvania Bank	12,472.50
1989 Refunding Issue Legal Fees	No. 187	Quarles & Brady	8,237.50

Pelican Bay Improvement District  
 April 19, 1989

---

<u>CERTIFICATE NO.</u>		<u>CONTRACTOR</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
1989 Refunding Issue Legal Descriptions Utility Site	No. 188	Wilson, Miller, et. al.	1,200.00
1989 Refunding Issue STP Effluent Disposal Alternatives	No. 189	Wilson, Miller, et. al.	6,963.00
1989 Refunding Issue Phase III Facilities Expansion	No. 190	Wilson, Miller, et. al.	7,977.50
1989 Refunding Issue PBID Maintenance Facility	No. 191	Pelican Bay Improvement District	6,702.17
1989 Refunding Issue WWTP Instrumentation	No. 192	Pelican Bay Improvement District	3,910.00
Northwest Fill Area Design Services	No. 6	Wilson, Miller, et. al.	2,260.20
Bay Colony Shores Design Services	No. 4	Wilson, Miller, et. al.	7,570.19
P.B. Blvd., Oakmont Pkwy., Greentree Dr., Vanderbilt Connector Road - Design Services	No. 1	Wilson, Miller, et. al.	1,840.50
Oakmont Unit 11 - Design Services	No. 2	Wilson, Miller, et. al.	16,331.45
Street Light Repairs	No. 1	Wilson, Miller, et. al.	3,303.38
Oakmont Unit 11 Street Lighting Design Services	No. 1	Wilson, Miller, et. al.	610.50
Oakmont Unit 7 Street Lighting Design Services	No. 1	Wilson, Miller, et. al.	6,194.00
TOTAL AMOUNT			\$ 107,460.71

Mr. Hake asked how much money was left in the W/S Bond Issue. Mr. Ward replied he was not sure of the exact number but would look it up and let him know.

Following further discussion, Mr. Mudge moved, seconded by Mr. Holtan and unanimously approved, payment of the Certificates of Payment, as presented.

CONFIRMATION OF INVOICES

Water/Sewer Operating Summary and Invoices For March 1989 - Approved As Presented

Mr. Mudge asked whether the temporary day laborers are used for raking out the lakes. Mr. Ward responded the day laborers are used to perform this task, as well as many others, particularly in the season. It was Mr. Hake's opinion that all the lakes should be maintained in such a manner on a monthly basis and the District should possibly use manpower personnel ten days out of each month to help keep up with the maintenance of the lakes on a regular basis. He recommended that staff should not regularly use the same manpower personnel because there might be something in the law which says that if you use a particular manpower employee on a regular basis, they become one of your employees.

Mr. Dunwiddie asked how many people on the District staff are allowed to take vehicles home at night. Mr. Ward replied that only an employee on call is allowed to take a vehicle home. Mr. Dunwiddie asked if the personal use of District equipment is allowed. Mr. Ward replied in the negative.

Following further discussion, Mr. Mudge moved, seconded by Mr. Potter and carried unanimously, that the Water/Sewer Operating Summary and Invoices for March 1989, be approved as presented.

Water Management Operating Summary and Invoices For March 1989 - Approved As Presented

Following discussion, Mr. Dunwiddie moved, seconded by Mr. Mudge and carried unanimously, that the Water Management Operating Summary and Invoices for March 1989, be approved as presented.

Street Lighting Invoices For March 1989 - Approved As Presented

Following discussion, Mr. Hake moved, seconded by Mr. Potter and carried unanimously, that the Street Lighting Invoices for March 1989, be approved as presented.

SUPERVISOR'S REQUESTS

Mr. Hake asked what action the Board would like to take regarding security in Pelican Bay. He reported in a recent meeting held at the Commons regarding this issue, Mrs. Hyland, a resident of Pelican Bay, reported that she was startled one day recently to find a person in her backyard using her water, and when the Sheriff's Department investigated, it was found this person was an employee of Jacaranda Landscape looking for a drink of water. He advised staff to put Jacaranda Landscape on notice that the Board would not tolerate such actions by Jacaranda's employees and if he didn't have an adequate drinking water on their trucks, he felt the District should buy the containers and deduct them from their bill. Mr. Ward commented that he did not condone such actions and had spoken to Mrs. Hyland regarding this matter, however, he had spoken with Mr. David Boose of Jacaranda and was told the worker got gasoline in his face and needed a source of water to get it out of his eyes and Mrs. Hyland's home was the closest place he could find. He advised he accepted this from Mr. Boose as being a true statement, however, made him aware that this should never happen again.

Mr. Hake asked how much it would cost the District to put in some higher intensity light bulbs in two selected locations on a trial basis and also put a different type of globe on the lamps to try and determine which

type of lamps the residents would prefer. Mr. Ward reported that the light itself is not expensive, however, the expensive part would be paying the electrician to perform the work. He offered that if this was done during the normal course of the street lighting repair work it would not cost that much extra. He advised, however, that he did not know if a higher intensity bulb could be used with the existing ballasts. Mr. Peek commented that as he recalled the District could go up one size using the same ballast but if a significantly higher intensity bulb was used, the ballast would have to be changed and this could be costly. Mr. Hake asked Mr. Ward to compile these costs and report back to the Board and then if it came to the point that the residents liked the higher intensity lights, the Board would have to make a decision on whether this could be done within the existing rate structure or whether staff should send out a questionnaire to poll the residents to determine if they want increased lighting and, if so, would they be willing to pay a reasonable fee for this to take place. Mr. Hake did not feel the complaints of four or five residents should dictate a change in the intensity of the lamps, unless the poll showed that a majority of the residents were in favor of the change.

Mr. Hake asked whether Mr. Ward had received any additional information from the Forum group. Mr. Ward responded he had recently received their Site Plan and advised this would be reviewed with the Conservation Advisory Committee on Monday, April 24th and he had planned on issuing a Memorandum advising the Board he had received these plans and they were available for review. Mr. Hake suggested that any Board member who wished to review the plans visit the District office.

Mr. Hake asked Mr. Ward whether he had followed up on Mr. McMackin's letter regarding changes in the flood insurance requirements which will require the District to insure full value rather than to insure above a threshold amount. Mr. Ward reported he had written to Mr. Tom Benson, the District's Insurance Agent, and Mr. Benson is currently reviewing this matter.

Mr. Hake reported he had received a letter from Mr. Graeme Hunter, a member of the Conservatory Advisory Committee, which read in part as follows: "In response to Rudy's instructions, I have inspected the lakes that make up our Water Management System and I think the general appearance of the lakes is okay, when you consider our low water situation. The lakes of each end of Tierra Mar do have a bit of scum and algae. This is at the north end particularly. These areas should be cleaned on a regular basis. The lake at St. Maarten is a problem. The center spillway outflow pipes stops up often. I have opened it five times in the past two weeks. The spillways on each side of the center are not effective when it comes to maintaining the Conservation water level. The southern most spillway should have a channel cut to the open water and in this way, this outflow pipe will help maintain the level that we need in order to keep the hardwood hammock dry. I hope this will be done soon....." Mr. Hake asked Mr. Ward why this System was clogging up. Mr. Ward responded that he felt that we are trying to get the water elevations lower than what they are designed to be and this is not going to work. Mr. Hake commented that Mr. Hunter also reported a fish kill in the St. Maarten lake and asked what caused this. Mr. Ward responded that fish kills are usually caused by low

dissolved oxygen levels which happen periodically when there are too many fish in the lake.

Mr. Potter reported that Collier County has gone into Clam Pass on two different occasions to try and open the Pass, however, to date, the work has not been very effective and the problem has not been solved. It was his opinion that digging a one and a half foot ditch, two feet deep, was not going to solve the problem. Mr. Potter advised that his wife has taken it upon herself to call Mary Ellen Hawkins to advise her of the situation and to notify her that the problem has not been solved and she also notified County Commissioner Volpe to advise him nothing has been accomplished. Mr. Hake suggested that Mr. Koste had remarked to him that the District has money within it's Budget to help clear Clam Pass, however, this would mean that the District would have to obtain the permits from the Regulatory Agencies, which the County has already received. Mr. Hake advised he had asked Mr. Koste to get all the information to him regarding this matter and he promised Mr. Koste he would then see what the District could accomplish, however, to date, he has heard nothing from Mr. Koste.

Mr. Mudge remarked he had taken a look at the February usage for the Bay Club and they had used 539,000 gallons of irrigation water and according to his calculations they were paying an overall rate of \$.35/thousand gallons, which was lower than the golf course. He suggested that the Board change the capacity charge for the Bay Club and put them on a Commercial rate. Thus, their monthly capacity charge would be \$253.65 per month as compared to \$37.79/month as is currently stands. Mr. Mudge felt this change should be instituted as quickly as possible. Mr. Ward

advised Mr. Mudge the system is such that when the Rate Study was performed, the Rate Study Committee tried to identify a majority of the large users in the system and properly classify them in Group Types. Mr. Mudge offered that when the Rate Study was done, the Committee failed to identify this type of user. Mr. Ward advised that if the Board decided to change the minimum capacity charge for Bay Club to a commercial rate he felt they would be opening "Pandora's Box", as the Bay Club is owned by the Registry, and if the Board computes the minimum rates that the Registry and the Ritz would pay under a commercial rate, they would find there would be significantly less dollars to the District than to leave them as residential units, which is how they are currently computed. Mr. Ward advised that the Registry and Ritz may have a case to come back to the Board and say if the District is going to classify a tennis court as a commercial parcel, then the Ritz and Registry Hotel should be reclassified as commercial property. Mr. Ward recommended that the Board not reclassify the Bay Club as commercial property. Mr. Mudge remarked that the District establishes the rates to be fair and equitable and he did not feel it was fair and equitable to classify Bay Club as residential. Mr. Hake commented that if he understood it correctly, what Mr. Ward was saying was that if the Board reclassified the Bay Club to commercial then the Board could be lowering its monthly capacity charges for both the Registry and the Ritz Carlton. Mr. Ward responded that he felt the Hotels would have a good argument. Mr. Hake asked Mr. McMackin whether he felt the Hotels would have a good argument. Mr. McMackin advised that under the District's current rate structure the hotels are paying monthly capacity charges of

one residential unit for every hotel room and under commercial use, the monthly capacity charge would be a great deal lower and Mr. Ward's fear was that if the Board decides that the tennis courts should pay more, what was to stop the Registry and the Ritz Carlton from saying this is fine, however, we should also be classified as commercial use and explain to me how Bay Club should be commercial and we should not be commercial.

Mr. Dunwiddie agreed with Mr. Mudge that the Board should determine some way whereby the Bay Club paid their fair share, however, he was not sure the way to do it was to call reclassify them as commercial. He suggested that rather than vote on this issue today, that during the new Rate Study, the Board might establish a new rate structure for a tennis club. Mr. Hake suggested that if one took the square footage of an average homesite and take this square footage into the Bay Club parcel then a new rate for this could be determined. Mr. Dunwiddie did not think this was even fair, as Bay Club uses more irrigation water than an average homesite and, thus, felt there should be a special rate for tennis courts. He also suggested that because they are using so much water they can't possibly be complying the with Phase II water restrictions. Mr. Hake suggested that he had been introduced to Mr. Joe Coppens, the new Manager, and he would make an appointment with him to explain the situation and if to notify him that if they continue to water outside of the Phase II restrictions they will be cited by the Sheriff's department. He also suggested he would discuss the minimum capacity charge with Mr. Coppens to find out Bay Club's choice in this matter, as if he gave them a choice he didn't feel they could argue about it.

Mr. Mudge advised that he had recently reviewed the last three Rate Studies and asked Mr. Ward if he recalled what it cost to update the last Rate Study. Mr. Ward replied that the District paid Coopers & Lybrand its going rate, \$125.00/hour, plus expenses, which, as he recalled, totaled approximately \$3,000 to \$4,000. Mr. Mudge remarked that he had looked at the Rate Study and he felt the structure was pretty good. Mr. Ward concurred but advised he was having trouble fitting the new golf course into this structure, but other than that, felt the concept is an excellent concept. Mr. Mudge proposed that the Board ask Mr. Cumiskey to update the Rate Study. Mr. Ward asked whether the Board desired that he give Mr. Cumiskey the parameters they were looking for, i.e., the new Golf Course, the tennis club, etc. and obtain an estimate from Coopers & Lybrand. Mr. Hake suggested that before Mr. Ward did this, Mr. Mudge should talk to Mr. Cumiskey, as he felt it would be very meaningful to Mr. Mudge. Mr. Mudge then suggested that Mr. Cumiskey come to Naples to meet with him and asked Mr. Ward to set up the meeting. Mr. Dunwiddie suggested there was a lot of number pushing that had to be done and he hated to pay Mr. Cumiskey to push numbers when staff was capable of doing this. Mr. Ward concurred that if the concepts were established, staff could do a lot of the calculations.

Mr. Mudge also commented that the more he looked at the Rate Study, the more enthused he was about a commodity only charge, where the high user pays a higher rate, as this forces conservation. Mr. Dunwiddie suggested that Mr. Mudge would find in the Rate Study that it stated that at some time in the future the District was going to have to go to a commodity only charge. Mr. Mudge felt the time to impose a commodity only

charge was getting very close.

Mr. Dunwiddie offered that for the Board's information, he would be meeting on April 28th, with Mr. Howard Beard of United Industries and he would be taking him to two or three of United Industries plants in the western Louisiana area, including the Morgan City plant. He advised that whether he gets into any negotiations with him regarding the boat clarifier it yet to be determined. He further advised he would subsequently be meeting with PBS&J after the meeting with Mr. Beard to try and learn their position regarding the boat clarifier and would have a report for the Board at the next meeting.

Regarding the question of how to dispose of the effluent during the rainy season, Mr. Dunwiddie suggested that the District owns 10 acres of land at the Utility Site, onto which they could put a lot of water and there may be places on the Golf Course where they could do the same thing. He felt places like this needed to be identified by the Engineers to determine where the District could dispose of the extra effluent.

Mr. Dunwiddie asked the current status of purchasing the automatic dialer for the chlorine alarm. Mr. Ward reported that staff is currently in the process of getting quotes from vendors.

Mr. Dunwiddie asked if the District was obligated to maintain the bikepaths or obligated to cut the grass around the them. Mr. Ward responded that he was not sure but the Foundation might have the responsibility for maintaining the bikepaths. Mr. Dunwiddie remarked that the bikepaths are getting worse as time goes on. Mr. Peek suggested that the County might be responsible for maintaining the bikepaths as they were

required improvements to be built along the roadway as required by the PUD documents and, thus, the County may be required to maintain them, just as they do the roadway surface. Mr. Ward offered he would check into this matter and report back to the Board. Mr. Dunwiddie suggested that when Mr. Ward determined the responsible party, he ask them what they intended to do about the bikepaths, because everyone one of them needs attention. Mr. Dunwiddie also asked Mr. Ward to get in touch with Jacaranda and have them trim the bushes abutting the bike paths as it is impossible to walk or ride down the paths without hitting your head on the bushes. Mr. Ward promised to take care of this matter.

Mr. Mudge asked why interest income is not shown on the Water & Sewer Operating Summary. Mr. Ward replied that it is not shown because the interest income is not a derived revenue from the system and most all of the interest that is derived from the system is from bond funds and the interest from the bond funds is not used in the budget calculations, but rather the interest stays in the bond funds.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, Mr. Dunwiddie moved, seconded by Mr. Mudge and approved unanimously that the meeting be adjourned. Time: 5:55 P.M.

---

JAMES D. HAKE  
PRESIDENT  
PELICAN BAY IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT

PELICAN BAY IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT  
WATER/SEWER INVOICES  
MARCH 1989

<u>PAYEE</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
Alpha Chemical	Janitorial Supplies	\$ 132.81
Association of Special Districts	1989 Annual Membership	250.00
B&H Sales	Meters & Meter Supplies	999.54
BancFlorida	Meeting Room Rental	87.00
Bob Dean Supply	Irrigation Supplies	60.62
Budco Temporaries	Temporary Day Labor	538.31
Chemsearch	Paint	481.42
Chlorinator Replacement Parts	Chlorinator Parts	1,120.00
City of Naples	Potable Water 2/1/89 - 3/3/89	21,435.23
Coast Pump & Supply	Irrigation Supplies	98.16
Combs Oil Company	Diesel Fuel For Emergency Generator	185.70
Coral Springs Improvement District	March Dental Insurance	55.75
Dafax Processing Corp.	Repair Computer	1,225.00
Don Reid Ford	1989 Ford Bronco II	11,649.00
Envirotech Operating Services	February W/W Analyses	100.00
Federal Express Corp.	February Courier Service	11.00
File One	March Office Supplies	102.52
Fischer & Porter	Repair Irrigation Master Meter	1,150.00
Fischer Scientific	Laboratory Supplies	23.69
Florida Power & Light	Portion of February Electric	2,500.45
Gulf Shore Associates	April Rent & Maintenance	953.23
Harmons	Rent Equipment - Chlorine Seminar	300.00
IBM Corporation	Displaywriter Maintenance to 6/30/89	312.00
Inacomp Computer Center	Repair Computer	60.00
Johnson Paints, Inc.	Paint Supplies	668.67
Mary W. Morgan	1988 Election Costs	203.82
North Trail Auto Parts	Vehicle Maintenance Supplies	31.00
PB&S Chemical Company	Chlorine	2,116.20
Petty, John	Reimbursement for Supplies	225.02
Pitney Bowes	Postage Machine Lease To June 30, 1989 & Reset Meter Fees	35.62
Presstige Printing	Purchase Orders	125.00
Kay's Septic Service	Remove Sludge W.T.T.P. - March	3,650.00
Regfiles, Inc.	D.E.R. Regfile System	566.00
Rose Boat & Engine Works	Repair Emergency Generator	213.90
Sears, Roebuck & Co.	Small Tools	85.12
Southwest Electric Supply	Electrical Supplies	5.76
Speedy Blueprinting	Office Supplies	14.34
Sunshine Ace Hardware	Bolts & Washers	7.26
Taylor Rental	Rent Equipment	145.40

PELICAN BAY IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT  
 WATER/SEWER INVOICES  
 MARCH 1989  
 (PAGE 2)

<u>PAYEE</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
The Office	Shipping Charges	\$ 6.65
Tri-W Rental	Rent Equipment	33.60
U.S. Postmaster	Postage - Utility Bills	145.00
United Telephone	February Telephone	398.39
VWL Tree Movers	Transplant Trees Utility Site	400.00
Walchem Corporation	Chemical Injector Parts	2,133.37
Wearguard, Inc.	Employee Uniforms	94.95
Weavers Office Supply	March Office Supplies	35.44
Wesco Turf, Inc.	Repair Turbine - STP	50.00
Westinghouse Communities of Naples, Inc.	February Fuel & Copying Charges	54.66
Yahl Brothers	Dumpster - Utility Site	641.00
Zee Medical Service	First Aid Supplies	19.52

PELICAN BAY IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT  
 WATER MANAGEMENT INVOICES  
 MARCH 1989

<u>PAYEE</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
Association of Special Districts	1989 Annual Membership	\$ 250.00
BancFlorida	Meeting Room Rental	87.00
Budco Temporaries, Inc.	Temporary Day Labor	538.32
Clerk of Court, Collier County	Record Drainage Easement - Collier County Library Site	31.10
Coral Springs Improvement District	March Dental Insurance	55.76
File One	March Office Supplies	102.52
Gulf Shore Associates	April Rent & Maintenance	953.24
IBM Corporation	Displaywriter Maintenance to 6/30/89	312.00
Jacaranda Landscape	February R-0-W Maintenance	16,476.37
Mary W. Morgan	1988 Election Costs	203.83
Naples Daily News	Legal Advertising	59.89
North Trail Auto Parts	Vehicle Maintenance Supplies	31.01
PBID W/S Account	R-0-W Maintenance 2/15/89 - 3/15/89	3,071.11
Pitney Bowes	Postage Machine Rental To June 30, 1989 & Reset Meter Fees	35.63
Presstige Printing	Purchase Orders	125.00
Spectrum Laboratories	February Lake Samples	264.00
Sunshine Ace Hardware	Repair Lawn Mower	66.11
United Telephone	February Telephone	299.27
Wearguard, Inc.	Employee Uniforms	94.95
Weavers Office Supply	March Office Supplies	32.20
Westinghouse Communities of Naples, Inc.	February Fuel & Copying	54.68
Zee Medical Service Co.	First Aid Supplies	19.53

PELICAN BAY IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT  
STREET LIGHT INVOICES  
MARCH 1989

<u>PAYEE</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
Barnett Bank	Interest to 4/3/89 - Unit 4 Street Lighting Loan	\$ 551.10
Barnett Bank	Interest to 4/5/89 - Unit 6 Street Lighting Loan	874.50
Speedy Blueprinting	Mylars - Street Lighting System	300.50

PELICAN BAY IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT  
WATER AND WASTEWATER OPERATING SUMMARY  
MARCH 1989

	FISCAL YEAR 1989 BUDGET	MONTH TO DATE			YEAR TO DATE		
		BUDGET	ACTUAL	VARIANCE FAVORABLE (UNFAVORABLE)	BUDGET	ACTUAL	VARIANCE FAVORABLE (UNFAVORABLE)
<u>CHARGES FOR SERVICES</u>							
Connection Fees	\$ 664,180	17,210	23,110	5,900	362,070	414,920	52,850
Meter Use Fees	22,250	1,750	2,000	250	11,000	11,450	450
<u>USER REVENUE</u>							
Water	616,818	53,865	54,403	538	304,359	309,571	5,212
Sewer	481,271	40,866	40,875	9	240,102	234,429	( 5,673)
Irrigation	620,010	46,423	56,601	10,178	298,687	336,122	37,435
<u>TOTAL REVENUE</u>	<u>\$2,404,529</u>	<u>160,114</u>	<u>176,989</u>	<u>16,875</u>	<u>1,216,218</u>	<u>1,306,492</u>	<u>90,274</u>
<u>PROFESSIONAL FEES</u>							
Engineering	\$ 25,000	0	0	0	7,419	7,419	0
Legal	22,000	0	0	0	14,617	14,617	0
Audit	8,800	0	0	0	7,540	7,540	0
Trust	6,050	2,020	2,020	0	2,700	2,700	0
Financial Advisor	7,000	0	0	0	0	0	0
<u>SYSTEM OPERATING EXPENSES</u>							
Office	\$ 32,408	2,221	2,536	( 315)	13,326	15,484	( 2,158)
Billing	2,640	220	145	75	1,320	2,514	( 1,194)
Insurance	63,439	0	0	0	63,439	66,536	( 3,097)
Payroll	162,764	18,780	13,749	5,031	81,380	67,771	13,609
Transportation	18,667	10,722	11,717	( 995)	14,332	12,545	1,787
Water Quality	16,950	1,095	100	995	10,372	5,660	4,712
Repairs & Maintenance	66,110	5,509	13,906	( 8,397)	33,054	54,327	( 21,273)
Electric	169,000	13,177	15,444	( 2,267)	76,596	103,172	( 26,576)
Chemicals	55,488	3,607	2,116	1,491	24,334	23,358	976
City of Naples Water	211,039	19,763	21,435	( 1,672)	101,122	102,978	( 1,856)
Meters	5,920	493	756	( 263)	2,958	5,434	( 2,476)
Contingencies	10,000	387	0	387	27,290	27,290	0
<u>TOTAL EXPENSES</u>	<u>\$ 883,274</u>	<u>77,994</u>	<u>83,924</u>	<u>( 5,930)</u>	<u>481,799</u>	<u>519,345</u>	<u>( 37,546)</u>

PELICAN BAY IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT  
WATER MANAGEMENT OPERATING SUMMARY  
MARCH 1989

	<u>MONTH TO DATE</u>			<u>FAVORABLE (UNFAVORABLE) VARIANCE</u>	<u>YEAR TO DATE</u>		<u>FAVORABLE (UNFAVORABLE) VARIANCE</u>
	<u>FISCAL YEAR 1989 BUDGET</u>	<u>BUDGET</u>	<u>ACTUAL</u>		<u>BUDGET</u>	<u>ACTUAL</u>	
<b>REVENUE</b>							
Maintenance Taxes	\$ 525,341	34,556	34,556	0	508,875	508,875	0
TOTAL REVENUE	<u>\$ 525,341</u>	<u>34,556</u>	<u>34,556</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>508,875</u>	<u>508,875</u>	<u>0</u>
<b>MEETING EXPENSE</b>							
Supervisors Fees	\$ 6,000	500	500	0	\$ 3,000	3,000	0
Legal Notification	800	67	60	7	402	725	( 323)
<b>PROFESSIONAL FEES</b>							
Engineering	15,000	0	0	0	825	825	0
Legal	15,000	0	0	0	10,254	10,254	0
Audit	8,500	0	0	0	7,208	7,208	0
Trust	1,500	0	0	0	1,500	1,652	( 152)
Financial Adviser	7,000	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SYSTEM OPERATING EXPENSE</b>							
Office	32,408	2,222	2,432	( 210)	13,331	14,483	( 1,152)
Payroll	159,415	18,394	14,562	3,832	79,709	68,109	11,600
Transportation	4,334	361	68	293	2,166	808	1,358
Fish Restocking Program	4,504	0	0	0	3,074	3,074	0
Lake Maintenance	32,147	2,679	0	2,679	16,074	19,456	( 3,382)
Swale Maintenance	4,000	333	66	267	1,998	348	1,650
Water Quality	11,880	990	264	726	5,940	5,084	856
Insurance	16,325	0	0	0	16,325	16,685	( 360)
Rights-Of-Way	269,110	17,019	16,476	543	113,529	107,803	5,726
Replanting Program	20,000	0	0	0	16,325	16,325	0
Water Connection	13,190	0	0	0	0	0	0
Water Use	23,259	1,938	3,071	(1,133)	11,628	17,106	( 5,478)
Renewal & Replacement	6,000	500	0	500	3,000	0	3,000
Contingencies	12,000	1,000	0	1,000	6,000	0	6,000
TOTAL EXPENSES	<u>\$ 662,372</u>	<u>46,003</u>	<u>37,499</u>	<u>8,504</u>	<u>312,288</u>	<u>292,945</u>	<u>19,343</u>

PELICAN BAY IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT  
APRIL 19, 1989 MINUTES  
TAPE NUMBERS & CORRESPONDING AGENDA ITEMS

<u>AGENDA ITEM</u>	<u>NUMBER ON TAPE</u>
1. Roll Call.	0 - 6 (Tape 1, Side A)
2. Approval of Minutes of the Meetings held March 15, 1989 and March 30, 1989.	6 - 32
3. Discussion of Proposed Fiscal Year 1990 Street Lighting Budget.	32 - 511 (End Tape 1, Side A) 0 - 18 (Tape 1, Side B)
4. Presentation of Proposed Foundation Expansion.	18 - 511 (End Tape 1, Side B)
5. Engineer's Report.	0 - 533 (Tape 2, Side A)
6. Presentation of Proposed Plat of Unit 13.	533 - 743 (End Tape 2, Side A) 0 - 26 (Tape 2, Side B)
7. Attorney's Report.	26 - 132
8. Manager's Report.	132 - 156
9. Certificates of Payment.	156 - 211
10. Confirmation of Invoices and Operating Summaries.	211 - 340
11. Supervisor's Requests.	340 - 744 (End Tape 2, Side B) 0 - 250 (Tape 3, Side A)
12. Adjournment.	250 - 255