

**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, March 24, 2015 at 1:00 p.m.**, in the **River Room at the River Club Conference Center (Second Floor of Fitness Center), 4787 Pelican Sound Boulevard, Estero, Florida 33928.**

**Present at the meeting were:**

Terry Mountford	Chair
Bob Schultz	Vice Chair
George (Tom) Schoenheider	Assistant Secretary
Judy Haase	Assistant Secretary
James Gilman	Assistant Secretary

**Also present were:**

Chuck Adams	District Manager
Cleo Crismond	Assistant Regional Manager
Tony Pires	District Counsel
Jim Whitmore	PSGRC General Manager
Anina Bachrach	Resident

**FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Call to Order/Roll Call**

Mr. Adams called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m., and noted, for the record, that all Supervisors were present, in person.

**SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS**

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

Ms. Anina Bachrach, a resident, referred to the reconfiguration of the Corkscrew Circle roundabout and suggested installing lights on top of the stop and yield signs, which blink and warn vehicles to stop or yield. She stressed that the cost would be much less than a reconfiguration.

**THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Continued Discussion: Traffic Calming**

Mr. Adams reported that the county's request for additional information was addressed and submitted to the county. He anticipated receiving approval from the county next month and Staff would obtain proposals.

In response to Mr. Mountford's question, Mr. Adams indicated that the permit was for the Corkscrew roundabout reconfiguration; the permit would be valid for six years.

Mr. Mountford felt that the speed hump was effective. Mr. Adams reported that Management received two or three comments; one was negative but, overall, Mr. Adams also felt that this was a successful program. Mr. Mountford advised that he received positive comments, mainly from Pinehurst residents who were grateful for the speed hump. Mr. Adams pointed out that one resident wanted to know if speed humps would be placed at the other entrances to which he indicated not at this time.

Mr. Schoenheider stated that a resident informed him that Pinehurst residents are speeding into the roundabout to "beat" other drivers around it.

Mr. Adams estimated \$10,000 to \$30,000 for the roundabout reconfiguration but believed that this is the cleanest way to get the desired result, which is to slow vehicles; he suggested waiting for the pricing information. Mr. Adams noted that additional speed humps could be installed, which are probably less aggressive than rumble strips; vehicles can glide over a speed hump if driving at a reasonable speed.

Ms. Haase noted that residents reported that the speed hump is too high and suggested a speed table, similar to ones in Barefoot Beach and Naples.

Mr. Schultz reported that the speed hump was discussed at the Gleneagles annual meeting this morning. Once the process was explained, residents were satisfied; however, they were not satisfied with the cost of the roundabout reconfiguration. Mr. Schultz indicated that a suggestion was made to include a water feature in the circle. Mr. Mountford expressed concern about the water feature causing visibility issues. Mr. Schultz confirmed that there is a vision requirement, regarding height.

Mr. Schoenheider asked if pressure can be placed on Lee County to include a right turn lane at the intersection of Corkscrew Road and US 41, as the traffic light is long and drivers making a right turn must wait for drivers going straight. Mr. Pires explained that this intersection is jointly owned by the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) and Lee County and noted that there might not be room or if the number of trips warrant a right-hand turn

lane. Mr. Adams suspected that the roadway does not have the necessary number of trips. Mr. Mountford suggested that cars go out the main gate to make a right. Mr. Adams agreed.

Mr. Adams reported that the three-way stop sign was installed leading into Island Sound Circle and there were positive comments.

Mr. Adams provided a proposal from Ms. Bachrach for raised pavement markers (RPMs) on several roads. He recommended approval, as Staff agreed that RPMs are inexpensive and make sense.

Mr. Adams requested Board authorization for Staff to proceed with installation of RPMs at four curve areas.

**On MOTION by Mr. Schultz and seconded by Mr. Mountford, with all in favor, authorization for Staff to proceed with installation of raised pavement markers at four curve areas was approved.**

Mr. Mountford felt that the RPMs were effective, especially at night, driving to and from the River Club and Pelican Sound Boulevard. He noted that the RPMs were not unattractive, like the yellow paint markings. Mr. Adams agreed that the RPMs were more effective than yellow paint markings because they “jar” the driver when the car crosses over them.

Ms. Bachrach observed that, with the RPMs around Island Way Circle, drivers will not drive as fast and stay in their lane, versus drivers speeding down the middle of the road, prior to the RPMs.

.+ Mr. Gilman questioned the response from residents. Mr. Whitmore confirmed that he heard no comments.

Mr. Mountford asked if the Board wanted to install RPMs along Sound Way and Pelican Sound Drive or place this item on the agenda for the next meeting. Mr. Adams recommended installing the RPMs at the four curb areas and past the three-way intersection and then focusing on the curve in other roadways.

Ms. Crismond agreed, since minimal cost was involved.

**FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Discussion/Consideration:  
Specifications/Proposals for Radar Speed  
Signs**

Mr. Adams recalled that, at the last meeting, the Board directed him to obtain proposals for radar speed signs. He provided proposals from the Radarsign, LLC (Radarsign) website and recommended the sign with a re-chargeable 12-volt battery. Mr. Adams pointed out that the battery has a two-week life expectancy before re-charging; there is an option for a solar panel and battery pack but it doubles the weight, making the sign difficult to move around. He stated that the best approach is removing the batteries and re-charging every couple of weeks, to make it a light weight/self-contained unit.

Mr. Adams reported that additional options include an Android App, which controls the sign from a smartphone or tablet and StreetSmart® traffic data reporting, which can be strapped to any pole. He explained that StreetSmart® is an amazing tool that can be moved to hot spots. Mr. Adams indicated that the price for one sign is \$3,290, with the Android App and StreetSmart®, which is more cost effective than the speed trailers, which cost about \$10,000. He pointed out that the solar panel and battery pack can be attached to a trailer.

Mr. Mountford expressed concern about the constant re-charging of the battery pack. Mr. Adams suggested removing the batteries and placing them into a charger every other Friday, which will extend the life of the radar sign.

Mr. Whitmore asked if there is an option for direct power. Mr. Adams replied affirmatively. Mr. Whitmore suggested tying into areas with low voltage lighting or tying into the monuments. Mr. Adams noted that this can be done, if there is power available.

Mr. Gilman questioned if the battery life is two years. Mr. Adams explained that there are two weeks in between re-charges and the life expectancy for a replacement battery is two years. Ms. Crismond pointed out that there is a two year warranty. Mr. Whitmore noted that battery packs can malfunction, due to the heat.

Mr. Schultz advised that the intent is to use the signs during the high season. Mr. Adams confirmed that this would be a seasonal awareness program, as traffic decreases, significantly, during the low season.

In response to Mr. Schultz' question, Mr. Adams indicated that the cost of the speed trailer is \$550 for 27 days.

Mr. Whitmore suggested installing signs, using direct power, in three areas with the biggest traffic problems. Mr. Mountford agreed.

Ms. Haase requested permanent signs on Pelican Sound Way, Pelican Sound Drive and Pelican Sound Boulevard. Mr. Adams will obtain proposals for three permanent radar signs and asked the Board to identify specific locations, which provide a benefit and power.

Mr. Schoenheider favored the flexibility of moving the sign to different areas. Mr. Adams agreed and suggested checking references from municipalities using portable radar signs. Mr. Mountford concurred with three permanent signs and one moveable sign.

Mr. Gilman pointed out that The Meadows may be interested. Mr. Whitmore reported that The Quarry, in Naples, has permanent radar signs, which look good and work well.

Mr. Schoenheider questioned how long the sign stores data. Mr. Whitmore stated that, if data is stored in a “cloud”, it can be stored forever. Mr. Adams confirmed that the data is downloaded through the smartphone or tablet to a cloud. Mr. Schoenheider asked if the data must be downloaded within a specific period of time. Mr. Adams indicated that the system can be set for automatic downloads to the cloud or downloads on a periodic basis.

Mr. Adams summarized that he will obtain proposals for three permanent and one portable radar sign and secure references on the performance of portable radar signs from other municipalities.

**FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Consideration of Proposal from Advantage Marine Services, Inc., for Lake Bank Erosion Repairs**

Mr. Adams provided a proposal from Advantage Marine Services, Inc., (Advantage) for lake bank erosion repairs and noted that Stoneybrook, The Brooks and Moody River Estates utilize this contractor.

Mr. Adams reported that an Advantage representative provided field verified measurements that were close to Mr. Adams’ measurements, utilizing the Lee County Geographic Information System (GIS).

Mr. Adams indicated that the proposal is \$123,904, or \$22 per linear foot, to install 6,117 linear feet of non-woven geo-barrier erosion tube, including sod installation. He explained that the non-woven tube will hold soil and as the soil dries, the tube will be cut open and raked off into a 4:1 slope; sod will be installed to the water’s edge. At the conclusion of this work, beneficial aquatic plants will be placed in front of the repaired areas, including low growing Bacopa and vertical plant materials, to help stabilize the soil and prevent lake bank erosion

caused by prevailing winds. Mr. Adams noted that the original budget was \$195,000 and recommended this proposal, as it is significantly less; remaining funds can be used for the roundabout improvements or additional aquatic plantings.

In response to Mr. Mountford's question, Mr. Adams indicated that the lake bank improvement repair areas are identified in red; the majority are residential areas adjacent to the lake. Mr. Schultz recalled a small area along the golf course. Mr. Adams noted that the damage is severe, due to the slope of the adjacent golf cart path; he will work with Mr. Rob Johnson on drainage and contouring to help collect water and direct it into the lake, under the surface, prior to the lake bank repair work.

Mr. Gilman referred to the chart of the lake bank erosion repairs. Mr. Adams pointed out that those were his original measurements, which were close to the measurements taken by Advantage; he was off by 300'. Mr. Gilman asked why the lakes were mainly residential, versus golf course. Mr. Adams explained that roof drainage creates impervious areas, meaning as water is falling, it runs to pervious areas, creating funneling and tunneling. The golf course is pervious, with greens space and sand traps, and tends to absorb water but, more importantly, as water runs off, it sheet flows off of the golf course and creates less concentrated washouts.

Mr. Adams pointed out that some lakes are over 17 years old and this is the first time the lake banks were repaired, which is a good life expectancy. Mr. Mountford pointed out that the District will have to look to repairing the lake banks again in another 17 to 20 years. Mr. Adams concurred.

Mr. Schoenheider asked if Sound 2 had erosion issues. Mr. Adams confirmed that the lake bank was examined and found to be sufficient but it has a lot of riprap; it was used by staff, for years, as a cut through. Mr. Adams clarified that, if there is over 10" of vertical face, the lake bank must be repaired, as it would be out of compliance with the permit requirements.

Mr. Adams pointed out that the South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD) performs an inspection and indicates whether there are issues; many districts react after receiving a Notice of Violation (NOV). He noted that the District recognizes these issues, in advance, and addresses them prior to SFWMD issuing a NOV. Mr. Adams explained that the District is completing lake bank repairs because it could be a liability, as people mowing along the lake bank edges run the risk of rolling equipment into the lake; SFWMD requires any lake bank over 10" of vertical face to be restored because it creates a public safety issue.

Mr. Gilman reported that his neighborhood installed gutters on their two story buildings, at the end of 2012; however, even with the gutters, water drains from the back of the building, going into the lake, causing erosion. As a result, corrugated pipe was placed on each downspout and directed into the lake. Mr. Adams pointed out that this is the common repair. Mr. Adams met with representatives of Lake E-1E and stressed the importance of repairing the lake bank. Residents were told that there is a deadline for repairs as the lake bank restoration project would be completed in the May or June time frame; residents cannot be forced to make repairs but it is in their best interests as the lake bank is deteriorating and becoming an eyesore.

In response to Mr. Gilman's question, Mr. Adams confirmed that Advantage will use a boat with a mud pump to complete the repairs. Mr. Adams will notify the Board when and where Advantage starts the work. Mr. Adams pointed out that he wants Advantage to complete the River Ridge project first, prior to projects in other CDDs.

Mr. Pires questioned whether the proposal has start and end dates. Mr. Adams confirmed that the proposal has this information, as well as hold harmless indemnifications and proof of insurance.

Mr. Schultz reminded Mr. Adams that the Edgewater IV work to install gutters must be completed prior to the lake bank erosion repairs on Lake E1-E. Mr. Adams indicated that he would like to complete the gutter work first, so the area is clean. Mr. Schultz questioned the time frame. Ms. Crismond replied now. Mr. Adams reported that he provided Greenscapes' contact information to the representatives of Edgewater IV to coordinate the landscaping work. If Edgewater IV does not want to use Greenscapes, they can obtain the specs from Greenscapes and advise their landscaper to spec the landscaping work the same way. Mr. Schultz will speak to the Edgewater IV Board.

Mr. Mountford asked what leverage the District has with Edgewater IV. Mr. Adams replied none; the long-term benefits of doing this work were explained to them.

Mr. Pires advised that, if erosion of the lake bank is caused by runoff from the gutters, which accelerates erosion, the District can advise that future restoration will be specially assessed to the adjoining property owners as they receive a greater benefit than the rest of the community.

Mr. Adams pointed out that there is a heavy concentration between the units because there are no gutters. He noted that installing an underground drainage system, will improve the life expectancy of the lake bank repairs tremendously.

Mr. Gilman reported that, in December, corrugated pipe was extended over the littoral shelves and, during the dry season, the pipes could be seen. Ms. Haase pointed out that her neighborhood placed riprap over the pipes. Mr. Adams explained that riprap holds the pipes down and, oftentimes, Staff had contractors extend the pipes to the other side of the littoral plants and below the surface.

Mr. Gilman recalled that their neighborhood was charged \$36 per linear foot, which included the corrugated pipes, and each building had 12 to 14 drains. Mr. Adams pointed out that piping is not expensive but the labor cost for installation is high.

**On MOTION by Ms. Haase and seconded by Mr. Gilman, with all in favor, the Advantage Marine Services, Inc., proposal, in an amount not-to-exceed \$123,904, for lake bank erosion repairs, and authorizing the Chair to execute the contract, were approved.**

Mr. Schultz questioned the timing of the next inspection. Mr. Adams indicated that he did not know but, explained that the recommendation for these repairs was in the lake audit and included in the Fiscal Year budget.

Mr. Whitmore noted that there may be erosion during the golf course renovation in 2016.

**SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Approval of March 3, 2015 Regular Meeting Minutes**

Mr. Adams presented the March 3, 2015 Regular Meeting Minutes and asked for any additions, deletions or corrections.

Mr. Pires provided his corrections to Mr. Adams.

The following changes were made:

Line 28 and throughout: Change “Bachriach” to “Bachrach”

Line 29: Insert “PSGRC President” after “Resident”

Regarding Line 259, Mr. Mountford recalled that it was the State Park that did not want to extend the sidewalk; WCI was against it. Mr. Pires indicated that he was comfortable with the statement as written.

The following changes were made:

Line 269: Change “Krebs” to “Whitmore”



Line 270: Change “CDD” to “PSGRC”

Mr. Schultz asked if the PSGRC is maintaining the landscaping on the Corkscrew Road extension. Mr. Whitmore indicated that the irrigation is not high quality; it was installed, along with the landscaping.

Regarding Lines 274 through 278, Mr. Mountford requested further discussion on whether the District, PSGRC or the county would stripe Corkscrew Road, from the gatehouse to the US 41 right-of-way (ROW). Mr. Mountford recalled that Mr. Pires was to have discussions with the county. Mr. Adams indicated that this is an ongoing action item.

The following changes were made:

Line 324: Change “Haase” to “Bachrach”

Line 460: Change “Bachriach” to “Bachrach”

Line 618: Change “Bachrach” to “Haase”

Line 623: Change “Bachrach” to “Haase”

Lines 192 and 193: Remove “Mr. Mountford pointed out that the District maintains the river and suggested testing their direct outflows”

Mr. Mountford clarified that the purpose of this discussion was for the District to prove that the pollution came from the outflows, from the river, along US 41, not from the District.

The following changes were made:

Lines 361: Insert “for a couple of hundred feet east of the gatehouse” after “sidewalk”

Lines 642 and 643: Delete entire sentence

**On MOTION by Mr. Gilman and seconded by Mr. Mountford, with all in favor, the March 3, 2015 Regular Meeting Minutes, as amended, were approved.**

• **Action/Agenda Items**

Ms. Crismond presented the Action/Agenda Items.

Items 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20 were continued.

Items 3, 4, 11, 12 and 15 were completed.

Regarding Item 6, Mr. Adams reported there will be another phase with the RPMs and curbs.

Regarding Item 7, Mr. Adams will obtain proposals for speed boards.

Regarding Item 8, Mr. Adams asked if Mr. Pires verified whether the county has a 60-day repair policy on sidewalks. Mr. Pires was not aware of a policy or requirement but will follow-up with the county.

Mr. Adams reported that a meeting between District Staff and county staff is being coordinated. Mr. Pires indicated that he emailed the Assistant County Attorney, who replied that he was not handling this matter and referred Mr. Pires to another Assistant County Attorney who was handling it. Mr. Pires and Mr. Adams will coordinate this meeting.

Mr. Pires pointed out that he informed the Assistant County Attorney that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the county's responsibility for the maintenance of Corkscrew Road, west of US 41. Mr. Pires anticipated the meeting being held prior to the next Board meeting. Mr. Adams confirmed that he left messages with Mr. Randy Cerchie, head of the Roadway Maintenance Department but did not receive a response.

Mr. Pires reported that Ms. Bachrach provided copies of her emails with Commissioner Pendergrass and Mr. Cerchie. Ms. Bachrach pointed out that Commissioner Pendergrass understood that the broken sidewalk is a major problem and offered to "take care of it". Mr. Mountford expressed concern that the right person is taking care of this matter, which, in this case, is Commissioner Kiker. Mr. Adams suggested starting with county staff in setting the meeting and taking responsibility.

Regarding Item 10, Mr. Schultz requested that Staff finalize an agenda in advance of the joint meeting between the CDD and the PSGRC on April 28, 2015. Mr. Whitmore indicated that the President of the PSGRC asked the Board for agenda items and will forward the items to Mr. Adams by April 10. Mr. Whitmore discussed the logistics of the meeting.

Regarding Item 13, Mr. Adams reported that Iberiabank is no longer interested in providing a line of credit to the District; he is working with Mr. Jim Mitchell, at Fifth-Third.

Regarding Item 15, Mr. Adams stated that the county is finalizing the redesign plans for the Pinehurst roundabout.

Regarding Item 16, Mr. Schultz indicated that he received an email from Mr. Krebs with the link to the county website but could not read it on his computer and asked Mr. Krebs for hard copies. Mr. Pires offered to print copies of the documents.

Regarding Item 18, Mr. Adams reported that Mr. Whitmore marked the areas in Gleneagles. Mr. Schultz recalled that Mr. Krebs was going to measure the markings but they are fading. Mr. Adams will direct Mr. Krebs take the measurements immediately.

Regarding Item 19, Mr. Adams reported that, last week, he reviewed the draft audit and anticipated presenting it at the April meeting.

Regarding Item 20, Mr. Schultz reported that the Street Tree Committee provided its findings to the PSGRC Board who forwarded it to the Architecture Review Committee (ARC). He spoke to the ARC Chair, and according to the River Club documents, any tree in the ROW must have a Lee County vegetation removal permit, prior to removal. Mr. Schultz stressed that his intent is to have the District exempt from making those decisions. Mr. Pires explained that he was concerned about hazard mitigation. Mr. Schultz hoped for a more informal approach and suggested waiting until everything is settled before the Board takes action regarding the District's role regarding street trees in the ROW.

Mr. Pires advised that, if the covenants contain language regarding whether Lee County requires a vegetation removal permit for trees in a ROW and Lee County says that they do not issue a vegetation removal for this type of situation, there is an enforcement issue as to the covenants.

Mr. Mountford heard that if the development order (DO) incorporates the removal of trees, even if the county retreats from its approval, the DO still stands.

Mr. Pires indicated that, once the DO is issued and development is complete, the DO and Lee County Codes require compliance with the terms and conditions of the DO, unless it is modified, in the future.

Mr. Mountford agreed with the District not taking action until the ARC takes action because there is controversy.

Mr. Whitmore indicated that the PSGRC is meeting with a resident, Mr. Levitan, who is on the ARC. He reported that the Village of Estero wants a permit for any tree cut down, even on the golf course, which does not make sense.

Mr. Adams pointed out that this is a revenue generator for the Village of Estero. Mr. Whitmore believed that they want to create their own code. Mr. Pires concurred and noted that, at the initial meeting, last week, the Village of Estero authorized staff to advertise ordinances to separate from the Lee County land development code.

Mr. Whitmore acknowledged that a Village of Estero Council Member has experience as a land use attorney and already drafted the code.

**SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Other Business**

Mr. Schultz asked for the status of grinding the Oak Run sidewalks. Ms. Crismond indicated that she obtained proposals but did not bring them to the meeting. Mr. Adams stated that grinding will commence; he believed that the amount was minor.

Mr. Schultz reported that the Club implemented the sequencing of the proposed flushing; however, there were ten instances, in the last two months, of stuck valves in Gleneagles, primarily at the intersections of Gleneagles Links Drive and Gleneagles Links Court. He pointed out that Gleneagles Links Court does not have a flush out at the end of the cul-de-sac and, as a result of the revised flushing sequence, snails and contaminants are being pushed towards the District. Mr. Schultz requested authorization for installation of a flush out at the end of Gleneagles Links Court. Mr. Adams did not foresee a problem, as this issue was previously addressed.

Mr. Mountford questioned the cost. Mr. Adams estimated not more than a few thousand dollars, as all that is required is a small pipe. Mr. Adams advised that it was a matter of locating the pipe, either inside or outside of the cul-de-sac in the ROW, digging down to the pipe and doing a hot tap on the line to bring up a 2" valve and assembly.

Mr. Mountford pointed out that doing a repair for such a small area will help immensely.

**On MOTION by Mr. Schultz and seconded by Mr. Schoenheider, with all in favor, authorization for the installation of a flush out, at the end of Gleneagles Links Court, was approved.**

Mr. Whitmore showed pictures of tree roots from an oak tree, which were removed when Mr. Mark Becker, a resident in The Masters, removed concrete from his driveway and installed pavers. Mr. Adams suggested a root barrier.

**EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Staff Reports**

**A. Attorney**

Mr. Pires had nothing additional to report.

Mr. Whitmore reported that the original Amended and Restated CDD Systems and Facilities Operation and Maintenance Agreement, with the PSGRC, was executed by Mr. Mountford and provided to Mr. Pires. Mr. Adams will pick up the agreement

**B. Engineer**

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

**C. Manager**

**i. Approval of Unaudited Financial Statements as of February 28, 2015**

Mr. Adams presented the Unaudited Financial Statements as of February 28, 2015. He reported that expenses were well under the pro-rated budget; seasonal one-time or seasonal activities, such as the lake bank erosion project and aquascaping, will occur and bring expenses back in line.

Mr. Adams referred to “Revenues”, which were 6% short of the assessment levy, which was typical for the last month of the payment schedule for the tax collection process. He anticipated full collection by the end of this month.

**ii. NEXT MEETING DATE: April 28, 2015 at 1:00 P.M., to include Joint Meeting with Pelican Sound Golf and River Club Board commencing at 3:00 P.M.**

The next meeting will be held on April 28, 2015 at 1:00 P.M., to include the Joint Meeting with the PSGRC Board, commencing at 3:00 p.m., at this location.

**NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

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


Mr. Schultz asked when the draft Fiscal Year 2016 budget will be presented. Mr. Adams replied in May and asked the Board to bring their calendars, for the purpose of scheduling the Public Hearing and ensuring a quorum.

**TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Adjournment**

There being nothing further to discuss, the meeting adjourned.

**On MOTION by Mr. Schoenheider and seconded by Mr. Gilman, with all in favor, the meeting adjourned at 2:20 p.m.**

  
Secretary/Assistant Secretary

  
Chair/Vice Chair