

**MINUTES OF MEETING  
VERANDAH WEST  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT**

A Public Hearing and Regular Meeting of the Verandah West Community Development District's Board of Supervisors was held on **Wednesday, August 9, 2017 at 1:30 p.m.**, at the **Verandah Sales Office, 11571 Verandah Blvd., Ft. Myers, Florida 33905.**

**Present and constituting a quorum were:**

Jeffrey Jordan	Chair
Susie McIntyre	Vice Chair
Donald Newman	Assistant Secretary
Paul Zampiceni	Assistant Secretary
Gerald Baldwin	Assistant Secretary

**Also present were:**

Chuck Adams	District Manager
Cleo Adams	Assistant Regional Manager
Jonathan Johnson <i>(via telephone)</i>	District Counsel
Dave Robson	District Engineer
Mallory Clancy	Johnson Engineering, Inc.
Rod Schneider	Resident
Jamie Jameson	Resident

**FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Call to Order/Roll Call**

Mr. Adams called the meeting to order at 1:37 p.m. All Supervisors were present, in person.

**SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Public Comments [3 minutes per person]**

Mr. Adams requested that Mr. Rod Schnieder, a resident, hold his comments until the discussion regarding Lake F.

**THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Public Hearing to Hear Comments and  
Objections on Adoption of Fiscal Year  
2017/2018 Budget**

**A. Proof of Publication**

Mr. Adams presented the proof of publication for today’s Public Hearing and Regular Meeting.

**B. Consideration of Resolution 2017-10, Relating to the Annual Appropriations and Adopting the Budget for the Fiscal Year Beginning October 1, 2017, and Ending September 30, 2018**

Mr. Adams presented Resolution 2017-10. The budget had not changed, since the last version was presented, and program and assessment levels would remain the same, year-over-year.

*\*\*\*Mr. Adams opened the Public Hearing.\*\*\**

No members of the public spoke.

*\*\*\*Mr. Adams closed the Public Hearing.\*\*\**

**On MOTION by Mr. Jordan and seconded by Mr. Zampiceni, with all in favor, Resolution 2017-10, Relating to the Annual Appropriations and Adopting the Budget for the Fiscal Year Beginning October 1, 2017, and Ending September 30, 2018, was adopted.**

**FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Consideration of Resolution 2017-11, Making a Determination of Benefit; Imposing Special Assessments; Providing for the Collection and Enforcement of Special Assessments, Including But Not Limited to Penalties and Interest Thereon; Certifying an Assessment Roll; Providing for Amendments to the Assessment Roll**

Mr. Adams presented Resolution 2017-11. A revised version was distributed; Section 3 was modified to provide more clarity and specificity, particularly with Item B, regarding direct-billed assessments and how they were handled, imposed and collected. This Resolution was the final step in the budget and the assessment levying process, taking into consideration the budget that was just adopted, the appropriations and assessment levels anticipated in the budget and authorized the preparation of a lien roll to be transmitted to the Tax Collector’s Office for

placement of the assessments on the property tax bills and for the direct collection of the off-roll assessments, which were primarily the units held by the Developer.

**On MOTION by Mr. Newman and seconded by Mr. Jordan, with all in favor, Resolution 2017-11, Making a Determination of Benefit; Imposing Special Assessments; Providing for the Collection and Enforcement of Special Assessments, Including But Not Limited to Penalties and Interest Thereon; Certifying an Assessment Roll; Providing for Amendments to the Assessment Roll , was adopted.**

**FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Consideration of Resolution 2017-12, Adopting the Annual Meeting Schedule for Fiscal Year 2017/2018**

Mr. Adams presented Resolution 2017-12. As in recent years, meetings would be held on the second Wednesday of October, January, May and August at 1:30 p.m., at this location.

**On MOTION by Mr. Zampiceni and seconded by Mr. Jordan, with all in favor, Resolution 2017-12, Adopting the Annual Meeting Schedule for Fiscal Year 2017/2018, was adopted.**

**SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Continued Discussion and Consideration: Water Level Data Collection Proposal from Johnson Engineering, Inc., for Lake F**

Mr. Rod Schneider, a resident living on Lake F, read his letter into the record:

*August 9, 2017*

*TO: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS*

*RE: Corrective Actions to Lake F1 Problems*

*The Board was notified of Lake F1 ecological failure on 2/13/2017. Several solutions were considered by the Board and rejected for various reasons. The Lake is presently starting to exhibit a brown tinge. This has been occurring earlier each year and results in the dark brown road "ditch look" that we have come to expect in February. The lake seems to be getting worse each year. While Verandah has over 50 lakes in its community, Lake F1 is the only lake in Verandah that turns brown each year.*

*I am asking for the following actions.*

1. *The berm between Lake F1 and the wetlands be repaired so that it is at its designed height. Dave Robson, Johnson Engineering, brought this to our attention at the January, 2017, Board Meeting.*
2. *The exit level of Lake F1 be raised .5 ft. or possibly more after the berm is repaired. Dave Robson at the CDD Meeting of January, 2017, "thought" this could be done. This adds a very significant amount of water to the lake.*
3. *A feasibility study to be performed regarding the implementation of Method 2, page 7 and page 10, report of 2/13/17 Restoring Lake F1 to ecological balance. Feasibility study regarding Method 3, page 10, has been performed and was thought to be too costly to implement. However, Method 3 is four times longer (pipe length) than Method 2 and had to be tunneled under a street. Method 2 would result in Lake F1 being connected to the rest of Verandah's lake system. Currently it is the only lake in Verandah that is totally independent of the larger deeper lakes.*

*Rod Schneider*

*(Enclosure of a map entitled, "Restoring Lake F (Hammock CreekWay) to Ecological Balance")*

Mr. Robson stated that he did not bring a copy of the February examination of feasibility and differences in cure methods. Raising Lake F was feasible but must be explored, as it was dependent on which season the water table was in and whether there was any ability to revise the wet season water table. To clarify, feasibility depended upon correcting the wet season water table and part of the water level data collection was to address that. Mr. Robson discussed the connecting Lake F1 to the east, running above the tennis courts and connecting to a roadway inlet so it did not require tunneling underneath the roadway; an inlet that went to Lake F1 was connected to an inlet connecting Lake F. A tunneling option was explored for connective tunneling under E1, on the other side of the wetland but that would be problematic, since it must go through wetlands. It was possible, prior to having a Conservation Easement, as part of the process for the other pipes but, once the Conservation Easement was put in place, it became more difficult. Obtaining that capability was not explored and nothing was offered regarding corrective actions for changing the control elevations. In Methods 1, 2 and 3, changes did not occur, with the exception of Method 1, wherein it connected to E1, making it correct at a 4'5" level; however, it would make it higher than the wet season water table, which was why it was feasible. At a much lower cost, if the monitoring would demonstrate the wet season water table was different than the 3'5" section of the lake, then an adjustment could be made. The water

management permitting process does not want a control elevation lower than the wet season. If the control elevation was lower, it would constantly bleed water out and, essentially, pull water from the wetland to the lake, through its control structure, to the river. In essence, the wetland water table would be short circuited to the river, which was why the water management district does not normally permit any control elevation lower than a wet season water table.

A Board Member stated that Mr. Schneider was proposing raising the water level. Mr. Robson stated that the problem with raising the water level was that the berm must then be raised, all the way around. Generally, for this lake, a 25-year, 3-day storm event would result in approximately get a raise of 2'11", in 3 days; therefore, there must be a berm to keep the water from leaving the basin. If there was a 4'5" control elevation and a 2' stage rise, due to a rain event, there would have to be a 6'5" level, all around the neighborhood. Based on the survey information, it was a real problem for the houses on the other side of the street, so those houses had to be included, due to the pipes going from the road and connecting to the lake; the water level in the lake would get to the road and to houses.

Mr. Adams stated that, essentially, water would come back up the pipe and out of the inlets affecting all of the homes in the area. Mr. Robson concurred. The roads were lower than the berm.

A Board Member stated that Mr. Robson's verbal advice was acceptable but he expected a written response; he would then analyze Mr. Robson's report, exactly, as to why this proposal was not feasible.

According to another Board Member's recollection, from previous meetings, Johnson Engineering's position of raising the water level was not the best solution, no matter how it was accomplished and the berm would have to be built all around the remainder of the neighborhood too. According to the Board Member's memory, Mr. Robson thought that the problem was that the water went out underground to the river and to the wetland. Mr. Robson stated that, during dry season, the surrounding water dropped to the level of the adjacent water table. The Board Member stated that Mr. Robson's suggestion was to add bentanite to the bottom. Mr. Robson stated that no contractors performed bentonite applications, any longer in South Florida. The South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD) was consulted to determine permitting problems, if any, for installing a liner, which was supposed to accomplish the same thing; bentonite was not considered to be as effective as a liner. The problem was that an acceptable liner project would require excavating 1/2' out of the bottom, installing sand, the liner and then

more sand This type of construction project was not feasible in a closed, constructed neighborhood, as the lake could not be accessed from the wetland side; it would have to be accessed from the housing side and getting the equipment in would be difficult. That was why he went back to the option of connecting inlets from the road going to River Village, to the road along the lake, and making the physical connection there, which was a way to complete the construction work without impacting homes.

Mr. Adams asked if there would still be recharge considerations, wherein the acreage from Lake F would be found somewhere else? Mr. Robson stated that Lake F1 was the same control elevation; therefore, lakes that were the same would be connected to the one to the east. Mr. Adams inquired if lining it took away the ability to recharge the water table, out of that acreage. Mr. Robson replied that SFWMD did not appear to have a problem.

A Board Member asked if measuring the water table would take 12 to 18 months. Mr. Robson replied affirmatively but the proposal must be authorized, first. Mr. Adams stated that monitoring must be completed, prior to approving. A few years of data was required before applying for a modification.

Discussion ensued regarding the Johnson Engineering proposal, water elevation, wet season water tables and the berm. The SFWMD required proof and data of what changed the lake, up or down, and how it would affect the wetland; nothing could be done without approval from SFWMD. This would be the first step in trying to establish a control elevation to the pond in that area and a monitoring period would be required.

Discussion ensued regarding the wetland and the locations of Lakes F1, F and E1. A newer map of the lakes was available and it would be included in his written response.

A Board Member stated that, no matter how the SFWMD labeled it, there was still more water in the dry season than in his lake. Mr. Robson stated that it could be due to the geology of the lake bottom. The Board Member stated that the wetland was being fed more water than his lake and asked why more water could not be added to his lake. Another Board Member stated that Mr. Robson did not say that; the SFWMD wanted proof that it would not affect the wetland. The lake was bleeding down, as it approached the dry part of the season, and the Board Member's lake was doing the same thing as the wetland. The concern was in the wet season water table, not the dry season water table. SFWMD does not want, if the lake level was raised, for the water to be stored higher in the pond and push it up further. The Board Member stated that Mr. Robson was now changing his statement, since he just said "the concern was not the dry

season.” Mr. Robson stated, “...that when you monitor the dry season, it was not a concern.”; the Board Member was incorrect, as it would be monitored all year. The Board Member stated that he knew what happened in the wet season, since the level was 3’5”, he water exited out and that was the height of it. Mr. Adams stated that it was actually higher than that and, as of now, a couple of inches were exited out. The Board Member disagreed with Mr. Adams. Mr. Adams replied that he just visited the site and took a picture of the water flowing over the weir and the control center. Discussion ensued concerning the bleeder.

A Board Member stated that discussion of this began talking about the two-year measurement, several months ago and, if the measurements had started the process would be six or seven months along; it seemed that the measurement process must begin so it could get completed. Another Board Member stated that was what the Board was supposed to vote on, today, and it was brought up at the last meeting, too. Mr. Adams stated that the question was whether to spend \$23,000, plus, to go through the exercise to try and prove that the original modeling was deficient.

A Board Member asked what the fix would be, if something erroneous was occurring. Mr. Robson stated that, if it was found that the impact of raising the level did not affect the wetland, then the water level would be raised but the berm would still have to be adjusted. The Board Member stated that was why he asked that the berm be repaired and brought up to a proper level. Mr. Robson stated that, if a big storm hits, water was allowed to be released everywhere; it was all the way around, a perimeter berm is what it was called. It did not come into play unless there was a really big storm and had no impact on the fluctuations and control elevation; it was just a berm and 5” would not impact that.

Discussion ensued regarding the top of the box going over the berm, water levels and saving the wetland from dryness versus flooding in the neighborhood. A study must be conducted, which could take years for completion.

**On MOTION by Mr. Baldwin and seconded by Mr. Jordan, with all in favor, the Johnson Engineering, Inc., Professional Services Agreement, for Lake F water level data collection, in a not-to-exceed amount of \$23,374.00, was approved.**

Mr. Adams presented the Unaudited Financial Statements as of June 30, 2017. Assessment revenue collections were at 99% and expenditures were at 74%.

**EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Approval of May 10, 2017 Regular Meeting Minutes**

Mr. Adams presented the May 10, 2017 Regular Meeting Minutes and asked for any additions, deletions or corrections.

**On MOTION by Mr. Jordan and seconded by Mr. Newman, with all in favor, the May 10, 2017 Regular Meeting Minutes, as presented, were approved.**

**NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Staff Reports**

**A. District Counsel**

There being no report, the next item followed.

**B. District Engineer**

Mr. Robson introduced Ms. Mallory Clancy, a University of Florida graduate and new member of Mr. Robson’s staff. Mr. Robson announced his retirement in six months and stated that Ms. Clancy would be attending District meetings, tending to bond processes, the stormwater systems, etc.

**C. District Manager**

A Board Member inquired where the \$23,000, plus, would be applied in the bidet. Mr. Adams stated that the funds would come from the surplus fund balance. It would be specific to Verandah West CDD and not considered a shared expense with Verandah East CDD, since it was not a water quality issue; it was a potential capital improvement. This could, eventually, be considered as a special assessment for a capital improvement. The Board could take that position since it was an aesthetic improvement, versus a stormwater or water quality control.

Mrs. Adams reported that the plantings were installed, last Friday, and a few needed to be replanted. Removal of dead Bay Trees was required in Tract C-4 in Bramble Cove, since they had been infected with beetle fungus. Only the trees presenting a potential liability would be removed such as, trees that could fall on houses. The cost would be approximately \$350.



**TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Supervisors' Requests**

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

**ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Adjournment**

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned.

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

[SIGNATURES APPEAR ON THE FOLLOWING PAGE]

COFEAL  
Secretary/Assistant Secretary

[Signature]  
Chair/Vice Chair