

**MINUTES OF MEETING
RIVER RIDGE
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT**

A Regular Meeting of the River Ridge Community Development District's Board of Supervisors was held on **Tuesday, May 27, 2014 at 1:00 p.m., at the Pelican Sound Golf and River Club at 4561 Pelican Sound Boulevard, Estero, Florida 33928.**

Present at the meeting were:

Terry Mountford	Chair
Bob Schultz (<i>via telephone</i>)	Vice Chair
George (Tom) Schoenheider	Assistant Secretary
Judy Haase	Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

Chuck Adams	District Manager
Cleo Crismond	Assistant Regional Manager
Tony Pires	District Counsel
Charlie Krebs	District Engineer
Jim Whitmore	PSGRC General Manager
Joyce Lenart	Resident and Pinehurst NVR

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

Call to Order/Roll Call

Ms. Crismond called the meeting to order at 1:08 p.m., and noted, for the record, Supervisors Mountford, Schoenheider and Haase were present, in person. Supervisor Schultz was attending via telephone. Supervisor Golle was not present.

Mr. Pires suggested a motion authorizing Mr. Schultz's full participation, via telephone, due to special circumstances.

On MOTION by Mr. Mountford and seconded by Mr. Schoenheider, with all in favor, authorizing Mr. Schultz' attendance and full participation, via telephone, due to special circumstances, was approved.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS

**Public Comments: Agenda Items (5
minutes per speaker)**

- **Solutions for Speeding in Roundabout at Corkscrew and Pinehurst Greens Drive**
 - **Revisit Analysis Options to Include Installation of Rumble Strips**

****This item, previously Item 8.B., was presented out of order.****

Ms. Crismond indicated that Ms. Joyce Lenart, a resident, wished to speak on the Pinehurst street repairs and the roundabout.

Ms. Lenart stated that it is her understanding that the repairs might possibly be included in the 2015 budget. She recalled her request of two months ago to resurface the roads in her neighborhood, as well as the possibility of installing a rumble strip, or other traffic calming device, that will assist in slowing down traffic in the roundabout.

Mr. Adams noted that this item is included in the agenda, in the Engineer’s section, under Staff Reports and asked the Board if they wished to discuss this out of order.

Mr. Mountford stated that, normally, this would be a small issue; however, it is a large issue that the District is wrestling with. He noted that there is a speeding problem throughout Pelican Sound, as well as at the roundabout.

Mr. Mountford recalled that the District Engineer, Mr. Krebs, was asked to research traffic calming devices, which includes the roundabout. Mr. Mountford suggested discussing the roundabout first, as the road resurfacing is a completely different issue. He noted that the traffic calming devices were discussed, extensively, at the prior meeting.

Mr. Krebs asked if the speed bumps are for Island Sound or Pinehurst. Mr. Mountford stated that the traffic calming devices should be considered for Island Sound, Pinehurst or the roundabout. Mr. Mountford noted that several Island Sound and Pinehurst residents have complained about speeding in their areas.

With regard to the roundabout, Mr. Krebs recommended improving the signage, as a first step. He indicated that warning signs can be placed ahead of the Yield sign; the signs can say “Yield Ahead”. Mr. Krebs indicated that a placard can be placed underneath the existing Yield sign for cars to stop and yield to the vehicles in the roundabout. If that fails, other methods can be utilized, such as the rumble strip or replacing the Yield sign with a Stop sign. Mr. Krebs stated that placing warning signs prior to the Yield sign will help, if the problem is a visibility issue.

Mr. Krebs opined that the installation of a rumble strip is not a good idea, if the roads will be resurfaced in a few years, as the strips will be removed at that time. He does not believe that this would be money well spent.

Mr. Mountford indicated that the roundabout is not a large area and the rubber strips cannot be too costly. Mr. Krebs advised that he discussed the strips with a roadway engineer and the rubber strips are bolted into the roadway. The bolts will eventually loosen and fall out, over time; replacement will be required. Mr. Krebs noted that this will jeopardize the integrity of the pavement and the District will eventually have to repair the road.

Mr. Krebs recalled a prior discussion regarding the installation of “removable rubber strips” in Island Sound. The roadway engineer advised that this strip should be installed in such a way that it will not leave nails behind, if a piece of the rubber tears off. Mr. Krebs indicated that the roadway pavement markings (RPMs) are mounted with adhesive and loosen, over time. The RPMs will leave stains on the pavement and create an eyesore.

Mr. Krebs pointed out that improved signage might be the best solution. Mr. Mountford contended that signage will not work and noted that, prior to the Yield sign, there was a Stop sign on the roundabout.

Mr. Mountford conveyed that he has been observing how other communities handle this situation. He advised that he played golf at Imperial and noticed that there are three consecutive speed bumps, approximately 50 yards apart, at the entrance to the community. This reminds people to slow down. Mr. Mountford indicated that they have two or three more speed bumps near the clubhouse. He is sure that the Board will receive complaints about the speed bumps if that route is taken.

Mr. Krebs indicated that, per the residents’ complaints, he was able to identify three to four locations where “table tops” can be installed on Island Sound. He noted that there are “table tops” that are closer to the District’s operation speed and would not be a big inconvenience. Mr. Krebs recommended informing the Fire Department and EMS of any traffic calming device that will be installed, as well as polling the HOAs and residents, to determine if they really want them installed.

Mr. Mountford questioned whether the District has a right to install the traffic calming devices. Mr. Pires replied affirmatively and pointed out that the District may find out that only one resident wants to install them. Mr. Mountford concurred and noted that the roundabout is a different story, as it may not be practical to poll all of Pelican Sound.

Mr. Mountford indicated that he would prefer to try out the speed bumps. He reiterated that signage does not work.

Mr. Schoenheider pointed out that the three entryways leading to the roundabout include one from the guard gate, one from Pinehurst and one from Pelican Sound Boulevard. He asked if speed bumps will be installed on all three. Mr. Krebs indicated that he will find a way to install them on all three, if that is what the Board wants. Mr. Schoenheider stated that, if it will be installed on one, it should be installed on all three. Mr. Krebs asserted that, for this reason, he prefers to try improved signage first. Ms. Lenart stated the existing signage is not doing any good.

Mr. Schoenheider asked if the roundabout is bricked or paved. Mr. Krebs explained that the roundabout is all brick and he does not recommend installing the traffic calming devices on brick; they should be installed prior to entering the roundabout. Mr. Krebs advised that the road from the guard gate is brick, as well. Mr. Whitmore clarified that the road is concrete, at the meeting point.

Further discussion ensued regarding the roads leading to the roundabout and possible locations for traffic calming devices.

Mr. Krebs indicated that the devices can be installed at the Stop signs on Pinehurst and Pelican Sound Boulevard.. He noted that the District can get creative and construct a traffic calming device out of bricks, depending on the costs involved. Mr. Krebs reported that Southern Hills installed raised brick pavers, which are not speed bumps but force drivers to slow down. Mr. Crismond was in agreement with that idea and noted that will be more aesthetically pleasing. Mr. Mountford considered that a good compromise. Mr. Schoenheider pointed out that the pavement will not be impacted.

Mr. Schultz stated that there are several roundabouts, on Coconut Road, with extensive signage and no traffic calming devices. He noted that he supports installing the raised pavers; however, he also prefers to install additional signage. Mr. Mountford was in agreement. Mr. Schultz clarified that he is referring to signage painted on the road.

Ms. Haase asked if Mr. Krebs was recommending one row of raised pavers, or if there would be additional rows. Mr. Krebs stated that the pavers can be installed on Pinehurst, where the roundabout starts, right after the guard house, and an additional set on the road leading out.

Ms. Lenart noted that the problem is that the drivers entering through Pelican Sound Boulevard do not treat it as a roundabout because it is a “straight shot for them to go out”. The pavers are located within the roundabout; therefore, by the time they hit the pavers, “they would have already shot through it.” These drivers are not looking for the vehicles entering through

Pinehurst. Pinehurst drivers are more cautious entering the roundabout because they anticipate that the drivers entering on Pelican Sound Boulevard will not yield. Ms. Lenart expressed doubt that the raised pavers will solve the problem. Mr. Krebs clarified that the raised pavers will be installed before the pavers. Ms. Lenart agreed that it will be more aesthetically pleasing.

Mr. Mountford advised that “Caution, Slow Down” signage can be installed prior to the raised pavers. Mr. Krebs reiterated that signage can be installed prior to the actual Yield sign. Mr. Krebs noted that some drivers do not know what a Yield sign means.

Mr. Mountford recalled that a Pelican Sound resident was killed in the roundabout that Mr. Schultz mentioned earlier; it is a dangerous location. He asked Mr. Krebs to prepare a plan for the Board’s review and consideration.

Mr. Krebs indicated that Island Sound has a speeding issue and recalled that a resident suggested a table top or some type of physical barrier. He advised that he reviewed the Florida Department of Transportation’s (DOT) Manual of Uniform Minimum Standards for Design, Construction and Maintenance for Streets and Highways (Manual) and noted that they have several different design options for different speeds. There is one that fits the District’s speed limit. Mr. Krebs investigated where they should be installed, as they should not be placed near a driveway. He identified three to four green areas, between buildings and dumpsters, where they can be installed. Mr. Krebs based his recommendations on the residents’ complaints of “blind spots” in the area. He recommended that the District consult with the HOAs.

Mr. Mountford suggested installing “Caution” signage. Mr. Krebs concurred and indicated that “Bump Ahead” and other signage should be installed.

Mr. Mountford reiterated his prior request for Mr. Krebs to prepare plans. Ms. Crismond asked if the plans will be ready prior to the next Board Meeting. Mr. Krebs advised that he will email the plans, in PDF format, to Ms. Crismond, for distribution to the Board.

Ms. Haase noted that the current Yield sign was placed too high and asked if it can be lowered. Mr. Krebs advised that he will inspect the sign but he believes it is at the correct height. Mr. Whitmore indicated that the sign is at the correct level; however, it seems high. Mr. Whitmore stated that the “Yield Ahead” signage should be lower. Mr. Krebs concurred and noted that the placard that is placed below the Yield sign will be lower and will call attention to the actual Yield sign.

Mr. Krebs clarified that the DOT Manual contains the height specification range for the signage and he believes that the District complied with the minimum range. The height range is

also structured so that anyone not paying attention does not get “whacked in the head with a sign”.

Mr. Schoenheider asked if there is a Yield sign on Pinehurst, or entering the roundabout. Mr. Krebs replied affirmatively. In response to Ms. Haase’s question, Mr. Krebs indicated that the road leading from the gatehouse does not have a Yield sign. Mr. Krebs clarified that there is a Stop sign before the gatehouse but nothing after.

In response to Mr. Mountford’s comment, Mr. Krebs confirmed that he will prepare a plan.

Mr. Whitmore reported that there is an issue with nonresidents entering through the exit gate on Williams Road after residents exit through the gate. He noted that the gate will not close if the sensor picks up the weight of another car. Mr. Whitmore stated that they are considering installing a device that will damage tires entering the wrong way. Mr. Adams indicated that the PSGRC is not required to unimpeded public access at “every” entry point, just at “an” entry point. Mr. Pires indicated that he has not heard of anyone installing a tire shredder on a public road. Mr. Adams noted that the PSGRC has two 24/7 manned gates to the District’s roadway system and confirmed that the District owns the road all the way up to Williams Road. Mr. Whitmore advised that a sign can be posted, stating that the PSGRC will not assume any responsibility for damaged tires and cars. Mr. Pires reiterated that he is not aware of the installation of tire shredders on public roads and indicated that he will research the matter, as he is not comfortable with approving the installation. Mr. Whitmore indicated that the PSGRC previously placed arms at the gate; they are knocked down and must be replaced constantly.

Further discussion ensued regarding tire shredders. It was noted that the Port Authority utilizes tire shredders. Mr. Adams suggested installing a combination of speed bumps to slow the cars down and allow ample time for the gate to close.

Mr. Whitmore advised Mr. Mountford that the Island Sound Board representative is in support of the tire shredder.

Mr. Pires noted that there are special purpose public properties, such as a public school. They are a public facility; however, they are closed after hours.

In response to Mr. Mountford’s question, Mr. Krebs indicated that he will include prices for signage and the traffic calming devices in the plan. Mr. Mountford asked if there is leeway in the budget for these improvements. Mr. Adams replied affirmatively.

Ms. Haase pointed out that Island Sound and the roundabout were discussed; however, the Board has not discussed the speeding issues in the community, in general. Mr. Krebs indicated that Stop signs are not effective, nor are they intended to control speeding, as they create adverse traffic conditions. Mr. Krebs recalled that the Board discussed installing a Stop sign at the clubhouse. He noted that residents are accustomed to the current traffic flow and installing a new Stop sign opens the door to potential accidents. Mr. Krebs explained that there should be justification for the installation of a new Stop sign, such as an increase in traffic accidents; speeding does not “fit the bill”.

Mr. Whitmore recalled prior discussions regarding the installation of “table tops” throughout the community. Mr. Krebs noted that drivers slow down while going over a table top and speed in between each one. Table tops make sense in Island Sound, where there are line of sight issues. Mr. Whitmore indicated that Edgewater has line of sight issues, as their driveways are recessed.

Further discussion ensued regarding Edgewater driveway conditions.

Mr. Schoenheider advised that he visited a community in South Carolina and observed that the road patrol has the ability to hand out speeding tickets to residents or vendors. The board has the ability to fine or sanction them, if they have multiple speeding offenses. He asked Mr. Pires if that was legal in Florida. Mr. Pires explained that neither the District nor the HOA has traffic enforcement authority. Mr. Pires clarified that the only entities with traffic enforcement authority are law enforcement agencies, the police in municipalities, troopers statewide and the sheriff’s office, countywide.

Mr. Schoenheider asked if a motion is necessary for the approval of the tire shredder. Mr. Adams noted that Mr. Pires will research the topic for further discussion at the next meeting. Mr. Adams suggested a motion contingent upon Mr. Pires’ research not being adverse to allowing the association to move forward with the improvements.

On MOTION by Mr. Schoenheider and seconded by Mr. Mountford, with all in favor, the installation of a tire shredder, contingent upon Mr. Pires’ research not being adverse to allowing the association to move forward with the improvements, was approved.

Mr. Mountford advised Mr. Krebs that he would like to get the projects completed quickly. Mr. Krebs indicated that he will provide the plan, with specifications and costs, to Ms. Crismond and noted that the exhibits will have sufficient information to be used in the bidding process.

Mr. Mountford indicated that the second part of Ms. Lenart’s question deals with road resurfacing. He advised that the Board has been considering how to approach resurfacing all the roads within Pelican Sound. Mr. Mountford indicated that Pinehurst’s roads are not any worse than the roads in other parts of the community. He confirmed that all the roads will be resurfaced; it is a matter of prioritization and funding. Mr. Mountford acknowledged that the road work performed in Island Sound was necessary, as the roads were caving in. He advised that The Masters, where he resides, has several depressions in the roads.

In response to Mr. Mountford’s question, Mr. Krebs advised that he could not locate the “bump” in front of the clubhouse.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS

Consideration of Resolution 2014-6, Approving the District’s Proposed Budget for Fiscal Year 2014/2015 and Setting a Public Hearing Thereon Pursuant to Florida Law

Mr. Adams presented Resolution 2014-6 for the Board’s consideration. He noted that the resolution identifies August 26, 2014 as the public hearing date. Mr. Mountford stated that August 26 is not good for him.

• **Discussion: Calendar/Schedules**

****This item previously the Fifth Order of Business, was discussed out of order.****

Mr. Adams recalled that he asked the Board to bring their schedules/calendar to today’s meeting to ensure that a quorum is established. Mr. Mountford advised that he will be out of town for the entire month of August. Ms. Haase noted that she is unavailable, as well.

Mr. Adams polled the Board for their availability in early September and stressed that the budget must be adopted by September 15. Mr. Adams asked the Board if they are available on September 2. Ms. Haase advised that she is unavailable that day. Mr. Adams indicated that Mr. Schultz is unavailable, as well.

Mr. Adams suggested scheduling the public hearing on September 2, while a quorum is confirmed. The hearing can be rescheduled, if necessary.

▪ **Consideration of Resolution 2014-6 resumed.**

Mr. Adams disseminated a revised budget and advised that Ms. Haase previously noticed that the expenses do not affect the FY 2015 totals, only some expenses will be carried over in the “Projected through 9/30/2014” and in the “Total Revenues & Expenditures. It serves to reduce the fund balance.

Referring to the handout, Mr. Adams noted that he added \$42,380.00 to the “Street lighting” line item. He clarified that \$42,380 is the cost of the uplighting previously approved by the Board. With regard to “Street sweeping”, Mr. Adams acknowledged that the cost was recognized in the “projected” column but was not carried over to the “Total Revenue & Expenditures”; the same applied to the “Roadway repairs” line item.

On Page 2, Mr. Adams noted that the “Fund Balance” was reduced to \$72,647, from the \$180,000 reflected in the budget that was included in the agenda. He recalled prior discussions to use the fund balance, which would bring it down to approximately 25% of the annual budget. Mr. Adams advised that the District’s average budget, excluding the \$350,000 expense, is \$355,000; therefore, \$72,647 keeps the District in the 25% “safe zone”. He pointed out that these funds fulfill the District’s gap funding needs for the months of October, November and December.

Mr. Adams explained that \$350,000 was identified as the total expense for lake bank erosion. It will be expensed in the first year, 2015, utilizing approximately \$167,000 of fund balance. The difference is collected in the current year assessments; this use of fund balance keeps the assessments at the target number previously discussed, which was \$380 per door front. He noted that the actual assessment is \$378.84, with the use of fund balance.

Mr. Adams indicated that, the following year, the District will recover the use of fund balance because the assessment will be kept the same, without the expense or the use of fund balance. He noted that \$167,000 will be recuperated in the fund balance. The result of the transaction is paying for this improvement, over a two-year period, without borrowing from an outside source and saving the cost of borrowing.

Mr. Adams indicated that the Board can consider the roadway resurfacing program in 2017. He suggested prioritizing the roads, which will save the District the cost of borrowing. Mr. Adams advised that the Board can choose another improvement from the capital improvement (CIP) schedule that he prepared, subsequent to the roadway resurfacing. The assessments will be reduced after all the improvements are made.

Mr. Schoenheider calculated that \$350,000 divided by 1,299 door fronts equals \$147.75 per door front; however, the assessments were increased by a larger amount. He noted that the “math doesn’t fit”. Mr. Adams explained that the assessments were increased from \$231 to \$378, an increase of \$147.

Mr. Mountford noted that the District jumped into a major expenditure without much discussion. Mr. Adams recalled that this was discussed, extensively, at the last meeting and suggested a review of the meeting minutes. Mr. Mountford asked what kind of study was performed to determine whether the lake bank erosion repairs are necessary. Mr. Adams and Ms. Crismond advised that the repairs are necessary. Mr. Adams indicated that the linear footage is the question. Mr. Adams advised that he will be performing the lake audit with Ms. Crismond; they will be measuring all the areas that are not in compliance and will mark the areas on a map. Mr. Adams indicated that the linear footage cost will be between \$25 to \$30 per linear foot.

Mr. Mountford pointed out that, percentage wise, this is a large assessment increase. He stated that the lake bank erosion repairs are not as noticeable as the roadway repairs. Ms. Crismond noted that the lake banks are “out of compliance”. Mr. Adams agreed that it is not a “bang for the buck” kind of item; however, it is a necessity because it is a permit compliance issue. Mr. Adams advised taking a proactive approach, prior to the District receiving a notice from the county or the erosion worsening.

Mr. Mountford asked whether the repairs are needed on the lake’s edge or the littoral shelf. Ms. Crismond and Mr. Adams confirmed that it is the lake’s edge.

In response to Mr. Mountford’s inquiry, Mr. Adams explained that the contractor will bring in a flat bottom boat with a mud pump. The mud is pumped out of the lake into cylinder tubing, with holes, allowing the water to drain. Subsequently, the tubing is cut open and the soil is raked into the lake bank. Mr. Adams noted that sod will be carried in on wheelbarrows, to prevent damage to adjacent landscape.

Mr. Schoenheider asked if the new plantings will be destroyed. Mr. Adams indicated that a minimal amount of plants will be lost, on the upper side of the shelf. Mr. Schoenheider inquired if the littoral shelf will be refurbished. Mr. Adams replied that Staff is only concerned with the slope and bank, up to the water’s edge; the 9” vertical will be eliminated.

Mr. Schultz recalled that a lake was identified as part of a “total stormwater management system” and noted that, in the past, refurbishments affecting everyone were assessed to the “whole District”. He asked Mr. Adams if the \$350,000 can be “spread across the entire District”.

Mr. Adams said that it is possible; however, the prior restoration was a water quality concern and the lake bank repairs are a “capital localized volume item”. He clarified that it is a capital investment, versus a system-wide water quality item.

Mr. Pires noted that the District can impose assessments to those who benefit from the system. Mr. Adams stated that he is “comfortable with it, if counsel is comfortable with it”. Mr. Pires indicated that he is comfortable with it, to the extent that the notice advising of the increase would need to articulate the purpose and utilization of the funds. Mr. Adams noted that everyone will be assessed, if the Board is comfortable with the decision.

Mr. Mountford indicated that the District should be consistent; it is harder to argue, if a consistent pattern is followed. Mr. Adams recalled that there were concerns with assessing the mitigation work.

Mr. Schoenheider asked Mr. Pires if he feels comfortable with the decision, if The Meadows contests the assessments. Mr. Pires indicated that the District will have to prove that everyone will benefit from the lake bank repairs and he feels comfortable that Mr. Adams’ and Mr. Krebs’ testimony is sufficient. Mr. Pires clarified that the District must prove that the assessment is less than the benefit. Mr. Adams agreed that it is easy to prove. Mr. Pires expressed confidence that the District would prevail.

Mr. Adams indicated that the adjustment will be made. Mr. Schultz noted that the \$147 increase would be reduced by approximately \$67 and result in an assessment of approximately \$203.

▪ **Discussion: Road Repairs**

****This item was an addition to the agenda.****

Mr. Mountford stated that he anticipates that the District will be pressured to fix the roads. Mr. Adams concurred. Mr. Mountford noted that the District must be ready to make emergency road repairs, as it will be a number of years before the District’s roads are resurfaced. Mr. Mountford asked Mr. Krebs to advise the Board of any necessary repairs, subsequent to his road inspection. Mr. Krebs indicated that he performed the road inspections the prior week and made a note of several areas that are in need of repairs. Mr. Krebs indicated that there is \$50,000 in contingencies that can be utilized for road repairs.

Further discussion ensued regarding road, paver and curb repairs.

Mr. Schultz asked Mr. Krebs if the depressions, adjacent to the gutters, were inspected, as they cause shallow areas and the water cannot reach the drains. Mr. Krebs advised that he made note of several areas with that problem. Mr. Krebs indicated that certain areas can wait until all the areas are resurfaced, if the severity of the depressions does not increase. In response to Mr. Schultz' comment regarding a gutter located on Glen Eagle, Mr. Krebs stated that he took pictures of that location and it is on his list. Mr. Schultz conveyed that the neighbors "bug" him all the time regarding the condition of the gutter. Mr. Krebs advised that he will inspect the area when it is raining, as it was dry during his prior inspection.

In response to Mr. Schultz' inquiry, Mr. Krebs reported that "the roads are still in good, serviceable condition", for the most part. Mr. Krebs did not notice any "good deterioration" from the prior year's inspection. He stated that the only "real cracking" he observed was on Turnberry Lake Drive and it has been there for several years. Mr. Krebs stated that he made note of the necessary pavement repairs, which can be performed based on the District's expenditures. Until all the roads are repaired, patchwork repairs will be performed, unless Mr. Krebs observes a critical repair.

Mr. Schultz asked Mr. Krebs to inspect the gutter in Glen Eagle. Mr. Krebs reiterated that he would inspect the area during a rain.

In response to Mr. Whitmore's question, Mr. Krebs indicated that he received an email from June regarding the deterioration of the inlets at the main gate on Corkscrew Road. Mr. Krebs stated that it seems the inlets have a PVC drain inside. Mr. Whitmore conveyed that the pipe may have been added during construction. Mr. Krebs questioned whether it was an addition or junk is sitting in there, as he cannot reach in there and grab it.

Further discussion ensued regarding the location of the pipe and inlets.

Mr. Krebs reported that Mr. Whitmore asked him to determine whether the damage at the inlets is on District or county property. Mr. Krebs surmised that there is an agreement currently in place with the county for the District to maintain that area. He noted that the District can notify the county of the repair. Mr. Krebs conveyed that the county might not care, as the road will not be "ripped up". Mr. Whitmore clarified that it is one pothole. Mr. Krebs stated that the repair is near, or on the property and the District should contact DOT to advise of the repair.

Mr. Krebs indicated that he can prioritize immediate repairs that should be performed, if the District plans on utilizing \$50,000 per year, over the next two years.

Mr. Mountford noted that the pavers at the entrance to The Masters are starting to fall apart. He questioned whether the paver repairs will be more expensive than the asphalt work.

Mr. Krebs indicated that depressions, similar to the ones observed in Island Sound, are forming in the cul-de-sac on Palmetto. He explained that the pavers can be pulled up, the asphalt leveled and the pavers reset. The pavers on the Corkscrew Road entrance are in much worse condition than the pavers in The Masters.

Mr. Krebs advised that some of the broken pavers are not structurally damaged and not causing a problem in the road; the contractor might be able to reuse them. He recalled that some pavers are an eyesore.

Mr. Mountford noted that picking out the good pavers might be too time consuming; they may have to be replaced. Mr. Krebs indicated that, if the entire entrance on Corkscrew is repaved, the good pavers can be saved and used to replace broken pavers, in other locations, as they will match in age and appearance.

In response to Mr. Adams' question, Mr. Krebs stated that, to the best of his knowledge, the pavers have not been flipped. Mr. Adams explained that the older pavers can be flipped to match the new pavers that will replace the broken ones.

Mr. Mountford indicated that residents are more cognizant of the condition of the roads and anticipates that the Board will receive many questions regarding road repairs. He noted that the Board must be prepared to respond to resident questions.

Mr. Krebs advised that he would repair the Corkscrew entrance first, followed by the two cul-de-sacs in Palmetto Dunes. He noted that he will have to review his notes to determine whether the next paver repairs should be made in The Masters or Southern Hill.

Ms. Haase suggested including the details of the repairs in the newsletter, as a constant reminder to the residents that the repairs will be made. Mr. Mountford asserted that the worst areas need to be addressed first.

With regard to Resolution 2014-6, Mr. Pires advised that the hearing date must be changed.

On MOTION by Mr. Mountford and seconded by Ms. Haase, with all in favor, Resolution 2014-6, Approving the District’s Proposed Budget for Fiscal Year 2014/2015 and Setting a Public Hearing Thereon Pursuant to Florida Law on September 2, 2014 at 1:00 p.m., at the Pelican Sound Golf and River Club, 4561 Pelican Sound Boulevard, as amended, was adopted.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Discussion: Staff Evaluations

- A. Attorney**
- B. Engineer**
- C. Manager**

Mr. Adams advised that Staff evaluations are included in the agenda. He pointed out that Mr. Mountford’s evaluations were not included in the agenda because he handed them in today.

Mr. Adams noted that the evaluations seemed very consistent. They reflect that the Board has a level of “comfort and satisfaction” with the District’s Engineer, Counsel and Manager.

Mr. Adams stated that there are one or two comments regarding the Manager assuming more of a leadership role with regard to assisting the Board with setting clear objectives. The Board prefers the District Engineer to be more proactive. Mr. Adams indicated that the evaluations reflect that the Board is satisfied with Staff’s performance.

Mr. Adams thanked the Board for taking the time to complete the evaluations.

Mr. Mountford recalled that he previously asked Mr. Adams who the Manager is and the response was that it is Wrathell, Hunt and Associates, LLC. Mr. Mountford stated that the only contact that the Board receives is to request whether or not the Board is attending a meeting. Mr. Mountford indicated that the Board should receive communications from Mr. Adams and Ms. Crismond. He affirmed that Mr. Adams and Ms. Crismond are “prime players” with the Board and, as far as he is concerned, they “are the firm”. Ms. Crismond and Mr. Adams assured Mr. Mountford that there are many “busy people” working behind the scene.

Mr. Adams pointed out that the Board deals directly with Ms. Crismond and himself and affirmed that “it is more than just us”. There is a “really good team” working behind the scenes.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Discussion: Calendar/Schedules

Mr. Adams recalled that, earlier in the meeting, the Board rescheduled the August 26 Public Hearing and Regular Meeting to September 2, contingent upon Mr. Golle's confirmation that he will be present on that date.

Mr. Adams polled the Board for their availability in June and July. Several Board Members advised that they will not be available in July. Mr. Adams indicated that a meeting can be held in June, if Mr. Golle is available.

Mr. Mountford noted that additional discussions will be necessary regarding the speeding issues. He indicated that the District can begin installing the additional signage. Mr. Mountford suggested inviting the NVRs to a future meeting to discuss the traffic calming devices.

Mr. Schultz pointed out that work on Corkscrew Circle should be performed during the summer, before the residents return. Mr. Adams concurred.

Discussion ensued regarding construction and construction vehicles.

Mr. Krebs advised that the signage can be installed without any problems. He noted that the paver repairs can commence in Pinehurst.

Mr. Adams advised that proposals can be obtained after Mr. Krebs transmits the plan.

Ms. Haase advised that Edgewater I is performing roof repairs beginning in July; the repairs are expected to last six to seven weeks.

Ms. Crismond summarized that the June 24 meeting will be held, if Mr. Golle is available, and no meetings will be held in July and August. The public hearing will be held on September 2, if Mr. Golle is available.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Approval of April 22, 2014 Regular Meeting Minutes

Ms. Crismond presented the April 22, 2014 Regular Meeting Minutes and asked for any additions, deletions or corrections.

Mr. Mountford stated that whoever transcribes the minutes does an "amazing job". He does not "know how they do it".

The following changes were made:

Line 144: Change "kids" to "hidden"

Line 238 to 240: Delete the sentence "That board...30 days."

Line 469: Change "fells" to "feels"

On MOTION by Mr. Schenheider and seconded by Ms. Haase, with all in favor, the April 22, 2014 Regular Meeting Minutes, as amended, were approved.

• **Action/Agenda Items**

Ms. Crismond presented the Action/Agenda Items.

With regard to Action Item 3, Mr. Adams advised that Staff will inspect the wall after today’s meeting.

Referring to Action Item 13, Ms. Crismond recalled that Sewer Viewer submitted a proposal in the amount of \$16,460. She advised that she obtained a lower quote, in the amount of \$15,000, from M.R.I. and negotiated a contract with them. The project is scheduled to be completed by the end of the week.

Ms. Crismond reported that, as a result of the bulrush outbreak and the littoral plants growing in the flow way, she has been holding several Lake & Wetland Management (Lake & Wetland) invoices. Staff met with them on Friday morning and they have made a dramatic improvement in their performance. She noted that the bulrush has been eradicated, except for an area in Tract 12. Ms. Crismond stated that the condition of the H Lakes was also discussed with Lake & Wetland.

Ms. Crismond advised that a Lake & Wetland representative suggested a new type of aeration system that is more efficient than the District’s current system and he will forward the literature for Ms. Crismond’s review. Lake & Wetland offered to install the new system in Lake H1-C, on a trial basis. She noted that the beneficial plants were “torched” as they tried to eradicate the Slender Spike Rush; therefore, Lake & Wetland will introduce a different palette of plants that they believe will “do better” in that lake.

Ms. Crismond advised that Lake H1-B will be raked.

Ms. Haase requested the inclusion of the uplighting project to the Action List.

Items 4, 6, 9, 11, 12, 13 and 17 were completed.

Items 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 14, 15 and 16 were continued.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Other Business

There being no other business, the next item followed.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Staff Reports

A. Attorney

Mr. Pires recalled that the Board approved additional changes to the Informal Policy and Procedure for Resident Inquiries/Complaints and disseminated a revised, clean copy to the Board. He noted that a copy will be uploaded to the District’s website.

Mr. Pires reported that the Florida Legislature made changes that will require certain information to be included on the District’s website.

Mr. Pires asked Mr. Adams for a status of the effluent water agreement. Mr. Adams indicated that the executed copy was received from the county. Mr. Pires requested a copy for his files.

- **Invoices**

The invoices were included for information purposes.

B. Engineer

There being nothing additional to report, the next item followed.

- **Invoices**

The invoices were included for information purposes.

- **Solutions for Speeding in Roundabout at Corkscrew and Pinehurst Greens Drive**

- o **Revisit Analysis Options to Include Installation of Rumble Strips**

This item was discussed during the Eighth Order of Business.

C. Manager

i. Approval of Unaudited Financial Statements as of April 30, 2014

Ms. Crismond presented the Unaudited Financial Statements as of April 30, 2014.

- **Check Register**

The check register was included for informational purposes.

ii. 1,322 Registered Voters in District as of April 15, 2014

There were 1,322 registered voters residing within the boundaries of the District as of April 15, 2014.

iii. NEXT MEETING DATE: June 24, 2014 at 1:00 P.M.

The next meeting will be held on June 24, 2014 at 1:00 p.m., at this location.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Supervisors’ Requests and Public Comments (5 minutes per speaker)


There being no Supervisors' requests or public comments, the next item followed.

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Adjournment

There being nothing further to discuss, the meeting adjourned.

On MOTION by Mr. Schoenheider and seconded by Mr. Schultz, with all in favor, the meeting adjourned at 2:50 p.m.


Secretary/Assistant Secretary


Chair/Vice Chair

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES 2014:

- BUDGET PROCESS
 - Process Improvement
- FUTURE MAJOR ISSUES
 - Resurface Roadways
 - Other Infrastructure (Lake Banks)
- COMMUNICATION
 - PSGRC
 - The Meadows
- BEST PRACTICES
 - Review other CDDs
 -