

**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, February 23, 2016 at 1:00 p.m.**, in the **River Room** at the **River Club Conference Center (Second Floor of Fitness Center), 4784 Pelican Sound Boulevard, Estero, Florida 33928.**

Present at the meeting were:

Terry Mountford	Chair
Bob Schultz	Vice Chair
James Gilman	Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

Chuck Adams	District Manager
Cleo Crismond	Assistant Regional Manager
Charlie Krebs	District Engineer
Tony Pires	District Counsel
Jim Whitmore	PSGRC Assistant General Manager
Steve Bolte	PSGRC President
Carmen Knoble	Resident
Anina Bachrach	Resident
Neil Severance	Resident
Dave Moreman	Resident

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

Call to Order/Roll Call

Mr. Adams called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m., and noted, for the record, that Supervisors Mountford, Schultz and Gilman were present, in person. Supervisors Schoenheider and Haase were not present.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS

Public Comments: Agenda Items (5 minutes per speaker)

Ms. Anina Bachrach, a resident, was concerned about darkness and poor visibility, at night, near Masters Circle, when turning from Pelican Sound Boulevard into The Masters. She

recommended adding reflectors, leading out of Masters Circle, to alert drivers. Mr. Whitmore pointed out that there was a sign indicating a split road. Mr. Adams asked if the area had a raised curb and discussed using yellow reflective paint. Mr. Krebs replied that it is a mountable curb and not a raised curb.

Ms. Bachrach stated that The Village of Estero would probably acquire Corkscrew Road and requested permission to provide her Corkscrew Road paperwork to The Village of Estero Manager, as she believed that The Village of Estero should know what the District went through and what occurred. Mr. Adams replied that Ms. Bachrach could send her paperwork and noted that the documents were public record.

Mr. Neil Severance, a resident, referred to an area near the Main Gate and 41. He remarked that the reflectors stop at The Meadows entrance and asked for the reflectors to continue from The Meadows to the gatehouse, on the center white divider line.

Ms. Mountford introduced Mr. Steve Bolte, the recently elected President of the Pelican Sound Golf and River Club (PSGRC).

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS

Continued Discussion: Traffic Calming

In response to a question, Mr. Adams indicated that he was in possession of the second radar sign; it must be configured with his tablet, which is easier in the office than in the field. The sign will be operational around the first or second week of March.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Continued Discussion: Traffic Signal Installation at US 41/Pelican Sound Drive

This item will be tabled and removed from future agendas, until further notice.

In response to Ms. Bachrach’s question, Mr. Adams explained that the traffic count study, which is a warrant requirement for a signal, is very expensive. When developed, the property to the east could possibly share in the cost of the signal.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Update: Sidewalk Installation at Corkscrew Roundabout

Mr. Krebs affirmed that Bonness, Inc., (Bonness), completed the sidewalk installation at the Corkscrew roundabout. Stabilization must be completed and pads are still missing. He would contact Bonness about missing sod and warning pads.

In response to a question about the lack of warning pads elsewhere, Ms. Crismond advised that the District was grandfathered in; the county would not require the District to install them unless repair or “change-out work was performed. Mr. Adams pointed out that, if residents wanted pads for the rest of the sidewalks, the Board could add the item to the roadway program and phase it in.

Mr. Krebs explained that, working with Mr. Whitmore, the sidewalk location was revised; trees were avoided and an easement must be written because a portion of the sidewalk is on golf course property. Existing landscaping on the hole was used as a buffer between the road and pedestrians. Mr. Pires suggested adding preparation of the sketch and legal and grant of easement to the Action List. Ms. Crismond confirmed that this item was added to the Action List. Mr. Krebs advised that the project was scheduled.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Discussion: Roadway Resurfacing Options

Mr. Krebs indicated that the memo describes the microsurfacing process. Microsurfacing is an emulsion, which is a mixture of water, sand and a chemical that, when applied over the surface, the chemical reaction allows the sand and water to come together and harden into a surface that can be walked on within 15 to 20 minutes and driven on within one hour. According to Mr. Mark Shane, of Advanced Paving Solutions (APS), APS has been working with different state and local communities, to apply this process, throughout Florida. APS guarantees the microsurfacing for three years. A test section in Cape Coral is reaching its third year. Mr. Krebs referred to before and after photos of a road with microsurfacing. Cracks in the road are treated with a sealant and any repairs, similar to those in the CDD, are taken down to remove the first inch of lime rock, apply a new patch to bring the surface level with the adjacent pavement and, then, the emulsion is applied on top. The emulsion is applied in two lifts. The first lift would be at a rate of 14 to 18 pounds, per square yard, and the second lift at a rate of 16 to 20 pounds, per square yard, giving the top lift a little more strength. The total thickness is, generally, 1/2” to 3/4”.

Mr. Krebs reviewed additional before and after photos. A photo of Orange Grove Boulevard, in North Fort Myers, showed a road with one application and no crack sealing; the cracks were beginning to show through.

Discussion ensued regarding the microsurfacing process, striping, pavement markings, etc.

Mr. Krebs stated that APS guarantees the work for three years, but expect a five to seven-year life span. Within the first three years, any issues would be repaired, within certain limits.

In response to a question regarding the time frame between applications, Mr. Krebs explained that, if the north side of Pelican Sound Boulevard was being microsurfaced, APS would start in one area, work the length of road and, on the same day, return to the beginning to apply the second lift. He believed that APS could apply the lifts pretty quickly; the roads would be closed and reopened, as often as necessary, during the day, and areas should be completed by the end of the day. Weather dictates what APS can accomplish but, in actuality, after an hour, cars can drive on the road and, within a few minutes, people can walk on it. Regarding road temperature, Mr. Krebs indicated that the roads must be above 50 to 55 degrees, which should not be an issue in this area. The surface must be swept clean of all debris because debris will prevent the microsurfacing from adhering to the existing surface. Reports indicated that chemicals or things that are still on the surface may also prevent the microsurfacing from sealing.

Mr. Mountford asked about sinkholes and large depressions. Mr. Krebs replied that depressions would be part of APS' bids; APS would cut out locations with depressions or "bad repairs", apply a patch and microsurface over the area. The curbs must be completed before microsurfacing commences; APS could subcontract the curb and brick paver work and include it in their proposal.

Mr. Mountford wanted to know if only one company provides these services or whether the District could obtain competitive bids. Mr. Pires stated that, based on the estimated cost of the project, the District would be required to competitively solicit proposals. Mr. Krebs indicated that no local companies perform this type of work; the closest is in Jacksonville. Mr. Krebs was unsure whether a contractor from north Florida, would perform work in this area but it can be put out to bid. Mr. Schultz noted that North Florida Emulsions, Inc. (NFE), performed work in Heritage Pines CDD.

If the Board was considering microsurfacing, Mr. Krebs recommended, at a minimum, adhering to the Department of Transportation (DOT) specifications. It may be worthwhile to microsurface a test section, on Pelican Sound Drive or Pelican Sound Boulevard, let residents drive on it and determine the outcome.

Mr. Bolte noted that, in his research, the emulsions are not unique in composition. Companies use different minerals; some use chopped fiberglass and some use other materials. A contractor could switch the composition from the test case applications to a different composition when the full job is completed; caveats about the quality of a contractor make all the difference relative to a fantastic to a lousy job. When reviewing bids, the contractor's previous work should be considered and prep work could make a major difference in the outcome.

Mr. Krebs agreed that the type of material is important. Mr. Randy Hines, of APS, advised Mr. Krebs that APS uses granite for their emulsions, which costs more but provides a more lasting surface. Mr. Krebs believed that, as the type of material could impact the success or failure of the project, specifications could require APS to use a granite sand emulsion. If that emulsion is what the DOT has used and the State will use, Mr. Krebs believed it would be a good basis to ensure that everybody applies the same material. This specification could be included as a proposal requirement.

Regarding a comment about microsurfacing offering significant savings, over conventional paving, Mr. Krebs stated that, if microsurfacing lasts five to seven, or even ten years, at the end of 20 years, the costs would probably be the same as paving because the roads would have been microsurfaced twice. In addition, if the second applications are $\frac{3}{4}$ "", it may be necessary to raise the manhole rims. Some depressions would have to be addressed with a determination of whether those could be cut out, milled down and microsurfacing applied, so that it is smooth, or, if the manholes sunk, due to compaction, and must be raised. All of these factors would be part of an official bid and items that the contractors must identify.

Mr. Krebs further explained that, even if the process netted the CDD five to ten years, with two applications, \$1.2 million would be spent, over 20 years. If the road was resurfaced every seven years, it would be \$800K, over 20 years, for microsurfacing. The original surfacing costs were about \$800K, for milling and overlaying, and the numbers that were used in the report were the numbers obtained from the work being performed in Gateway, where Gateway Boulevard and other internal roads are being turned over to the County and the roads must be

resurfaced to bring them up to County standards. Accurate and recent milling data and pavement data was used.

Mr. Schultz expressed concern over a discrepancy in the milling and paving costs he received from the engineering firm that Riverwood CDD used last fall. The price was \$30 per square yard for milling and paving. Mr. Adams noted that he just spent about \$6.30 per square yard, at River Hall CDD, late last spring, and suggested that cost variances might be due to the proximity of material plants. Discussion continued over obtaining real numbers from these contractors and determining the cost savings, where possible, along with the difficulty of that task, because the processes are relatively new to southern Florida and the comparable data is spread throughout the United States and Europe. Mr. Schultz noted that the process has been around for a long time; every year improvements are made and the life span extends. Mr. Adams will request a price for milling and repaving from Ajax.

Mr. Dave Morman, a resident, asked if crack sealing was more expensive. Mr. Krebs replied that it is part of the same process to treat all cracks and depressions. Mr. Morman asked about chip sealing. Mr. Krebs did not recommend that method for the community. While Mr. Krebs agreed that there is a cost savings, the process does not work with curbs and areas with traffic; it is for very rural country roads and takes a long time for the road to be compacted by traffic and to become a nice surface. Moreover, Mr. Krebs believed that the community would be very unhappy if the Board decided to pursue a chip and seal process.

Although no one in Mr. Krebs' office had experience with microsurfacing, during a tour of the CDD, Mr. Shane advised that the roads were a prime candidate for microsurfacing. Mr. Shane acknowledged that many repairs would be necessary, due to cracking and depressions. Mr. Krebs stated that, when repairs are made, if the subgrade is good, the contractor will use asphalt as a black base approved by the DOT, before applying the second layer. In one community, wherever there were depressions, asphalt was used as a leveling course, before the second microsurfacing course was applied, to raise it to the same elevation, which seemed to work fine.

Mr. Mountford was worried that the contractor might rush the job; therefore, the CDD must stress that it wants everything fixed correctly. Mr. Krebs stated that Ajax and Bonness are local companies and the last thing they want is a local community complaining.

Mr. Mountford asked what would happen if companies from outside the area provided lower bids but the difference was worth it to have a local contractor. Mr. Pires responded that

there is flexibility in the Rules of Procedure to award contracts to the lowest, most responsive, competent bidder whose bid best meets the qualifications and specifications and is in the best interest of the District, in terms of accountability, responsibility etc.

Mr. Whitmore wanted to know whether the CDD was considering going out past the Corkscrew gate, to the 150' owned by the District. He was unsure if the concrete, where the pavers are, has risen, or the asphalt sunk. Coming in from Pelican Sound from Corkscrew, before the main gate, there is a 12" concrete slab going across. Mr. Adams replied that he had not noticed that and consulted the map. Mr. Krebs opined that it is probably due to compaction. Mr. Krebs acknowledged that, in speaking to Mr. Shane, if the Board was considering this, in addition to bidding the curb and paver repair, the issue would fall under the paver repair. Discussion continued regarding the poor quality of the roads, mainly in the Pinehurst area, with a big bump and concrete ribbons, and Turnberry Lake Drive, which has significant cracks.

Mr. Whitmore pointed out that The Club would recommend, or prefer it, if the District included Torrey Pines, owned by The Club, down to the River Club, because it would make sense to complete it at the same time. Mr. Krebs commented that the road is not a District-owned road. Mr. Adams and Ms. Crismond indicated that separate contracts would be required. Mr. Pires suggested adding that the prices would be offered to the community, in the bid specifications. Ms. Crismond advised that the District does that all the time, to make it less expensive. Mr. Adams stated that the contractor would develop a separate proposal for The Club. Mr. Pires suggested letting The Club handle all of the mobilization costs.

Mr. Mountford asked about the pavers. It was noted that it would be a good idea to put all items into a proposal. Mr. Krebs advised that Mr. Shane is working on an estimate for the entire community, as a rough draft, to provide a ballpark figure. Mr. Shane has some information and a good idea of what to do. Mr. Krebs explained that the paver repairs would most likely not be in the report because it is not what APS does. APS can probably provide a good estimate for concrete. When this project goes out to bid, paver estimates will be scheduled with each individual contractor. Paver repairs must be included.

Mr. Mountford suggested approaching the pavers as a separate project. He felt that it would appear odd to have beautiful new roads and unsightly pavers. Mr. Mountford recommended finding a contractor who specializes in pavers. Mr. Pires suggested putting out a

separate bid request for the paver project. Mr. Adams agreed, stating he would definitely recommend bidding the pavers once the asphalt repaving or microsurfacing was completed.

Mr. Schultz recalled that Mr. Dan Howell attended a meeting in December and educated the Board and Staff on microsurfacing. The Board has learned a great deal about the subject since then and there are projects going on throughout South Florida, mostly positive. Mr. Schultz discussed projects in Port Charlotte, Heritage Palms Lee County and Cape Coral. The test strip shows no signs of serious wear, even though there is a lot of traffic from turning trucks and cars. The City of Fort Lauderdale is in the middle of a program to complete 86 miles of microsurfacing and Hernando County completed \$1.4 million of microsurfacing, in North Florida, five or six years ago, and the roads remain in good condition. The feedback from a community in Weeki Wachee was very positive about microsurfacing. With regard to the Riverwood project, Mr. Krebs found that it cost \$4 per square yard for double layer microsurfacing. For 1" mill and resurfacing, that project was \$13; however, the price depends upon the location of materials, etc. Mr. Schultz advised that Mr. Adams will obtain a better estimate. One of the two factors important to cost is life estimates. Mr. Schultz's findings showed a minimum of ten years for microsurfacing with today's processes.

Mr. Adams will solicit an informal proposal to provide a basis for current pricing.

Mr. Bolte commented that, since Mr. Schultz was basing a lot of comments on the Riverwood CDD, he suggested obtaining a rough estimate from APS because APS completed milling and paving and microsurfacing there.

Mr. Krebs noted that APS would need to include the cost of performing possible road repairs, which is why the contractor will be on site to make note of the conditions, in order to provide a more detailed estimate. Mr. Krebs advised that the estimate given will be for the microsurfacing, in more detail, and Mr. Adams will secure an estimate for the milling and overlay. The two estimates should be considerably closer to what a contractor would actually bid. When this is put out to bid, for either process, the District will receive different numbers but contractors will provide "good numbers" if they want the job. Mr. Bolte asked if APS does both milling and overlay. Mr. Krebs responded no; APS focuses on microsurfacing and chip and seal repairs.

Mr. Whitmore asked Mr. Krebs if, after two applications, there comes a point where the third coat cannot be applied because it may cause issues with the curb height. Mr. Krebs

explained that two applications can be applied before mill and overlay are necessary or some major changes to the inlets in the roads are required.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Approval of January 26, 2016 Regular Meeting Minutes

Mr. Adams presented the **January 26, 2016** Regular Meeting Minutes and asked for any additions, deletions or corrections.

On MOTION by Mr. Mountford and seconded by Mr. Schultz, with all in favor, the January 26, 2016 Regular Meeting Minutes, as presented, were approved.

- **Action/Agenda Items**

Mr. Adams presented the Action/Agenda Items.

Items 7 and 10 were completed.

Item 4 was near completion.

Items 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9 and 11 were ongoing.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Other Business

There being no other business, the next item followed.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Staff Reports

A. Attorney

There being no report, the next item followed.

B. Engineer

There being no report, the next item followed.

C. Manager

i. Approval of Unaudited Financial Statements as of January 31, 2016

Mr. Adams presented the Unaudited Financial Statements as of January 31, 2016.

ii. NEXT MEETING DATE: March 22, 2016 at 1:00 P.M.

Mr. Adams indicated that the next meeting will be held on March 22, 2016 at 1:00 p.m., at this location.

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

Mr. Schultz indicated that The Club had concerns about the reclaimed water quality and asked Mr. Whitmore to explain. Mr. Whitmore explained that reclaimed water is a flow of effluent water so it contains nutrients. Soil samples and topical type solutions are being considered by The Club. A question was raised about other types of filtration being used. The water has bio carbs, sodium content and other nutrients but Mr. Whitmore was unsure where some of the other components were coming from. Mr. Krebs suggested sending him samples, which he would forward to the Utility Department for testing and a recommendation.

Mr. Whitmore indicated that a water quality consultant was coming in March but any type of assistance would be appreciated. Mr. Adams inquired as to whether the golf superintendent contacted any other golf superintendents in the area. Mr. Whitmore advised that West Bay and Pelican Landing were contacted and provided with the name of the consultant. Mr. Adams noted that reclaimed water is used at Stoneybrook and he has not heard of any issues; although, Stoneybrook mixes the reclaimed water with water from surface wells, possibly diluting issues that may arise.

Mr. Whitmore stated that the well is on the driving range lake and the golf course is the only one pulling from the effluent lake. Mr. Whitmore will send samples to Mr. Krebs and Mr. Krebs will convey recommendations received from the Utility Department. Mr. Adams suggested that, possibly, something could be introduced into the lake.

There being no public comments, the next item followed.

ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Adjournment

There being nothing further to discuss, the meeting adjourned.

**On MOTION by Mr. Mountford and seconded by Mr. Gilman,
with all in favor, the meeting adjourned at 2:16 p.m.**

Secretary/Assistant Secretary

Chair/Vice Chair


Secretary/Assistant Secretary


Chair/Vice Chair