1	LELY CON	MUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT
2		NAPLES, FLORIDA
3	<b>REGULAR ME</b>	EETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
4		May 20, 2020
5		
6	The regular meeting of the Lel	y Community Development District Board of Supervisors was held
7	on Wednesday, May 20, 2020 at 1:30 p.m. at the LCDD Maintenance Building, Naples, Florida.	
8		
9	SUPERVISORS PRESENT:	Gerry Campkin, Chairman
10		William Lee, Vice Chairman
11		Harold Ousley, Treasurer
12		Kenneth Drum, Secretary
13		Anne Marie Bularzik, Supervisor, Assistant Secretary
14	ALSO PRESENT:	Neil Dorrill, Dorrill Management
15		Kevin Carter, Operations Manager
16		Tony Pires, District Counsel
17		Freddy Bowers, Director of Community Patrol
18		Christopher Dorrill, Field Manager
19		Nathan Phillips, (Via speakerphone)
20		Terry Cole, District Engineer
21		
22		
23	Mr. Dorrill offered the invocat	tion, and the Pledge of Allegiance was recited in unison.
24		
25 26	PUBLIC COMMENT	acks to the Deard shout getting further lake bank remediation as
26 27		boke to the Board about getting further lake bank remediation as
27 28	part of the current and next year's budget. ***inaudible comments Mr. Abruzzi asked as well where the Majors were listed on the document prepared by the	
28 29	engineer as to what lakes would be done and in what order.	
30	John Anderson from Tiger Island advised the Board that their landscaper had indicated that	
31	their irrigation line has been getting sediment and shells in it, and his Association asked him to	
32	determine if it had something to do with the pumps, and if better filtration could be the	
33	answer. Mr. Lee indicated that they do not pump water out of the lake, but out of the	
34	reservoir. ***Inaudible comments by Mr. Lee.	
35	Mr. *** noted that a few years ago Stahlman came to the individual homeowners and advised	
36	•	ter to pick up the snails. ***inaudible discussion
37		

- 1 Lely Community Development District Minutes
- 2 May 20, 2020
- 3 Page 2
- 4

#### 5 ROLL CALL/APPROVAL OF AGENDA

- 6 Item 7A was the Upgraded signage to Maintenance/Meeting building.
- 7 At this point Philippe \*\*\* from Vesta spoke to the issue of sign replacement within the District.
- 8 \*\*\*inaudible discussion
- 9 Items 7B, Update on traffic issue at Celeste; 7C, Buckles in roadway on Grand Lely; 7D, Junction
- 10 of Wildflower and St. Andrews and 7E, How meetings will be run in the future were added.
- 11 Items 6A and a discussion of the irrigation issue will be moved forward in the agenda to
- 12 accommodate Mr. Phillips and those present.
- 13 With those additions and changes, and with the approval of Mr. Campkin's participation via
- speakerphone due to exceptional circumstances, the agenda was unanimously approved as
- amended on a MOTION by Mr. Drum and a second by Mr. Ousley.
- 16

#### 17 APPROVAL OF MARCH REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

- 18 On Page 2, Line 17, The Commissioner's name is Solis.
- 19 On a MOTION by Dr. Bularzik and a second by Mr. Ousley, the minutes were unanimously
- 20 approved as amended.
- 21

## 22 FY 2019 AUDIT PRESENTATION

- 23 Nathan Phillips presented the Board members with an overview of the 2019 Budget as of
- 24 September 30.
- 25 It was noted that Management's responsibility was to assure that there was internal controls in
- 26 place to reduce error and fraud, and receipts, disbursements and transactions were verified.
- 27 Based on all the testing, Mr. Phillips noted that everything was fairly stated as of September 30.
- 28 Government auditing standards were followed and all requirements were delineated.
- 29 The management discussion analysis prepared by Dorrill Management was reviewed and
- 30 nothing of concern was found. The budget versus actual showed no items of concern.
- 31 The assets and liabilities of the District as of September 20, 2019, were shown. Total assets
- were roughly \$3,300,000, the bulk of which are infrastructure and capital assets.
- 33 The cash position at that date was stronger at \$3,510,000 than it was on the same date the
- 34 previous year, mainly because of the cash performance from the CSA which was greater than
- 35 had been budgeted.
- 36 All other components stayed fairly consistent, although there was more activity under capital
- 37 assets, which were delineated and approved as authorized pursuant to the protocols that were
- in place. Assets that were disposed of or fully utilized were removed.

- 1 Lely Community Development District Minutes
- 2 May 20, 2020
- 3 Page 3
- 4
- 5 Liabilities stayed fairly consistent. There was some fluctuation under accounts payable
- 6 depending on what was going on during the year, and most of the extra costs were chemical
- 7 related, and some engineering fees were noted as well.
- 8 The District has no debt as all the bonds have been paid off in previous years, so the net
- 9 position of the District was \$13,200,000, of which \$9,800,000 was capital assets. The carry
- 10 over, contingency funds were then \$3,400,000.
- 11 The presentation required a statement of activity showing expenses first, which was provided.
- 12 Expenses were shown to be \$3,100,000, and the ad valorem taxes, CSA funds and FEMA
- 13 reimbursement money coming in was shown as well. Revenue over expenses in this
- presentation was \$516,000, and with all the other miscellaneous items was \$698,000 to thegood.
- 16 The one fund, the general fund, showed an increase in cash. It showed total revenues coming
- into the District at \$3,800,000 which was roughly \$500,000 more than the previous year due to
- 18 the extra CSA funds, ad valorem assessments, and FEMA reimbursements.
- 19 The expenses of the District were up by about 13 percent, which was partly capital outlay for
- 20 additional equipment as well as pump house repairs and replacements. As the District is an
- older community there will be more repairs and maintenance until the infrastructure items are
- 22 repaired or replaced to the fullest.
- 23 Chemical costs were higher in 2019 by about \$36,000 and mulching costs were higher as well.
- 24 Water costs were also up, partially due to breakage is some of the lines.
- 25 The various policies adopted by the District were noted as having been applied, and also the
- 26 different reconciliations showing the difference between the accrual and cash basis statements.
- 27 Verification was made that the money the District has is in qualified depositories.
- 28 The fund balances were lining up to what had been adopted in the budget going into 2020 for
- 29 contingency and capital reserves.
- 30 One of the reasons expenses were lower was because some of them have the contingency in
- 31 them and the reserve for unexpected expenses.
- 32 The required internal control compliance report was included, and no significant deficiencies
- 33 were noted and all laws and regulations were being adhered to.
- 34 The required document for the auditor general indicated that the District's money is invested in
- 35 the appropriate items pursuant to Florida Statutes as required.
- 36 The auditor general's letter indicated that there were no internal control issues; there was no
- 37 state of financial emergency, or deteriorating financial conditions. There were no abuse or law
- violations, and nothing irregular about the District.

- 1 Lely Community Development District Minutes
- 2 May 20, 2020
- 3 Page 4

4

- 5 In closing, Mr. Phillips added that the report is a clean opinion, which historically the District
- 6 has had.

# 7 On a MOTION by Dr. Bularzik and a second by Mr. Ousley, the Board unanimously accepted

- 8 the Audit.
- 9 Mr. Dorrill added that from a staff perspective they were very sad to hear of the death of Mr.
- 10 Phillips' partner, and the Board members thanked him for the audit presentation.
- 11

# 12 IRRIGATION QUALITY AGREEMENT

- 13 Mr. Dorrill advised that at the time the District entered into a renewal with the Board of County
- 14 Commissioners to purchase irrigation quality water, a five year agreement was contemplated
- 15 with a renewal of another five years. That changed, and the initial term was only four years.
- 16 The County is obligated under the Florida Administrative Code to make sure that at the time
- 17 homes are constructed that the potable water line is not connected with the District's irrigation
- 18 water. Mr. Dorrill added that in the past 30 years he was not aware of a single instance when
- 19 the two lines were connected has occurred, but the Code does obligation the County to certify
- 20 that cross connections do not exist, and they at one time had a division with several employees
- 21 who did this work, They have now passed this on to the wholesale customer, which in this case
- 22 is the District.
- 23 Before the end of the fiscal year the effort will be made to do the potential 1,800 certifications
- 24 that are required. The landscape companies are aware of how to do these tests, and the costs
- are anywhere from \$28 60 \$38. The District owns the main distribution line in the road right-
- 26 of-way, but it does not have the right to enter onto private property to operation the irrigation
- 27 systems in order to conduct the test.
- 28 The individual homeowner or condominium associations, who do have the right to operate the
- 29 irrigation systems, will have to be called upon to conduct these tests to perform the
- 30 certification. Dr. Bularzik asked how Collier County could enter could do this, and Mr. Dorrill
- advised that he did not know that answer, unless they were doing it as part of the building
- 32 process.
- 33 Mr. Drum asked if individual homeowners would be required to purchase additional liability
- insurance to allow an individual to come onto their property and perform this test.
- 35 Additionally, every homeowner receives a sewer bill from the County Utilities Department
- 36 regularly, and Mr. Drum wondered why they are requiring residents to hire landscapers to
- 37 come in and do this test. For example, Stahlman could be hired by an HOA to come in and
- 38 perform the test,

- 1 Lely Community Development District Minutes
- 2 May 20, 2020
- 3 Page 5
- 4
- 5 They would then have to bill the individual homeowners, who may not pay them. Mr. Drum
- 6 was not happy with the way this has been set up, and felt that it should have been planned
- 7 better by the government.
- 8 Dr. Bularzik asked what the ramifications for the LCDD would be if this work is not done, and
- 9 was advised that they may not renew their agreement with the District. Mr. Pires noted that
- 10 this was in the agreement itself, that prior to renewal this has to occur. If it was not done, the
- amount of water the District could get from the County would be restricted.
- 12 Dr. Bularzik read a section of the contract to those present, on Page 3, Section 7, which
- indicated that within no less than 180 days and no more than 365 days from the ending of the
- 14 initial five year term, or the then current five year term, the parties will meet and discuss the
- 15 terms and conditions. She thinks that this will have to be done every five years.
- 16 On Page 7 it talks about the number of homes, and on Exhibit C it lists the homes that are in the
- 17 Lely CDD where potable water meters are located as of September, 2014. It stated that the
- 18 inspection would be done on these homes, as well as any other properties within the CDD
- 19 irrigated by irrigation quality water and served by a potable water distribution system. This
- 20 portion appears to indicate that there are many other residences that have been built since
- 21 2014 which would require the test.
- 22 Mr. Drum asked Mr. Pires if the LCDD, who signed this contract, had the right to bind HOAs or
- 23 individual homeowners. Mr. Pires noted that the County likes to deal with one entity, and the
- 24 District is the one that entered into the agreement at that time. The District arguably could get
- individual approvals from the HOAs and homeowners to conduct these inspections, and there
- 26 would then have to be an increased assessment for that cost.
- 27 Mr. Pires added that with regard to the number of cross connections that need to be inspected,
- the 1,815 as noted should be what the District provides to the County. Mr. Cole noted that
- 29 what the cross connection inspection involved was laid out in the document, and Mr. Dorrill
- 30 added that essentially it involved manipulating the controls at the individual homes. With the
- potable water main closed, if the irrigation watering system doesn't come on, that would mean
- 32 that the irrigation is not improperly connected.
- 33 The irrigation water meter is on the home, and the County has the irrigation transmission mains
- 34 along the roads, and there is then a service line that runs to the customer's house from that.
- 35 The main transmission line is 50 feet from the connection point. The test is performed at that
- 36 point, and not at the electrical box.
- 37 Mr. Campkin indicated that they are doing this check all the time, and it doesn't seem logical
- that they now have to pay for it when it is checked regularly.

- 1 Lely Community Development District
- 2 May 20, 2020
- 3 Page 6
- 4
- 5 The Board members expressed their concerns about this, and Mr. Pires noted that the time for
- 6 renewal was quickly approaching. He suggested that an extension of the agreement should be
- 7 obtained from the County as it is a complicated matter. In his opinion, the County would not
- 8 want 1,000 people descending on the courthouse steps because their potable water was cut
- 9 off, which could happen if this issue is not addressed.
- 10 Dr. Bularzik added that the list of addresses the County provided as an exhibit with the
- 11 contract is not at all complete, and Mr. Dorrill stated that the exhibit was drawn up in 2014.
- 12 Anything built in the last six years does not seem to be on the exhibit.
- 13 It was Mr. Dorrill's suggestion that they do what was required per the contract, and if the
- 14 County wishes more to be done beyond that, an extension would have to be negotiated. Five
- 15 years was delineated in the agreement and it has only been four, and further, Mr. Dorrill does
- 16 not have the legal authority to enter someone's property. There will also be a question of who
- 17 needs to pay for these tests at the end user level.
- 18 Mr. Pires added that when a connection is made originally to a county line, there has to be an
- inspection performed and certification, and those could be pulled. It would be a big project to
- 20 do that, but would eliminate the need for a physical inspection, but the County would be in the
- 21 best position to know this as they performed the inspection at the outset.
- 22 750,000 gallons of water is purchased every day from the County to redistribute to the
- 23 residential communities, and that water is needed. Mr. Dorrill felt that the homeowners and
- 24 condo associations should partner with the CDD and provide the certificates, but that requiring
- 25 this project every five years would not be appropriate.
- 26 Dr. Bularzik noted that Alex Villarreal, who is a water expert, opined that it was all of the homes
- that had to comply and not just the number noted on the contract. It was not the CDDs
- 28 contract that was sent to the condo associations, and it involves a large sum of money to
- 29 comply, which Dr. Bularzik did not feel was fair. The landscapers that will provide the testing
- 30 service have agreed to charge \$25 per homeowner, and she suggested that everyone use their
- 31 own landscaper, and make sure that the fee is \$25. That bill would then go to the LCDD and be
- 32 put into the budget for the coming years.
- After further discussion, Mr. Pires noted that it was his opinion that the number was 1,850 for
- 34 renewal, and there would be an ongoing obligation to do the rest. The associations will be
- asked for voluntary compliance, and Mr. Campkin advised that no strangers would be allowed
- 36 into his community due to the Corona Virus. Dr. Bularzik assured him that the landscape
- 37 companies had been contacted to do this work for the same price.
- 38

- 1 Lely Community Development District Minutes
- 2 May 20, 2020
- 3 Page 7
- 4
- 5 Mr. Lee pointed out and Mr. Pires concurred that three years previously the County had come
- 6 in and put a backflow preventer on all the potable water lines to avoid cross contamination,
- 7 and this should be sufficient for the County. A list of those residents could reduce the number
- 8 of checks required, as well as the number of COs issued in that last year as they would have
- 9 been checked as well. The Board briefly discussed who should be responsible to pay the
- approximately \$38,000 it would cost to comply with the requested checks.
- 11 On a MOTION by Dr. Bularzik and a second by Mr. Ousley, the Board unanimously approved
- 12 the chairman and the manager to sign a letter to the County requesting the County to extend
- 13 the agreement for a one year period as per the initial terms. Additionally, a member of the
- 14 Water District will be asked to come and speak to the CDD Board to advise them of all the
- 15 **County's conditions moving forward.**
- 16 It was confirmed that the individual HOAs would use their individual contractors, and would be
- 17 reimbursed by the CDD for the costs. Mr. Dorrill explained again that he did not have the
- 18 authority to hire someone to go onto anyone's property, which is why the HOA must work with
- 19 the contractor, who will fill out the certificates, and the bill will be paid by the District.
- 20 A cap of \$25.00 will be put on each test performed,
- At this point in time it would be for no more than 1,815 connections, which is the number
- 22 noted for renewal.
- Peggy \*\*\* asked how a 2014 contract still has a year left on it in 2020. Mr. Pires indicated that
- 24 the list was from 2014, but the agreement was entered into in 2016, which indicated that it
- would be effective through September 30 of 2020. This resident also asked how a contract
- 26 entered into by the CDD with the County would ultimately fall on the homeowners to handle.
- 27 Mr. Pires advised that there is a difference between entering into an agreement and having the
- authority to enter onto someone's property. He suggested that it would be productive to deal
- with what was going on at the present time, and they are doing it this way as the County
- 30 requires dealing with one master group.
- In discussing this issue with the homeowner, Mr. Dorrill noted that the only agreement they
- 32 have with them to supply the water is with the Master Association, and the agreement under
- discussion is not part of the CSA. Additionally, she was advised that the District does have
- 34 easements for lake maintenance and drainage, which is totally unrelated to the utility lines.
- 35 Mr. Pires added that he would have to do further research to answer some of the concerns
- 36 of this resident, and provide information at the next meeting.
- 37
- 38

- 1 Lely Community Development District Minutes
- 2 May 20, 2020
- 3 Page 8
- 4
- 5 On a MOTION by Dr. Bularzik and a second by Mr. Campkin, the individual homeowners
- 6 and/or condominium associations would hire their own landscaping companies, and
- 7 Greenscapes, Stahlman or Four Seasons who have provided prices to do the work, to perform
- 8 the inspection for no more than \$25.00 per connection. The bill would then go to the HOA,
- 9 but would be submitted to the LCDD for payment.
- 10 As per Mr. Pires requested, the following amendment was added to the above Motion.
- 11 Additionally, no more than 1,815 tests would be performed at this time.
- 12 Mr. Pires also noted that it is implicit in the Motion that all the vendors being used must be
- 13 licensed as required under the agreement.
- 14 \*\*Overtalk
- 15 Mr. Pires added that under the agreement the cross connection checks may have to be
- 16 performed by a licensed professional irrigation contractor or a certified reclaimed water and
- 17 field inspector.
- 18 Mr. Dorrill added that if an HOA has 89 homes, he will expect to receive certificates for 89
- 19 homes, as he does not want to process payments in a piecemeal manner.
- 20 In response to some questions from Dr. Bularzik as to how the residents and involved parties
- 21 will be advised, Mr. Dorrill will provide a summary of what the procedures will be which can be
- 22 sent out, which can also be provided to the irrigation contractors.
- As it relates to approval by the County Commission, Mr. Pires will ask that this issue be placed
- 24 on the next available agenda, which will not be until June.
- 25 Mr. Dorrill asked for immediate compliance, even though a one year extension is being
- 26 requested from the County.
- 27

#### 28 MANAGER'S REPORT

#### 29 <u>A. Community Patrol</u>

- 30 Mr. Dorrill opted not to go over the reports for the previous two months, but he did ask the
- Board to pay particular attention to the number of suspicious people and trespassers that were
- 32 encountered over this period of time. If this is a trend, Mr. Dorrill felt that it needed to be
- discussed further as 99 percent of the trespassers were non residents.
- 34 Mr. Dorrill thanked Mr. Bowers for the good job he did, and asked those present to call him if
- 35 they had any questions on the reports, or to submit an email and he will be happy to answer
- 36 them.
- 37
- 38

- 1 Lely Community Development District Minutes
- 2 May 20, 2020
- 3 Page 9
- 4

#### 5 <u>B. 2021 Budget Approval/Resolution and Public Hearing</u>

- 6 On a MOTION by Mr. Drum and a second by Mr. Ousley the Board unanimously approved the
- 7 tentative budget for 2021, authorized the Chairman to execute the Resolution, and
- 8 established August 19<sup>th</sup> as the Public Hearing date.
- 9

#### 10 <u>C. Registered Voter Certificate</u>

- 11 The statute requires conveyance of the number of registered voters in a public meeting, and to
- 12 remind the voters that this is an election year, The number received from Mr. Edwards was \*\*\*
- 13 (inaudible).
- 14
- 15 <u>E. Irrigation Filter Repairs</u>
- 16 The costs for repairing and replacing the filters will be \$33,275. Mr. Dorrill advised that they
- were budgeting under the assumption that they will move forward with that, and Mr. Dorrill
- will push it into the new fiscal year if possible. The final bill will be submitted to the Board forapproval.

20 On a MOTION by Mr. Lee and a second by Mr. Ousley the Board unanimously approved the

- 21 bill to replace the six irrigation filters.
- 22

## 23 <u>F. Parking Lot Expansion Proposals</u>

- 24 Three bids were received, and Mr. Cole advised that they recommended the bid from Bonness
- at \$49,749 which was closest to the amount budgeted for the work. This will add 15 spaces to
- the parking lot. On a MOTION by Mr. Drum and a second by Mr. Ousley, the Board
- 27 unanimously approved that the bid from Bonness of Naples, Florida be accepted to do the
- 28 parking lot expansion work.
- 29

# 30 G. Change Order on Lake Bank Erosion Work

- 31 The change order was necessary as staff had made the assumption that there would be enough
- 32 sand in a particular lake to make the work possible, but there was not, and sand had to be
- trucked in. This also had to be done on a few of the other lakes. Mr. Cole recommended
- 34 approval of the change order in the amount of approximately \$13,467 for 200 cubic yards of
- 35 sand.
- 36 On a MOTION by Mr. Drum and a second by Mr. Ousley, the Board unanimously approved the
- 37 change order for the amount listed above.
- 38

- 1 Lely Community Development District Minutes
- 2 May 20, 2020
- 3 Page 10

4

- 5 ATTORNEY'S REPORT
- 6 <u>A</u>. Qualifying Period
- 7 Mr. Pires noted that the notice of the qualifying period has been placed in the paper for the
- 8 Board seats that are open. The qualifying period is from noon on Monday, June 8<sup>th</sup>, to noon on
- 9 Friday, June 12<sup>th</sup>.
- 10

## 11 <u>B. Lely Lakes Issue</u>

12 This item was sidetracked and Mr. Pires will have information for the Board at the next regular

13 meeting.

14

# 15 <u>C. Covid-19 Information</u>

- 16 The Governor had indicated in one of his executive orders that all local governments could
- 17 conduct meetings using communications through technology. That order has been extended to
- 18 sometime in June. Mr. Pires will keep the Board advised as to any further developments on
- 19 this.
- 20

# 21 FINANCIAL REPORTS

- 22 These reports were midyear, and are used for forecast and preparation of the budget.
- The District had \$4,600,000 in cash at midyear, and \$1,500,000 of that was in reserves.
- 24 Total assets were \$4,700,000 against \$158,000 in payables.
- 25 The income statement showed over \$37,000 in last minute non ad valorem payments from the
- tax bill, and total taxes received year-to-date were \$2,206,000 against a budget of \$2,500,000,
- 27 T here are still some delinquent taxes. Discounts were taken early in the year and the tax
- collector's fees are taken off the top, so the District is at about 95 percent of annual revenues in
- 29 the first six months.
- 30 Going through the cost centers, Mr. Dorrill noted that at that point they were \$83,000 under
- 31 budget on the expense side, even taking into account that many things are seasonal or paid in
- 32 the early part of the year.
- 33 On a MOTION by Dr. Bularzik and a second by Mr. Ousley, the Board then unanimously
- 34 accepted the financials as submitted.
- 35
- 36
- 37
- 38

- 1 Lely Community Development District Minutes
- 2 May 20, 2020
- 3 Page 11
- 4

#### 5 SUPERVISORS' REQUESTS

- 6 Item A was were held to the following month, and Item C was previously discussed.
- 7

# 8 <u>C. Roundabout at Celeste</u>

- 9 Dr, Bularzik, Mr. Carter and \*\*\* met with two gentlemen from the Department of
- 10 Transportation to review the signs there and the confusion they are causing. The Department
- individuals indicated that they would come up with a plan in about a week. Although they have
- 12 not yet seen the plan, this item is in process.
- 13

# 14 D. Intersection of Wildflower and St. Andrews Boulevard

- 15 It was Mr. Dorrill's understanding that the County restriped that intersection to remove a left
- 16 turn only lane heading north on Wildflower. The District was not consulted. Mr. Campkin felt
- 17 that it was not a good thing to do as the number of cars coming up Wildflower was not going to
- 18 decrease with that one lane out. Mr. Dorrill indicated that staff did not disagree with him.
- 19 (Mr. Lee's comments inaudible.)
- 20

# 21 <u>E. Future Electronic or Virtual Meetings</u>

- 22 Mr. Campkin felt that an application like Zoom would be appropriate for the meetings in the
- 23 foreseeable future, and he could run the meeting from where he is located. Mr. Dorrill
- indicated that he would explore that option or others that are available.
- 25
- 26 Mr. Campkin added at this point that he had just received a message from the County that one
- 27 of their non return water valves had blown in Lely and was spewing a great deal of water. It will
- require tearing up the roadway in that area to replace the pipe.
- 29

# 30 ADJOURNMENT

- 31 There were no public comments received, and with the notice that the next meeting would be
- 32 held on June 17<sup>th</sup>, with the annual hurricane workshop will start at 1:00 with the regular
- meeting to follow, the meeting was then adjourned at 3:15 p.m. on a MOTION by Dr. Bularzik
- 34 and a second by Mr. Lee.