

Naples, Florida

November 15, 1989

LET IT BE KNOWN, that the Board of Supervisors of 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
TREASURER:	J. Russell Mudge James F. Dunwiddie Walter B. Potter

ALSO PRESENT: Mr. Gary L. Moyer, District Manager; Mr. James P. Ward, Assistant District Manager; Mr. F. Joseph McMackin, Attorney for the District; Messrs. Thomas Peek and Steve Means of Wilson, Miller, Barton, Soll & Peek; Messrs. Lou Hoegsted, Marty Fritz, Ben Briggs and Edward Griffith of Westinghouse Communities of Naples, Inc.; Messrs. Rudy Small, Graeme Hunter and Henry Michel, Members of the Conservation Advisory Committee; Mr. Bernie Young, Vice President of the Pelican Bay Property Owner's Association; Mr. Ralph G. Carrothers; a Court Reporter for Collier County; Mr. John Petty of the Pelican Bay Improvement District; PBID Residents; Ms. Barbara C. Smith 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 on October 18, 1989 and November 10, 1989.
3. Discussion of Various Issues Related to Collier County Providing Wastewater Service to the Pelican Bay Community.
 - A) Working Group to Negotiate with Collier County
4. Consideration of Award of Bids for Meter Purchases, Fiscal Year 1990.
5. Attorney's Report.
 - A) Discussion of Legal Opinion Regarding the Construction of Water and Sewer Lines in Bay Colony.
 - B) Discussion of the New Requirements of Chapter 197, Florida Statutes.
6. Presentation by Westinghouse Communities of Naples, Inc. Regarding the Proposed North Boardwalk and Use of the District Berm.
7. Engineer's Report.
8. Manager's Report.
 - A) Discussion of Assessment Program for Future Street Lighting System.
9. Certificates of Payment.
10. Confirmation of Invoices and Operating Summaries.
11. Supervisor's Requests & Audience Participation.
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 OCTOBER 18, 1989 - APPROVED AS AMENDED

Mr. Dunwiddie moved, seconded by Mr. Mudge and approved unanimously, the Minutes of October 18, 1989, subject to the following corrections:

Page 3524 - In the seventh line of the page, the word, "Treasurer" be added before the name J. Russell Mudge.

Page 3524 - In the eight line of the page the name James R. Dunwiddie be amended to James F. Dunwiddie.

Page 3524 - In the second line of the second paragraph, the name "Joseph P. McMackin" be amended to "F. Joseph McMackin".

MINUTES OF MEETING OF NOVEMBER 10, 1989 - APPROVED AS AMENDED

Mr. Mudge moved, seconded by Mr. Dunwiddie and approved unanimously the Minutes of November 10, 1989, subject to the following corrections:

Page 3579 - In the second line of the second paragraph, the word "District" be amended to "District's".

DISCUSSION OF VARIOUS ISSUES RELATED TO COLLIER COUNTY PROVIDING WASTEWATER SERVICE TO THE PELICAN BAY COMMUNITY

Working Group To Negotiate With Collier County

Mr. McMackin explained that on October 30, 1989 the District received informal notification that Collier County staff was going to recommend to the Collier County Board of County Commissioners on October 31, 1989 that the District be taken over, i.e., the Board of County Commissioners be seated and succeed to the powers of the Board of Supervisors. At the County Commission meeting, the County Commissioners and staff had indicated that this was necessary because the District had requested that Senator Dudley amend the District's Enabling Legislation at the November special session of the Legislature to give the Board of Supervisors a vote on the issue as to whether the Board of County Commissioners could take over the District. Mr. McMackin recalled for the Board that the Enabling Act seems to give a region-wide District a vote as to whether or not they desire to take over a District and it gives the County Commission the right, in its sole discretion, to sit instead of the Board of Supervisors, but it doesn't give the Board of Supervisors or the residents of Pelican Bay any right to either approve or disapprove of this act. Senator Dudley, at the Legislative Hearing, deleted the provision

that it be in the region-wide District's sole discretion and added that it must also include an affirmative vote of the Pelican Bay Improvement District. He explained that this change came from Senator Dudley himself as the amendment the District had proposed was not quite that stringent, rather the District just desired to incorporate the provisions of Chapter 190.046, Subparagraphs 4 and 5. Mr. McMackin advised that at the last minute, he and Mr. Ward met with County staff and a settlement to defer this issue was reached. Upon the County agreeing not to take over the Board of Supervisors in an adverse and hostile manner, the President of the Board of Supervisors agreed to an Emergency Meeting on Friday, November 10, 1989, to ask the Board of Supervisors to agree not to issue bonds for a facilities expansion prior to March 1, 1990 and that the District Manager be directed to issue a letter to Senator Dudley and to Representative Hawkins requesting that Senator Dudley's Bill be taken off the November call and that the District would continue to negotiate in good faith with the County on a staff level concerning providing water and sewer service to the District. Mr. McMackin stated that the Emergency Meeting was held on November 10, 1989 and the Resolution was passed and communicated to the County staff and on November 14, 1989, the County Commission again deferred this matter. He advised that the County staff position is summarized in a letter from Mr. Dorrill which sets forth part of the understanding between the District and the County. He commented that a letter had been directed from District staff to Senator Dudley and Senator Dudley had agreed to take this matter off the November call. He explained that the only matter left to be accomplished is the good faith negotiations with the County on the

issues outlined in various correspondence and Chapter 190 which essentially boils down to who can provide these services to the residents of Pelican Bay in the most efficient manner, at the most economical cost and at the highest level of service.

Mr. Mudge advised that his understanding of Mr. Saunders' statement at the end of yesterday's County Commission meeting was that no Resolution would be passed by the County Commissioners, but that the District proceed with their meetings and that the County had an Agreement with the District on how to proceed. Mr. McMackin affirmed that there was no County Resolution and that the County Commission simply deferred this issue based on the District's Resolution.

Mr. Mudge also explained that as part of the County's motion at the August 29th meeting of the County Commission, the Commissioners agreed that it would be helpful in the discussions with the District not to offer bulk rates for water, sewer or irrigation and that they would only offer retail rates.

Mr. Hake stated everyone could make comments on events that have happened in the past, however, he did not think it was in either party's best interest to go back and hash over too many of these things. He suggested that it would be to everyone's mutual benefit to proceed in an orderly fashion and start off on a very small scale, as had been recommended by staff, and let the District staff and the County staff get together, have their meetings and come to an agreement, if possible, on what the Hole, Montes & Associates Study is about; clearing everyone's minds of what has happened in the past. He hoped that the same course of

events would take place on the part of County staff.

Mr. Hake proposed that the Board allow Mr. Tom Peek and members of his staff to make contact with the County staff and sit down and discuss the Hole, Montes & Associates Report. He also recommended that if the County wanted someone else at the meeting, other than the Engineering staff, then Mr. Ward be included as part of the negotiations. It was Mr. Hake's opinion that the negotiating team start out small and then as matters progressed and understandings were reached, the Board could elaborate and get into the study of the rates or which ever direction the discussions seemed to flow so that some sort of understanding or conclusion could be reached as to what was better for whom. Mr. Hake agreed that if the Board proceeded in this manner they would be adhering to the provisions and framework outlined in Mr. Neil Dorrill's letter of November 14, 1989 to the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Ward suggested that the Board allow Mr. Peek to meet with Hole, Montes & Associates and leave the framework open and that Mr. Peek proceed in the spirit and intent of the Resolution that was adopted by the Board of Supervisors at their meeting of November 10, 1989. Mr. McMackin agreed with Mr. Ward's thoughts on this matter and assumed the Board wanted Mr. Peek to explore all avenues which would bring the County and the District together; whether this meant providing part of the services, all of the services, none of the services, on a bulk basis, on a retail basis, etc., that it was not the Board's intent to limit Mr. Peek's area of discussion to only what was in Mr. Dorrill's letter but rather what Mr. Peek, as the District's Engineer, felt might be appropriate under the circumstances. Mr. Mudge did not feel that Mr. Dorrill's letter addressed

the District going forward alone in what the costs of that would be. Mr. Peek remarked he did not feel Mr. Dorrill's letter would in any way restrict the discussions with Hole, Montes & Associates. Mr. Dunwiddie felt the discussions should proceed on the basis of Mr. Dorrill's letter and the District's Resolution, on the assumption that the Resolution would in no way restrict or limit the discussions between the parties. Mr. Dunwiddie felt that both parties needed to analyze and compare on the same basis. Mr. McMackin stated that his recollection of all the verbal discussions which had taken place was that one of the goals of everyone was to compare "apples to apples" and no one had told him anything different. It was Mr. McMackin's opinion that Mr. Dorrill's letter was meant to summarize what is a matter of Public Record and to the extent that it is inconsistent with that then it need not be followed but to the extent that it provides a summary, the Board could use it this way. Mr. Dunwiddie suggested that the matter at hand seemed to be the Board's directions to Mr. Peek and he saw nothing inconsistent with the Board suggesting to Mr. Peek that he try to work this matter through to the extent he could to determine what is in the best interest of Pelican Bay residents. Mr. Hake offered that he did not think Mr. Peek would negotiate in any other fashion and he felt that Mr. Peek was more familiar with the workings of the County than the Board.

Following further discussion, Mr. Mudge moved, seconded by Mr. Potter and approved unanimously, that Mr. Peek be authorized to begin the discussions with Collier County regarding the analysis of facts relative to services provided to the residents of Pelican Bay by the Pelican Bay

Improvement District and the negotiations proceed within the framework as outlined in Mr. Neil Dorrill's letter of November 14, 1989 to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Dunwiddie suggested that Mr. Peek try to start the discussions with what the HM&A Report said the County would have to spend, WMBS&P's analysis of what the District would have to spend and to put those together and compare them on an "apples to apples" basis. To him, this is the basis for any other further analyses that will have to be done in terms of annual operating expenses as opposed to whatever charges are made and until this is resolved one could not start talking about annual expenses. It was Mr. Hake's opinion that the discussions should be left to the professional ability of Mr. Peek and that he proceed in which ever direction he desired to proceed. He did not feel the Board should attach any strings on Mr. Peek if they were going to ask him to work on the Board's behalf. Mr. Hake asked Mr. Peek to keep the Board informed as to the proceedings and he hoped that Mr. Peek would present the Board with a synopsis of each meeting as it occurred.

CONSIDERATION OF AWARD OF BIDS FOR METER PURCHASES, FISCAL YEAR 1990

Mr. Ward advised that as directed by the Board at the Meeting of October 18, 1989, the meter purchases for Fiscal Year 1990 had been re-bid in order to expand the Bidder's List to include the suppliers of water meters, as well as the manufacturers and so that WMBS&P could review the meter specifications. He explained that bids were received on November 13, 1989 and the Bid Tabulations had been forwarded to the Board.

He commented that the low bidder for 5/8"x3/4" meters was Semsco;

the low bidder for 1" meters was Davis Meter & Supply; the low bidder for 1-1/2" meters was B&H Sales and the low bidder for 2" meters was Semsco. Mr. Ward did not feel that it would be inappropriate to use other meter suppliers other than the supplier the District has been using in the past. He advised that although the District has used Precision meters in the past, Kent meters which would be supplied by Semsco are equally as good and he also felt there was value to the District having more than one meter supplier.

In response to a question by Mr. Dunwiddie, Mr. Means offered that he had reviewed the meter specifications relative to the American Water Works Association specifications and the bids received met the A.W.W.A. specifications as well as the requirements of the District.

Mr. Holtan asked Mr. Ward if he knew what Collier County and the City of Naples paid for the meters they were using. Mr. Ward explained that the City and the County use a different style of meter, called a Badger Meter, and the major difference between the type of meter the District uses and the type of meter the County and the City of Naples use has to do with the backflow preventer on the meter itself. He explained that the District uses a meter with a built-in backflow preventer and the purpose of the backflow preventer is to keep old water from going back into the system which in can cause the hydrogen sulfide odor problem. He advised that the Badger Meter itself costs \$26.00 and an exterior backflow preventer costs approximately \$12.00. It was his understanding that the County and the City do not install backflow preventers on their meters.

The Board concurred that the District should continue to use the

meters with a built-in backflow preventer as it was very helpful in preventing the hydrogen sulfide odor.

In response to a question by Mr. Potter, Mr. Ward recommended that the Board not award any bids for magnetic turbine 2" - 4" meters as if they are used they are purchased on a case by case basis and are not purchased in bulk. The Board concurred.

Following discussion, Mr. Mudge moved, seconded by Mr. Potter and approved unanimously that the meter purchases for Fiscal Year 1990 be awarded to the low bidders as follows: 5/8" meters to Semsco in the amount of \$31.10 per meter; 3/4" meters to Davis Meter & Supply in the amount of \$42.80 per meter; 1" meters to Semsco in the amount of \$70.70 per meter; 1-1/2" meters to B & H Sales in the amount of \$120.00 per meter and 2" meters to Semsco in the amount of \$188.70 per meter.

ATTORNEY'S REPORT

Discussion of Legal Opinion Regarding the Construction of Water and Sewer Lines in Bay Colony

Mr. McMackin explained that Pelican Bay Boulevard has now been extended to Bay Colony Drive and that a Guardhouse has been constructed at the intersection of Bay Colony Drive and Pelican Bay Boulevard. He advised that beyond the entrance to Bay Colony Drive and the entrance to the Ritz Carlton there is an area called The Island and The Strand. He offered that the District had previously constructed main water and sewer lines along Bay Colony Drive to the Ritz Carlton Hotel and with the construction of the Guardhouse, Bay Colony Drive will become a private road and access will be limited to Bay Colony and The Island and The Strand. He explained that the

question which has been asked by the Board is whether or not the Developer owes the District any money for the installation of the water mains in this area since the District has an Agreement which concerns when major mains are subdivision facilities; the general rule being that the District bears the expense of the installation of major mains and the Developer of an individual subdivision bears the expense of the subdivision facilities.

Mr. McMackin explained this matter in two separate sections; the first being the section from the bridge into The Island and The Strand area back down to Pelican Bay Boulevard. He advised that these lines are governed by the District's "Agreement for Construction of Subdivision Facilities" between WCN and PBID, dated October 21, 1987, in which major mains are defined and outlined on an attached map which is an exhibit to this Agreement and which shows the lines along what on this particular diagram is referred to as Pelican Beach Drive, but is essentially what is now called Bay Colony Drive, to be major mains and it appears that they serve more than one subdivision; serving not only the Ritz Carlton Hotel but Bay Colony Shores and whatever else might be developed in Areas 6 & 8, as depicted on the Attachment. The second section, The Island and The Strand area, is governed by an Agreement for "Construction of Water and Sewer Lines in Island/Strand" between WCN and PBID, dated April 20, 1988. He explained that no major mains had yet been installed in this area because at the time of the Agreement there was a question as to the scheme of development for this area. However, it now appears that the development plans are more certain and Subparagraph 3(A) on Page 2 of the Agreement sets forth the criteria with which the District Engineer shall determine

whether the plans constitute a development scheme which would render all or a portion of the District's service lines a subdivision facility and states that if the District's Engineer makes a determination that the development constitutes a subdivision facility that these expenses will be reimbursed to the District. However, if the District Engineer finds that this development does not fall under the criteria set forth in Subparagraph 3(A) then the facilities would be considered to be major mains and the expense would be borne by the District. Mr. McMackin advised that he had recently spoken with Mr. Steve Means regarding this matter, and he had informed him that, to date, WMBS&P has made no formal determination regarding the facilities in this area.

In conclusion, it was Mr. McMackin's opinion that recovery of the District's installation charges from Pelican Bay Boulevard to the bridge did not appear likely under the Agreement and the recovery of the District's investment from the bridge to the end of The Strand area would be determined by the District's Engineers, based on the criteria set forth in the April 20, 1988 Agreement.

Mr. Hake asked Mr. Peek when he would be in a position to act on the Agreement of April 20, 1988. Mr. Peek remarked WMBS&P is waiting to see the development plans from the Developer so they can make a final determination.

In response to a question by Mr. Holtan, Mr. McMackin stated that on the broader range as to the legality of the privatization of Bay Colony Drive, he had looked into seeing what rights might have inured to the residents of Pelican Bay based on everything from the initial advertising

brochures to concepts such as easements and adverse possession and had found no viable theory of law applicable to this that could be used to prevent WCN from making this road private.

In response to a comment by Mr. Holtan on the issue of the recovery of the costs of the main between Pelican Bay Boulevard and the Ritz Carlton area, Mr. McMackin explained that it is possible that a theory could be created that at the time of the October, 1987 Agreement these were major mains because of current understanding, however, he felt the burden would be upon the District to prove that there was an understanding and that this understanding was based on reasonable information that the District had a right to rely on and that it was changed. However, he advised at the present time he could not recommend to the Board that he had made this determination. Mr. Holtan asked Mr. McMackin whether he would make this determination. Mr. McMackin explained that he is continuing, under the instructions of Mr. Hake, to review this matter and his report today was simply an update on what had been discussed to date.

Mr. Rudy Small did not understand the equity of why the taxpayers of Pelican Bay had to pay for private roads. It did not make any sense to him to pay taxes to put water and sewer lines into a private development.

Mr. Hoegsted advised that taxes do not pay for any water and sewer improvements, that these lines are paid for through the District's rates. He believed that the line to the Ritz Carlton cost \$1.5 million dollars and advised the Ritz Carlton Hotel paid over \$400,000 towards the cost of this line and the remainder of the line would be paid for through the balance of the connection fees to be paid to connect to the system in

this area. He stated the District should receive approximately \$1,000,000 more in connection fees from the Bay Colony area alone than what it cost to install this line.

Mr. Moyer, in addressing Mr. Small's concern, explained that when the District addressed its financing philosophy during the Rate Study Committee meetings, the Committee tried to identify and define what the District System was that had to be financed and it was concluded and defined in the Agreement of October 18, 1989, that the District had an obligation to provide plant capacity and the major distribution and collection system, as differentiated from subdivision improvements which serve parcels of land. He explained that this was an engineering determination on what is a major facility and what is a subdivision facility and the Engineers made this determination without any prejudice from the Developer, the Board or from District staff. He stated there are rules of thumb on what is a major facility and what is a subdivision facility and this resulted in the preparation of the map which accompanied the Agreement and at that time the reason for this exercise was so the District could clearly identify to the future purchasers of land what their obligation would be if they purchased property in Pelican Bay and what the District's obligation would be. He advised that the facilities down Pelican Bay Boulevard to the Hotel were identified by the Engineers as major facilities and when The Island and The Strand were approved by the Board there was some question on whether these were going to be major facilities simply because no one knew the sizes of the lines, the use of the land, etc.

Mr. Moyer explained that the District is collecting uniform rates from users in the same category and by law you have to treat users in the same category equally and fairly. Mr. Moyer advised that the rates represent something and are related to the system that the District is trying to pay for and this system is defined to include major mains.

Discussion of the New Requirements of Chapter 197, Florida Statutes

Mr. McMackin explained that Chapter 197.363 of the Florida Statutes was amended in 1989 and will become effective January 1, 1990 and the Statute deals with alternative methods for the District to collect non-Ad Valorem assessments which are the primary collections that the District enjoys. He briefly summarized the new provisions and explained three alternatives to the District. The first alternative would allow the Property Appraiser and Tax Collector, at their option as opposed to their duty, to collect the District taxes, as is currently done, subject to the District entering into a written agreement with the Property Appraiser and the Tax Collector. The second alternative is that the District may collect its non-ad valorem assessments and would not require the Tax Collector or Property Appraiser to provide any services to the District. The third alternative is called the "Uniform Method" and provides for utilization of the services of the Property Appraiser and the Tax Collector but requires the District to certify its tax rolls and to meet certain deadlines in order to utilize the Uniform Method. It involves working with the County and the County subcontracting with the District to perform this service. It would require a Resolution by the Board at a Public Hearing and the affected property owners must be advised by first class mail, prior notice

of both the jeopardy non-payment would place upon them and their right to hear. Mr. Hake asked why Mr. McMackin was bringing this matter up. Mr. McMackin responded that the Board must take action on this matter prior to the end of the year in order that the District is able to make these collections in November, 1990. He explained that in the past Mr. Ward has worked with the Property Appraiser's office and it has all been automatic, however, under the new Statutes the District must enter into a written agreement with the County for the continuation of the County services in the collection of the District's assessments.

Following discussion, the Board concurred that the District remain with Alternative 3, the Uniform Method, and subsequently Mr. McMackin recommended that the Board authorize the District Manager to make the necessary publications in order to schedule a Public Hearing on this matter for the December 20, 1989 meeting and also that the District Manager should be authorized to begin discussions with the County Tax Collector and the Property Appraiser for entering into an agreement so that whatever costs might be involved could be brought back to the Board at the December meeting for their approval.

Mr. Ward explained that it would be a nightmare to try and collect the taxes in house. Mr. Dunwiddie asked if District staff could not reach an agreement with Mr. Colding and Mr. Carlton whether Alternative 2 would be the only option left to the District. Mr. Moyer explained that the way he read the Statute was that if the District selected the Uniform Method, the Property Appraiser has to provide the District with certain information by June 1st of each year and the Tax Collector has to extend

this information on the Tax Rolls and provide the District with the information by September 15th of each year. He was not sure it was optional and the County could tell the District to collect their own taxes. Mr. McMackin agreed with Mr. Moyer, however, felt the County could accomplish this on the expense side, thereby making it prohibitive to collect the taxes.

Following discussion, Mr. Holtan moved, seconded by Mr. Potter and approved unanimously that District staff be authorized to schedule the December 20, 1989 meeting as a Public Hearing on the process to be used for the collection of the District's water management taxes and that staff be authorized to enter into discussions with Mr. Sam Colding and Mr. Guy Carlton regarding Alternative 3, the "Uniform Method" and entering into a written agreement with the Property Appraiser and the Tax Collector for the collection of the District's taxes.

PRESENTATION BY WESTINGHOUSE COMMUNITIES OF NAPLES, INC. REGARDING THE
PROPOSED NORTH BOARDWALK AND USE OF THE DISTRICT BERM

Mr. Ed Griffith explained that in 1990 the Pelican Bay Foundation is going to start construction on the North Boardwalk and they currently have a D.E.R. Permit which expires in March 1991 and construction of the North Boardwalk is going to require connections to the District's Water Management Berm, which means the Boardwalk would encroach into the District's Water Management easement. He advised that in order to facilitate the Boardwalk there are three locations where connections have to be made so that the rest of the tram system can work and utilize the Boardwalk. He was aware that all this will require future Board approval, however, his purpose today was to ask for the Board's comments and input so

that when they start the construction drawings they had something to go by.

Several conceptual plans were included in the Agenda package, including the Tram & Beach Access Master Plan; the North Beach Facility & Boardwalk Plan; the North Boardwalk/Berm Connection, Detail A; the Foundation Parking, Detail B; and the Commons Berm Connection, Detail C. He explained that the Boardwalk would be constructed of wood and there would have to be asphalt paving of the berm and the extension to get to the Boardwalk. He also explained that this would be identical to the way the Sandbar Boardwalk is connected to the berm and through the use of a drawing depicted for the Board the conceptual view of the proposed connections to the berm.

Mr. Dunwiddie suggested that before WCN came back to the Board for final approval, they have these plans reviewed by WMBS&P to make sure the District has plenty of north-south communication as far as water flow is concerned at all three of the proposed connections to the berm.

Mr. Hake asked how many parking spaces there would be and whether these were the only parking spaces available for this area. Mr. Briggs responded there would be 140 parking spaces in the lot at the South Boardwalk and there would be additional parking at the north end of the berm, as part of a park that will be developed in this area, and in this park there would be another 40 parking spaces. He advised this exceeded the request of the Expansion Committee, who indicated they desired a minimum of 130 parking spaces. Mr. Hake remarked that the parking space represents less than three percent of the total residential population at buildout and asked Mr. Briggs whether this was intelligent thinking or was

it restricted by the space that they wanted to take. Mr. Hake advised that the Board has the power to condemn space to give the Foundation more parking should it be needed. Mr. Briggs stated that in his own judgement as well as that of the Expansion Committee, there is not enough space available for everyone to park a car at a parking lot toward the beach and a good tram system all the way along the berm must be developed to try and pull people out of any one of the developments so they don't get into a car.

Mr. Bernie Young explained that there was one very important difference in the two boardwalks that the Board should be aware of; that being when the Expansion Committee agreed that the North Boardwalk would require less parking than the South Boardwalk, it was thought that the North Boardwalk would be a passive system as opposed to an active system at the South Boardwalk. He commented that an active system would be where the restaurant, bar and service facilities would be located and which would require a person to come in a car, dressed up, get on a tram and go to the facility. The North Boardwalk was thought of as a passive facility, where a person would walk the boardwalk. It would possibly have a fishing place along the way, with picnic tables, a canteen and restrooms on the other end of the boardwalk. The Committee's idea was that if there was only what parking was necessary at the North Boardwalk, it would encourage people to walk to the beach, thereby having less tram traffic. Thus, the Expansion Committee tried to separate those people who need the tram to use the South Boardwalk and those people who like to walk to use the North Boardwalk.

Mr. Rudy Small advised that before the Conservation Advisory Committee could take a look at these plans they would have to know the location of the current easements, how much encroachment there would be and the offsets. He also felt the encroachment on the PBID easement from the turn-a-round ought to be reviewed, as well as the offsets and how the Pelican Bay resident would benefit from it. Mr. Dunwiddie asked if the turn-a-round could be put on the other side of the berm. Mr. Griffith remarked they could take a look at this possibility.

Mr. Small commented that the width of the proposed North Boardwalk is to be the same as that of the South Boardwalk and he felt everyone now realized this was a dangerous situation. He advised the boardwalk built by the County is considerably wider and consequently less dangerous. Mr. Briggs explained that the current South Boardwalk is ten feet wide, while the County Boardwalk is twelve feet wide. He stated that when the original permit was obtained for the North Boardwalk it was permitted for ten feet. However, the Foundation has asked Mr. Gary Ward, their representative in Tallahassee, to explore the possibility of being able to widen the North Boardwalk to twelve feet. Also, Mr. Briggs commented he has talked to the Engineers who assured him that if they are turned down on the twelve foot proposal, the railings could be put outside the ten feet so there would be a usable ten feet. He advised that everyone is in agreement that the present boardwalk, which is effectively 8.5 feet in width, is not wide enough and no one wants to repeat this mistake and he promised they would do everything possible to build a twelve foot wide boardwalk.

Mr. Dunwiddie asked Mr. Briggs whether any thought had been given to building a boardwalk along the beach between the North and South Boardwalks. Mr. Briggs responded that this matter had never been discussed by the Expansion Committee but it could be discussed. However, he felt it would be difficult to get this request through the DNR permitting process but promised to look into the matter.

In conclusion, Mr. Hake remarked that the connections to the berm did not seem to be in question by the Board, but rather the parking and the access to the parking. Mr. Dunwiddie offered that the connections are in question only to the extent that they encroach into the District's Water Management easement, however, he had no problem with this provided the Engineers advised it would not cause the District any trouble and the Board would not be violating its own edicts per their decision on St. Nicole.

Mr. Hake asked Mr. Griffith to re-do the drawings to show in color the easements that presently exist so that the Board could review these easements and, in the meantime, have WMBS&P take a look at what was being proposed to see if it would create any problem with the District's Water Management System.

Mr. Hake suggested that the Board did not want to repeat the mistake they had made when they reviewed the St. Nicole plans, that being the plans were just reviewed for the St. Nicole project not taking into consideration how the construction would affect the adjacent property. Through the use of the drawings, Mr. Briggs pointed out the adjacent property that would be affected by the North Boardwalk and the new parking lot at the Commons.

Mr. Dunwiddie requested that when WCN presented the plans to the Board for final approval, he desired to see the final grades of the new construction as well as the surrounding area. Mr. Hake stated that in order for the Board to make an intelligent decision regarding this matter, he asked that WCN come back to the Board with drawings of exactly what is there, with the easements outlined and clarification on any questions or objections from the Expansion Committee. Mr. Briggs remarked that the Expansion Committee would be meeting next week and they would discuss this matter in full.

Mr. Hunter stated that he had objections in the beginning and he fought hard for certain locations, however, it was apparent that this was not going to be acceptable to the Developers and since that time, he has fought just as hard to make sure that there would be adequate parking at the two places. He felt it would be helpful for the Board during final approval if the Foundation defined a little more clearly how many parking places will be provided at the North Boardwalk, because the total parking package should be in the neighborhood of 200 spaces. Mr. Hake felt this was a very fine suggestion.

Mr. Griffith concluded by stating that WCN would return at the next meeting with the final construction drawings and at that time would make a final presentation to the Board. Mr. Hake suggested the Board would also like to see a final clarification on the parking because the Board has not agreed to anything on the parking. He advised that conceptually everything else looked pretty good. Mr. Dunwiddie offered he would also like to see the rationale for whatever parking they felt was needed. The

Board concurred.

ENGINEER'S REPORT

Mr. Peek had nothing to report at this time.

MANAGER'S REPORT

Discussion of Assessment Program for Future Street Lighting System

Mr. Ward reported that during the past month he and Mr. Hake had been discussing how the District should proceed with the assessment program for the funding of the District Street Lighting System for the retirement of the existing debt and for future financing requirements. He explained that the pending completion of the balance of Pelican Bay Boulevard and the Vanderbilt Connector Road, on the east side of Bay Colony Shores, and the completion of Greentree Drive to Pelican Bay Boulevard, would complete the obligations of the District for its water and sewer lines. Also, the Developer will be completing the road system and, thus, he felt it would be a good idea for the Board to also consider the completion of its street lighting system in these areas. In light of this, he advised he had prepared a preliminary analysis to show what it would cost to complete the balance of the District's Street Lighting System and to pay off all of the existing outstanding street lighting loans. He reported that his analysis showed it will cost a little under \$700,000 to complete the balance of the system. Because he did not know the exact density of the undeveloped areas he computed the approximate cost, per assessment, per lot, using two different methods: the first using the PUD density, which would work out to approximately \$113.00 per unit and the second using the average density, which would work out to approximately \$180.00 per unit. He stated that

when the Board first began discussions regarding a special assessment for certain areas in order to pay off the existing loans, he had informed the Board that the assessment amount would be in the neighborhood of \$300.00 per unit, which would be levied on all the residents in Oakmont area, Beauville and the Unit Four (4) single family area. However, he advised that if the District is able to do one special assessment over the balance of the project in order to complete the District's financing obligations for the Street Lighting System, the District would be able to reduce the overall per unit assessment to approximately \$115.00 to \$180.00 per unit, depending on the density figures for the final assessment.

At this time, he asked for the Board's input on how they desired to proceed; i.e., doing one special assessment or doing a multiple number of special assessments. It was Mr. Ward's recommendation that the one special assessment method had a great deal of benefit and would complete the District's obligations for the street lighting system.

Mr. Hake asked why the Ritz Carlton Hotel property should be included in the assessment area, as the users of the Ritz Carlton will have no access into Pelican Bay. Mr. Ward explained that the Ritz Carlton Hotel is within the boundaries of the District's Street Lighting System and when he performed his analysis he was under the impression that they would have access to Pelican Bay through their gate up through Bay Colony Drive. However, if this would not be the case, he would have to rethink this concept.

Mr. Hake explained that once the special assessment took place, the District would be in the position to lower its annual assessment. Mr.

Ward advised that if you looked at the existing Fiscal Year 1990 Street Lighting Budget and eliminated all the debt service, a resident's current tax bill, based on a \$300,000 home, would drop from approximately \$85.00 per year to \$20.00 per year, a substantial decrease to the homeowner. Mr. Ward advised that a map showing the areas which would be assessed had been sent to the Board members under separate cover.

Mr. Dunwiddie strongly supported the one time special assessment.

Mr. Hake asked the procedure the Board must go through to proceed with the special assessment and whether any further notification was needed to the residents within the assessment area. Mr. McMackin advised that in a previous Memorandum to the Board, he had outlined the exact procedures for proceeding with the special assessment. Mr. Ward explained there is a lengthy procedure that the District must follow, if this concept met the Board's approval.

Mr. Dunwiddie stated that his only concern was the fact that it is so much more expensive per resident, per acre, to install street lights in the Oakmont area, for instance, than along Pelican Bay Boulevard, where the highrises are located and asked whether it was equitable to charge the highrises the same assessment. Mr. Moyer explained that Mr. Ward's calculations were based on units, the assumption being that each unit owner would benefit equally from the Street Lighting System and this would be the argument the District would have to make at the Public Hearing.

Mr. Hake suggested that staff and Mr. McMackin work together before the next meeting to bring themselves up to date on the methodology for performing the special assessment and to determine whether the Board

could proceed with this in a legal and effective fashion. He then suggested that this matter be deferred to the December meeting.

Mr. Ward also advised that during the past month he has had the opportunity to meet with the Developer of St. Simone and they have subsequently provided him with the drainage plans to ultimately fix the Stratford drainage problem. He explained that staff would quickly review these plans and would have an answer back to St. Simone the early part of next week on whether or not the plans were acceptable. He also reported that the Developer of St. Simone had advised him that they would expeditiously proceed with putting the final ultimate resolution to the water management problem on the Stratford's parking lot in place.

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 Phase III-B Expansion External Clarifier	No. 216	Wilson, Miller, et. al.	\$ 9,496.80
1989 Refunding Issue FDER Permit To Bring Utility Site in FDER Criteria 17.610	No. 217	Wilson, Miller, et. al.	1,757.50
P.B. Blvd., Oakmont Parkway, Greentree Drive, Vanderbilt Connector Road - Design Services	No. 8	Wilson, Miller, et. al.	\$ 9,304.00
		TOTAL AMOUNT	\$ 20,558.30

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

CONFIRMATION OF INVOICES

Water/Sewer Invoices and Operating Summaries For October 1989 - Approved As Presented

Following discussion, Mr. Dunwiddie moved, seconded by Mr. Mudge, and carried unanimously, that the Water/Sewer Invoices for October, 1989, be approved as presented.

Water Management Invoices and Operating Summaries For October 1989 - Approved As Presented

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

Street Lighting Invoices For October 1989 - Approved As Presented

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

SUPERVISOR'S REQUESTS AND AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Mr. Hake advised the Board that he would be out of town from December 12th to January 8th and would like to change the date of the regular December meeting as he desired to be in attendance. Mr. Ward explained that if the December meeting was moved to early December and it was scheduled as a Public Hearing it would not give staff enough time to properly advertise the Public Hearing on Chapter 197 of the Florida Statutes. Thus, he suggested that the Board meet on December 20, 1989 for the Public Hearing and to discuss this one item only. Following discussion, the Board concurred that the regular meeting would take place on Monday, December 11, 1989 at 3:00 P.M. and the Special Meeting for the

Public Hearing on Chapter 197 of the Florida Statutes would take place on December 20, 1989 at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Mudge asked for an explanation of the Golf Course water storage. He stated there is a lake located near Hole No. 7, which he believed was filled by a pump and he asked where this water comes from. Mr. Ward responded that this water comes from the District's Utility Site. Mr. Mudge asked if the lake near Hole No. 7 was only filled with water from the District. Mr. Ward responded in the affirmative, however, commented that it does have some groundwater recharge. Mr. Mudge asked whether there was any other drainage tied into the lake near Hole No. 7. Mr. Ward replied not to his knowledge.

Mr. Mudge asked what the pipe construction and the digging was at the northeast corner of Seagate Drive and West Boulevard. Mr. Ward replied that this was the County's construction of the potable water line to eventually tie into the District's system.

Mr. Mudge commented that he had recently reviewed the October water, sewer and irrigation billing and was totally amazed at the single family, Group One, irrigation use. It was unbelievable to him the amount of irrigation water some single family homes were using each month. He listed several users of the system with high use. He commented that Rudy Small has one of the best looking yards in the area and the yard is good size and Mr. Small had only used 24,000 gallons of irrigation water in the month of October. He did not feel many of the residents knew what their timers were set for, as they might very well be set by their gardeners, however, he felt that the amount of their irrigation bill would wake them

up. Mr. Ward advised the District caught a lot of people in the October billing who were abusing the system and the rate structure currently in place for irrigation water will do a good job in waking the residents up very quickly. However, he was sorry that a letter was not sent ahead of time explaining the rates.

Mr. Dunwiddie asked Mr. Peek when the Board could expect a Report on the status of the Phase III-B Facilities Expansion. Mr. Means responded they would have the Report to the Board by the December 11th meeting.

Mr. Dunwiddie reminded Mr. Ward that the Board had previously asked staff to notify them when plans came into the District office for review so the Board could review them if they so desired. Mr. Ward apologized for staff's failure to notify them and promised notification in the future.

Mr. Hake remarked that prior to the meeting Mr. Means had handed him a letter and asked that it be read at the meeting. Mr. Hake commented that the letter was addressed to him and read as follows: "This letter is in response to a letter addressed to you from Michael Arnold of the Collier County Utility Department, dated October 26, 1989, regarding Collier County Wastewater effluent quality. In his letter, Mr. Arnold claims that during the October 18, 1989 Board of Supervisors meeting I said that Collier County was in violation of its operating permits for the North Naples Collier County Wastewater Treatment Facilities effluent system. From recall of the meeting and from review of the Minutes, I am at a loss as to how and why Mr. Arnold can make this claim. My statement was in response to a question by Mr. Mudge who asked if the effluent from the Collier

County North Naples Treatment Plant met the current D.E.R. regulations for the use of effluent on public access areas. The current D.E.R. regulations were adopted in April, 1989 and addressed effluent quality for various uses, treatment process reliability, including S-1 reliability and continuous monitoring requirements. I responded to the question by indicating that through my conversation with the Collier County Utilities Department, the North Naples plant does not meet all of the new D.E.R. criteria. It is my understanding that the North Naples plant does not yet have Class I reliability and continuous monitoring which are new requirements. I did not say or imply that the plant effluent does not meet the quality parameters in their current operating permits. Furthermore, since I have not reviewed the North Naples plant operating records and permits I do not know if violations exist. I fail to see how the District can "perpetuate misinformation in public sessions when this misinformation does not exist". It is also my intent to avoid finger pointing and to clarify my statement for the record so that misunderstanding can be avoided. I would request that this letter be read into the record at the next Board of Supervisors meeting. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me."

Mr. Hake failed to see how the District perpetuates misinformation. Mr. Peek responded that one must refer to Mr. Arnold's letter as this was a direct quotation from Mr. Arnold's letter. Mr. Dunwiddie remarked that Mr. Arnold's letter also accused him (Mr. Dunwiddie) of parroting Mr. Mean's remarks and he (Mr. Dunwiddie) agreed completely with the remarks Mr. Means actually made, but stated he (Mr.

Dunwiddie) did not make any remarks imputed to him by Mr. Arnold.

Mr. Mudge asked whether any letter had been sent by District staff to Neil Dorrell regarding the District's request for certain data to be supplied to PBID for its review. Mr. Ward responded that District staff had not sent out any such letter and based on the comments today, it would not be his recommendation to send such a letter at this time. Mr. Hake and Mr. McMackin concurred with Mr. Ward's recommendation.


Mr. Bernie Young stated that at the last meeting the Board had asked the Property Owner's Association to supply them with the names of residents who would be willing to sit on a Committee for discussions with the County. He suggested that Mr. Rudy Small sit on the Committee for engineering related issues and Mr. Irving Kahn sit on the Committee for financial related matters. He advised that both Mr. Small and Mr. Kahn were waiting for instructions as to how they could assist the Board. Mr. Hake suggested that since Mr. Small was in attendance at the meeting he understood the Board decision on how they desired to proceed on this issue and he asked Mr. Mudge to pass the appropriate information on to Mr. Kahn. Mr. Dunwiddie also suggested if any Committee was formed he would like to see Mr. Carl Bowen sit on the Committee to help with engineering related matters. Mr. Hake advised that a Committee would be formed if necessary depending on the way the conversations flowed and at the appropriate time.

Mr. Mudge desired to make it clear that Mr. Peek would keep the Board informed as to the progress of the discussions, not necessarily on a month-to-month basis but rather a day-to-day basis.

Pelican Bay Improvement District
November 15, 1989

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, Mr. Potter moved, seconded by Mr. Hake and approved unanimously that the meeting be adjourned. Time: 6:20 P.M.



JAMES D. HAKE
PRESIDENT
PELICAN BAY IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT

PELICAN BAY IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT
WATER/SEWER INVOICES
OCTOBER 1989

<u>PAYEE</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
Actron IV, Inc.	Rent Equipment	\$ 10.00
Airport Tire & Service Center	Tires Ford Ranger	95.66
A.J. Welding	Flow Meter Holder	293.75
Allied Universal Corp.	Chlorine	773.10
Alpha Chemical	Janitorial Supplies	113.01
A.S.C.E.	Magazine Subscription	66.00
Association of Special Districts	1989-1990 Annual Dues	250.00
BancFlorida	3rd Quarter S.E.P. Contributions	633.18
BancFlorida	1989 S.E.P. Trustee Fees	37.50
BancFlorida	Meeting Room Rental - September 20, 1989	25.00
Bay Electric of Collier	Electrical Repairs	1,026.31
B & B Builders	Plant Supplies	21.25
B & H Sales	Meters & Meter Supplies	1,460.53
Brinker Brown Fastener	Small Tools, Fastener System & Parts H.S.P.	1,322.69
City of Naples	Potable Water Service - September 1, 1989 to October 1, 1989	18,580.97
Coast Pump & Supply	Irrigation Supplies	16.29
Coastal Couriers, Inc.	August Courier Service	6.00
Coral Springs Improvement District	Office Services Thru September 30, 1989	52.76
Coral Springs Improvement District	October Dental Insurance	49.56
Day-Timers, Inc.	October Office Supplies	22.32
Envirotech Operating Services	W/W Analyses & Groundwater Monitoring Program Testing	1,836.80
Envirotech Operating Services	WWTP Operations - October 9, 1989 Thru October 27, 1989	1,709.31
Federal Express Corp.	September & October Courier Service	48.38
Ferguson Enterprises	Irrigation Supplies	572.30
File One	October Office Supplies	37.63
Fischer & Porter	H.S.P. Repairs	1,332.00
Fisher Scientific	Laboratory Supplies & Reference Manuals	660.00
Florida Municipal Health Trust	October Health Insurance	598.06
Florida Power & Light	September & October Electric	20,787.52
Gulf Shore Associates	October Rent & Maintenance	879.72
Gulf Shore Associates	November Rent & Maintenance	879.72
Gulf Shore Insurance	W/S Portion F.Y. 1990 Insurance	19,509.36
Harcros Chemicals	WWTP Chemicals	528.55
H.F. Scientific, Inc.	Chart Paper	162.24

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

<u>PAYEE</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
Hoffman Office Supply	September Office Supplies	\$ 17.82
Hour Delivery, Inc.	September Courier Service	11.00
IBM Corporation	Displaywriter Maintenance to 12/31/89	312.00
Inacomp Computer Center	Laserwriter Toner	159.95
Jacaranda Landscape	Bushhog Wellfield	250.00
Lewis Publishers, Inc.	Reference Manual	52.50
Manatron, Inc.	Software Update	5.45
Molytek, Inc.	Chart Paper	41.60
Naples Daily News	Legal Advertising	143.14
Nationwide Business Forms	Window Envelopes - Utility Bills	183.00
Park Tire Center	Repair 1983 Ford Courier	219.88
PB&S Chemical Co.	Chlorine	3,174.30
Pitney Bowes	Postage Meter Rental	38.62
Qualicom Electronics	October & November Phone Pager	12.12
Quarles & Brady	August Legal Services	2,082.05
Ray's Septic Service	Remove Sludge WWTP	3,630.00
RegFiles	Quarterly RegFiles	511.00
RMRS System	Meter Postage	100.00
Robbins Telephone Answering Service	October Answering Service	94.15
Scotty's, Inc.	Small Tools	19.44
Southwest Electric Supply	Electrical Supplies	66.80
State of Florida D.E.R.	License Renewals - John Petty	50.00
Sun Bank	3rd Quarter S.E.P. Contributions	161.54
Sunshine Ace Hardware	Plant Supplies	168.85
Taylor Paving	Patch Pavement - Pine Village Lane & Bentwood Drive	300.00
Tri-W Rental	Rent Equipment	22.40
Unisys Direct	Computer Ribbons	126.90
Unisys Corporation	Computer Maintenance Agreement	981.00
United Telephone Of Florida	September Telephone	361.01
U.S. Postmaster	Bulk Mail Deposit - Utility Billing	1,000.00
Waste Management of Collier County	September & October Utility Site Dumpster	852.00
Wearguard, Inc.	Employee Uniforms	909.32
Weavers Office Supply	September & October Office Supplies	10.13
Westinghouse Communities of Naples, Inc.	August & September Fuel & Copies	270.83
Wilson, Miller, Barton, Soll & Peek, Inc.	Engineering Services - August 26, 1989 Thru September 22, 1989	2,531.73
Zee Medical Service Co.	First Aid Supplies	38.00

PELICAN BAY IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT
WATER MANAGEMENT INVOICES
OCTOBER 1989

<u>PAYEE</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
AC Laboratories, Inc.	September Lake Sampling	\$ 350.00
Airport Tire & Service Center	Tires Ford Ranger	95.66
A.J. Welding	Weir Plate Oakmont Lake	225.00
Asgrow Florida Company	Lake Maintenance Chemicals	5,506.00
Association of Special Districts	1989-1990 Annual Dues	250.00
BancFlorida	1989 S.E.P. Trustee Fees	37.50
BancFlorida	3rd Quarter S.E.P. Contributions	633.18
BancFlorida	Meeting Room Rental - Sept. 20, 1989	25.00
Coral Springs Improvement District	Lake Samples & Office Services Thru September 30, 1989	1,416.78
Coral Springs Improvement District	October Dental Insurance	49.56
Day-Timers, Inc.	October Office Supplies	22.32
Federal Express Corp.	September & October Courier Service	36.37
File One	October Office Supplies	37.65
Florida Department of Agriculture & Consumer Services	Commercial Applicator License - Chesley E. Adams, Jr.	10.00
Florida Municipal Health Insurance	October Health Insurance	598.06
Florida Power & Light Co.	September & October Electric	36.14
Gulf Shore Associates	October Rent & Maintenance	879.73
Gulf Shore Associates	November Rent & Maintenance	879.73
Gulf Shore Insurance	W/M Portion F.Y. 1990 Insurance	4,252.04
Hoffman Office Supply	September Office Supplies	17.82
Hour Delivery, Inc.	September Courier Service	11.00
IBM Corporation	Displaywriter Maintenance to 12/31/89	312.00
Jacaranda Landscape	Mow Berm	200.00
Jacaranda Landscape	October R-0-W Maintenance	16,616.37
Jacaranda Landscape	Replanting Program - 1989	16,917.50
Manatron, Inc.	Software Update	5.46
Motrim Incorporated	Parts for Motrim	147.88
Naples Armature Works	Parts Chemical Injection	223.42
Naples Daily News	Legal Advertising	97.57
Park Tire Center	Repair 1983 Ford Courier	219.87
PBID Water/Sewer Account	R-0-W Maintenance 8/15/89 to 9/30/89	4,086.77
Pitney Bowes	Postage Meter Rental	38.63
Qualicom Electronics	October & November Telephone Pager	12.10
Quarles & Brady	August Legal Services	2,082.05
RMRS System	Meter Postage	100.00

PELICAN BAY IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT
WATER MANAGEMENT INVOICES
OCTOBER 1989

(PAGE 2)

<u>PAYEE</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
Robbins Telephone Answering Service	October Answering Service	\$ 94.15
Sun Bank	3rd Quarter S.E.P. Contributions	161.54
Sunshine Ace Hardware	Sprayer Back Pack	109.99
Unisys Corporation	Computer Maintenance Agreement	981.00
Unisys Direct	Computer Ribbons	126.90
United Telephone of Florida	September Telephone	261.91
Van Waters & Rogers	Lake Maintenance Chemicals	2,595.00
Wearguard, Inc.	Employee Uniforms	909.34
Weavers Office Supply	September Office Supplies	10.13
Westinghouse Communities of Naples, Inc.	August & September Fuel & Copies	270.85
Wilson, Miller, Barton Soll & Peek, Inc.	Engineering Services August 26, 1989 Thru September 22, 1989	1,284.65
Zee Medical Services	First Aid Supplies	38.00

PELICAN BAY IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT
STREET LIGHT INVOICES
OCTOBER 1989

<u>PAYEE</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
BancFlorida	3rd Quarter S.E.P. Contributions	\$ 88.18
Bay Electric of Collier	Street Lighting Repairs	6,937.35
Florida Power & Light	September Electric	920.42
Florida Power & Light	October Electric	856.09
Gulf Shore Insurance	S/L Portion F.Y. 1990 Insurance	1,250.60

PELICAN BAY IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT
WATER AND WASTEWATER OPERATING SUMMARY
OCTOBER 1989

	FISCAL YEAR 1990 BUDGET	MONTH TO DATE			YEAR TO DATE		
		BUDGET	ACTUAL	VARIANCE FAVORABLE (UNFAVORABLE)	BUDGET	ACTUAL	VARIANCE FAVORABLE (UNFAVORABLE)
<u>CHARGES FOR SERVICES</u>							
Connection Fees	\$1,944,320	539,880	260,732	(279,148)	539,880	260,732	(279,148)
Meter Use Fees	58,250	43,000	2,500	(40,500)	43,000	2,500	(40,500)
<u>USER REVENUE & INTEREST INCOME</u>							
Water	658,219	45,625	44,392	(1,233)	45,625	44,392	(1,233)
Sewer	649,735	46,621	44,860	(1,761)	46,621	44,860	(1,761)
Irrigation	669,543	55,200	79,005	23,805	55,200	79,005	23,805
Interest	160,347	13,362	12,372	(990)	13,362	12,372	(990)
<u>TOTAL REVENUE</u>	<u>\$4,140,414</u>	<u>743,688</u>	<u>443,861</u>	<u>(299,827)</u>	<u>743,688</u>	<u>443,861</u>	<u>(299,827)</u>
<u>PROFESSIONAL FEES</u>							
Engineering	\$ 40,000	0	0	0	0	0	0
Legal	27,000	0	0	0	0	0	0
Audit	8,000	0	0	0	0	0	0
Trust	7,050	0	0	0	0	0	0
Office	37,617	2,656	3,015	(359)	2,656	3,015	(359)
Billing	3,933	328	1,183	(855)	328	1,183	(855)
Insurance	80,195	19,509	19,509	0	19,509	19,509	0
Payroll	203,813	15,678	12,525	3,153	15,678	12,525	3,153
Transportation	8,667	722	316	406	722	316	406
<u>SYSTEM OPERATING EXPENSES</u>							
Water Quality Testing	18,310	1,526	1,837	(311)	1,526	1,837	(311)
Repairs & Maintenance	105,410	8,784	6,750	2,034	8,784	6,750	2,034
Electric	253,538	19,311	16,889	2,422	19,311	16,889	2,422
Chemicals	73,594	6,102	1,831	4,271	6,102	1,831	4,271
City of Naples Water	263,766	16,454	18,475	(2,021)	16,454	18,475	(2,021)
Meter Expense	13,600	1,133	892	241	1,133	892	241
Sludge Hauling	41,844	3,487	1,760	1,727	3,487	1,760	1,727
Contingencies	30,000	2,500	0	2,500	2,500	0	2,500
<u>TOTAL EXPENSES</u>	<u>1,216,337</u>	<u>98,190</u>	<u>84,982</u>	<u>13,208</u>	<u>98,190</u>	<u>84,982</u>	<u>13,208</u>

PELICAN BAY IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT
WATER MANAGEMENT OPERATING SUMMARY
OCTOBER 1989

	<u>MONTH TO DATE</u>				<u>YEAR TO DATE</u>		
	<u>FISCAL YEAR 1990 BUDGET</u>	<u>BUDGET</u>	<u>ACTUAL</u>	<u>FAVORABLE (UNFAVORABLE) VARIANCE</u>	<u>BUDGET</u>	<u>ACTUAL</u>	<u>FAVORABLE (UNFAVORABLE) VARIANCE</u>
REVENUE							
Maintenance Taxes	\$ 669,507	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
TOTAL REVENUE	<u>\$ 669,507</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
MEETING EXPENSE							
Supervisors Fees	\$ 6,000	500	500	0	\$ 500	500	0
Legal Notification	1,500	125	83	42	125	83	42
PROFESSIONAL FEES							
Engineering	18,000	0	0	0	0	0	0
Legal	20,000	0	0	0	0	0	0
Audit	8,000	0	0	0	0	0	0
Trust	1,800	0	0	0	0	0	0
SYSTEM OPERATING EXPENSE							
Office	37,617	2,656	2,747	(91)	2,656	2,747	(91)
Payroll	171,797	13,215	10,816	2,399	13,215	10,816	2,399
Transportation	4,334	361	316	45	361	316	45
Aquascaping Program	8,000	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lake Maintenance	48,705	4,059	8,549	(4,490)	4,059	8,549	(4,490)
Berm & Swale Maintenance	4,000	333	348	(15)	333	348	(15)
Water Quality Testing	11,880	990	0	990	990	0	990
Insurance	17,858	4,252	4,252	0	4,252	4,252	0
Rights-Of-Way	271,111	17,019	16,476	543	17,019	16,476	543
Replanting Program	20,000	16,918	16,918	0	16,918	16,918	0
Water Connection	29,102	0	0	0	0	0	0
Water Use Projections	72,500	6,042	6,972	(930)	6,042	6,972	(930)
Contingencies	12,000	1,000	0	1,000	1,000	0	1,000
TOTAL EXPENSES	<u>\$ 764,204</u>	<u>67,470</u>	<u>67,977</u>	<u>(507)</u>	<u>67,470</u>	<u>67,977</u>	<u>(507)</u>

PELICAN BAY IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT
NOVEMBER 15, 1989 MINUTES
TAPE NUMBERS & CORRESPONDING AGENDA ITEMS

<u>AGENDA ITEM</u>	<u>NUMBER ON TAPE</u>
1. Roll Call.	0 - 3 (Tape 1, Side A)
2. Approval of Minutes of the Meetings held on October 18, 1989 and November 10, 1989.	3 - 52
3. Discussion of Various Issues Related to Collier County Providing Wastewater Service to the Pelican Bay Community. A) Working Group to Negotiate with Collier County.	52 - 526
4. Consideration of Award of Bids for Meter Purchases, Fiscal Year 1990.	526 - 696
5. Attorney's Report. A) Discussion of Legal Opinion Regarding the Construction of Water & Sewer Lines in Bay Colony. B) Discussion of the New Requirements of Chapter 197, Florida Statutes.	696 - 741 (End Tape 1, Side A) 0 - 444 (Tape 1, Side B)
6. Presentation by Westinghouse Communities of Naples, Inc. Regarding the Proposed North Boardwalk and Use of the District Berm.	444 - 741 (End Tape 1, Side B) 0 - 566 (Tape 2, Side A)
7. Engineer's Report.	566 - 571
8. Manager's Report. A) Discussion of Assessment Program for Future Street Lighting System.	571 - 741 (End Tape 2, Side A) 0 - 108 (Tape 2, Side B)
9. Certificates of Payment.	108 - 130
10. Confirmation of Invoices and Operating Summaries.	130 - 285
11. Supervisor's Requests & Audience Participation.	285 - 716
12. Adjournment.	716 - 719