

**MINUTES OF MEETING
MOODY RIVER ESTATES
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT**

The Board of Supervisors of the Moody River Estates Community Development District held a Public Hearing and Regular Meeting on **Thursday, August 17, 2017 at 1:00 p.m.**, in the **Clubhouse at Moody River Estates, 3050 Moody River Blvd., North Fort Myers, Florida 33903.**

Present and constituting a quorum were:

Terry Pye	Chair
Elizabeth Keeler	Vice Chair
William Keeler	Assistant Secretary
Ilse Mayer	Assistant Secretary
John Teckorius	Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

Chuck Adams	District Manager
Cleo Adams	Assistant Regional Manager
Wes Kayne	District Engineer
Mike Eckert	District Counsel
Laura Bryant	Associate Manger
Steve Sanford (<i>via telephone</i>)	Bond Counsel – Greenburg, Taurig
John Kessler (<i>via telephone</i>)	FMSbonds
Robert Geltner	Resident
Paul Hoffman	Resident
Teresa Silva	Resident
Tamra Greider	Resident

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

Call to Order/Roll Call

Mr. Adams called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. All Supervisors were present, in person.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS

Public Comments (*agenda items*)

Mr. Robert Geltner, a resident, inquired about Items 3 and 4. Mr. Adams stated that the public hearing to adopt the budget was forthcoming and asked Mr. Geltner to hold his comments until that time.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS

Consideration of Resolution 2017-11, Authorizing the Issuance of Not Exceeding in Total Aggregate Principal Amount of the Outstanding Principal Amount of the Herein Defined Refunded Bonds Consisting of its Senior Special Assessment Refunding Bonds, Series 2017A-1, and its Subordinate Special Assessment Refunding Bonds, Series 2017a-2 Bonds (Collectively, the “Bonds”), to Current Refund All of the District’s Outstanding Capital Improvement Revenue Bonds, Series 2005 (the “Refunded Bonds”); Determining the Need for a Negotiated Limited Offering of the Bonds and Providing for a Delegated Award of Such Bonds; Appointing the Underwriter for the Limited Offering of the Bonds; Approving the Form of and Authorizing the Execution and Delivery of a Bond Purchase Contract With Respect to the Bonds; Approving the Forms of and Authorizing the Execution and Delivery of a Master Trust Indenture and a First Supplemental Trust Indenture Securing the Bonds; Appointing a Trustee; Approving the Form of and Authorizing the Distribution of a Preliminary Limited Offering Memorandum; Approving the Execution and Delivery of a Final Limited Offering Memorandum; Approving the Form of and Authorizing the Execution of a Continuing Disclosure Agreement, and Appointing a Dissemination Agent; Approving the Application of Bond Proceeds; Authorizing Certain Modifications to the Assessment Methodology Report for the Series 2017 Refunding Bonds; Providing for the

Registration of the Bonds Pursuant to the DTC Book-Entry Only System; Authorizing the Proper Officials to Do All Things Deemed Necessary in Connection with the Issuance, Sale and Delivery of the Bonds; and Providing for Severability, Conflicts and an Effective Date

Mr. Adams presented Resolution 2017-11. This Resolution contemplated the refinancing of the District's Series 2005 bonds. Mr. John Kessler, of FMSbonds, Inc. (FMS), briefly explained the current market conditions and refinancing of the Series 2005 bonds. The current interest rate on the bonds was 5.35% and the par amount of the bonds was \$8,395,000. Interest rates were at record lows and the bond market was strong. When refinancing the bonds, the maturity date would not be extended and the par amount would not change. Refinancing would result in a "Debt Service" reduction of approximately \$75,000 to \$80,000, per year. Since the District was not fully developed, 100% of the bond refinancing could not be attained; however, 85% of the bonds would be rated and were expected to be priced in the 3% range. The remainder would be a non-rated component that would probably price out in the 4% range. It was expected that the total bonds would blend out and be priced the 4% to 5% yield range.

Mr. Steve Sanford, Bond Counsel, stated that the existing bonds would be refinanced at a lower coupon rate. This Resolution authorized the Series 2017 bonds. One series of bonds would have a Standard & Poor's (S&P) rating and a lower coupon rate and the other would be the non-rated subordinate series and have a slightly higher coupon rate; however, the interest rates would be significantly lower than what the District was currently paying. Between the two Series 2017 bonds, the principal amount of the bonds that would be issued would be no greater than the outstanding principal amount of the bonds that were presently outstanding. This Resolution would authorize the bonds and approve certain documents associated with the transaction.

Discussion ensued regarding the documentation, such as the Trust Indenture and Supplemental Trust Indenture. Most of the documents would be between the District and U.S. Bank, as Trustee. The Bond Purchase Contract, between the District and FMSbonds, as the Underwriter, spelled out the conditions and required deliverables, in order to have a successful closing. That document would be executed, once the bonds were sold, and all of the interest

rates and redemption provisions would be set forth in the document. A Continuing Disclosure Agreement, as required under SEC Rules, required the District to provide certain annual information concerning the District and the status of the development, including any material negatives which were required to be reported. Those documents would provide secondary investors, who desired purchasing bonds in a secondary market, would have the most updated information. The prospectus was dated as of a certain period of time but that information continually changed, over time; therefore, it was necessary to maintain the prospectus as current as possible. The Preliminary Limited Offering Memorandum (PLOM), or Prospectus, was the marketing tool that set forth information about the District, the development and the bonds that qualified investors would purchase. Once the final pricing terms were obtained, the preliminary Prospectus would become the final Prospectus and contain the final terms. The Escrow Agreement would be between the District and U.S. Bank, who would serve as the escrow agent; it would be a short-term Agreement while funds are in escrow. When the issuance of bonds occurs, a Notice stating that funds would be released would be required. The Notice must be sent within 30 days from the date of the closing. All monies would be held in escrow, pursuant to the Escrow Agreement, so that, when the bonds were issued, Bond Counsel could issue an opinion that the outstanding bonds were no longer outstanding, pursuant to the old Indenture. After the 30-day period, the money would be applied to pay off the old bondholder. The Resolution spelled out certain parameters and, when Mr. Kessler priced the bonds, the pricing terms must be within those parameters. A Special Meeting would not be necessary, since the Chair or Vice Chair would already be delegated the authority to execute the Bond Purchase Agreement, as long as the parameters approved by the Board, were met. At least a 9% savings would be realized, through this bond refinance. The new bondholders would have a lockout period of no longer than 11 years. May 1, 2028, would be the maximum lockout period.

In response to a Board Member's inquiry concerning the Costs of Issuance (COI) for the bonds, Mr. Kessler stated that they were approximately \$140,000, for all consultants involved. Mr. Adams stated that the majority of the \$140,000 COI would be off-set from a balance in the Deferred Cost Account, which would be reflected in the financials, for approximately \$120,000. Those were funds that the original Developer walked away from, leaving them to the District, and which are, essentially, paying for this transaction.

Mr. Geltner asked for clarification that the net savings would be approximately \$70,000. Mr. Adams replied affirmatively and reiterated that the net savings would be approximately \$70,000, per year, and, conservatively, in the parameters of 9%, although the Assessment Methodology Report indicated above 13%. Once the numbers were reflective of the sale, a revised Supplemental Methodology Report would be presented for approval, to lock in the final numbers.

On MOTION by Mr. Pye and seconded by Mr. Teckorius, with all in favor, Resolution 2017-11, Authorizing the Issuance of Not Exceeding in Total Aggregate Principal Amount of the Outstanding Principal Amount of the Herein Defined Refunded Bonds Consisting of its Senior Special Assessment Refunding Bonds, Series 2017A-1, and its Subordinate Special Assessment Refunding Bonds, Series 2017a-2 Bonds (Collectively, the “Bonds”), to Current Refund All of the District’s Outstanding Capital Improvement Revenue Bonds, Series 2005 (the “Refunded Bonds”); Determining the Need for a Negotiated Limited Offering of the Bonds and Providing for a Delegated Award of Such Bonds; Appointing the Underwriter for the Limited Offering of the Bonds; Approving the Form of and Authorizing the Execution and Delivery of a Bond Purchase Contract With Respect to the Bonds; Approving the Forms of and Authorizing the Execution and Delivery of a Master Trust Indenture and a First Supplemental Trust Indenture Securing the Bonds; Appointing a Trustee; Approving the Form of and Authorizing the Distribution of a Preliminary Limited Offering Memorandum; Approving the Execution and Delivery of a Final Limited Offering Memorandum; Approving the Form of and Authorizing the Execution of a Continuing Disclosure Agreement, and Appointing a Dissemination Agent; Approving the Application of Bond Proceeds; Authorizing Certain Modifications to the Assessment Methodology Report for the Series 2017 Refunding Bonds; Providing for the Registration of the Bonds Pursuant to the DTC Book-Entry Only System; Authorizing the Proper Officials to Do All Things Deemed Necessary in Connection with the Issuance, Sale and Delivery of the Bonds; and Providing for Severability, Conflicts and an Effective Date, was adopted.

- **Preliminary Supplemental Assessment Methodology Report**

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

Mr. Adams stated that the Board received the preliminary Supplemental Assessment Methodology Report. It did not change from the original Assessment Methodology Report in how it assigned liens on special and peculiar benefits. The changes were related to the number changes in the transaction; it made some recitals on the amount of the original bond issuance, the remaining outstanding amount, took into consideration the range of interest for both the rated portion, 2017A-1, which was everything but Moody East, and the non-rated portion, 2017a-2, which was Moody East. The Tables, on Page 9, reflected no changes in the product type or the type of units assigned by product type. There were no changes related to development and the outflow of those principal amounts remained the same, in terms of how they were applied to the product types, in special and peculiar benefits. The outstanding portion remained by neighborhood and by unit, which was being refinanced through this bond refinancing.

Mr. Teckorius inquired about Moody East. Mr. Adams replied that Moody East was the entire property to the east, which had two major parcels. One was delinquent in paying taxes and went to tax certificate sale, on occasion; that parcel was unable to get rated. The negative impact of that parcel would not be reflective of the larger one, which was rated.

On MOTION by Mr. Teckorius and seconded by Ms. Mayer, with all in favor, the Preliminary Supplemental Assessment Methodology Report, was approved.

Mr. Adams stated that this meeting would be continued to Wednesday, September 6, 2017 at 1:00 p.m., at this location to approve the Final Supplemental Assessment Methodology Report. In response to a question about how the pricing would affect the budget, Mr. Adams stated that the Fiscal Year 2018 budget Public Hearing would also be continued To September 6. If Mr. Kessler provided the pricing, by the middle part of next week, there would be no problem revising the "Debt Service fund" budget to incorporate the savings into the final budget, prior to adoption, on September 6 and also leave time to meet the Lee County Lien Roll submittal deadline, which Mr. Adams believed was September 15.

*****Mr. Sanford and Mr. Kessler left the meeting.*****

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Public Hearing to Hear Comments and Objections on the Adoption of the District's Final Budget for Fiscal Year 2017/2018, Pursuant to Florida Law

A. Affidavit/Proof of Publication

Mr. Adams presented the affidavit of publication for today's Budget Public Hearing and Regular Meeting.

B. Consideration of Resolution 2017-12, Relating to the Annual Appropriations and Adopting the Budget for the Fiscal Year Beginning October 1, 2017, and Ending September 30, 2018; Authorizing Budget Amendments; and Providing an Effective Date

Mr. Adams presented Resolution 2017-12. There were no significant changes, year-over-year. Expenditures remained similar, other than the reduction due to the use of fund balance to keep assessments the same. The assessment for the single-family units would remain at \$307.80, per unit; however, the assessment for the multi-family units, on the east, would increase from \$127.02 to \$131.05, per unit. It was not necessary to send Mailed Notices to the multi-family landowners, on the east, since a higher assessment rate was previously noticed, two years ago. The "Debt Service" budget would reflect a recognized savings, based upon the refinancing; however, it was not reflected in the budget presented today; it would be incorporated into the budget and presented at the September 6 Continued Meeting.

On MOTION by Ms. Mayer and seconded by Ms. Keeler, with all in favor, the Public Hearing to Consider Resolution 2017-12, Relating to the Annual Appropriations and Adopting the Budget for the Fiscal Year Beginning October 1, 2017, and Ending September 30, 2018; Authorizing Budget Amendments; and Providing an Effective Date, was opened.

No members of the public spoke.

On MOTION by Ms. Mayer and seconded by Ms. Keeler, with all in favor, the Public Hearing to Consider Resolution 2017-12, Relating to the Annual Appropriations and Adopting the Budget for the Fiscal Year Beginning October 1, 2017, and Ending September 30, 2018; Authorizing Budget Amendments; and Providing an Effective Date, was continued to Wednesday, September 6, 2017 at 1:00 p.m., at this location.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Consideration of Resolution 2017-13, Making a Determination of Benefit; Imposing Special Assessments; Providing for the Collection and Enforcement of Special Assessments, Certifying an Assessment Roll; Providing for Amendments to the Assessment Roll

This item was deferred to the Continued Meeting.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Consideration of Resolution 2017-14, Adopting the Annual Meeting Schedule for Fiscal Year 2017/2018

Mr. Adams presented Resolution 2017-14. Meetings would be held on the third Thursday of October, January, March, May, June and August.

On MOTION by Mr. Mayer and seconded by Mr. Pye, with all in favor, Resolution 2017-14, Adopting the Annual Meeting Schedule for Fiscal Year 2017/2018, as presented, was approved.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Continued Discussion/Consideration: Fishing Areas and Sport Fish Stocking

Mr. Adams stated that fishing in the District’s ponds continued. Some were residents but others were from outside the District. A few years ago, a “No Fishing” policy was established, by adoption of a Resolution, which stated that there would not be fishing in any of the ponds. A letter was sent to the Sheriff’s Office, as well. The issue with implementing that policy was that a Board Member or Management must call the Sheriff’s Office and be present when the Deputy

arrived, for the Deputy to enforce the policy. Since the District was in this position, designating fishing, only in certain ponds, was suggested. Ponds that would not encumber the backyards of residents or their privacy, could be designated for fishing and stocked, accordingly, with sport fish, to encourage fishing in those designated ponds. Prior to this meeting, Mr. Adams reviewed the Moody River HOA documents and, unfortunately, the HOA strictly prohibited fishing in the ponds; therefore, he would not advise approving a policy that contradicted the HOA **Covenants, Conditions & Restrictions (CC&Rs)**, as set forth on Page 24, under 533, Paragraph C, "Listing of Restricted Activities", of the Declaration to the HOA documents. Mr. Adams recommended taking no additional action with regard to the fishing. Going forward, the HOA could take action and might be able to enforce the "No Fishing" policy.

Mr. Keeler stated that, as of the last two months, it was not a problem. Rounds were being made and he thought the message was getting out.

Mr. Adams presented a proposal from LakeMasters Aquatic Weed Control, Inc. (LakeMasters) to stock sport fish in Lake 9, to encourage the predatory birds to remain in the CDD. Bass could only be stocked in May and July. The cost would be \$1,065 for 1,500, 2" to 3" bream fish. Mr. Adams would notify the Board, once the fish stocking was scheduled.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

**Consideration of License Agreement:
David W. & Cathy L. Mize, 12617 Blue
Banyon Ct.**

Mr. Adams presented a request and License Agreement from Mr. and Mrs. Mize, residents. A revised Agreement, received by Mr. Eckert, was provided, under separate cover. The District could allow the encroachment that was built into a lake maintenance easement but the District would have the right and authority to remove the encroachment, whenever necessary. The Agreement ensured that, in the event the District had to utilize or remove the easement, it would be at no cost the District; the cost burden would fall on the homeowner. Discussion ensued regarding the encroachment.

Ms. Mayer wanted clarification of why the encroachment was already built and its purpose. Mr. Mize stated that he received approval to build a lanai and hired a contractor and requested a quote but, due to a misunderstanding, the construction foreman proceeded

immediately with the project and had already laid out the materials. The purpose of the lanai was for a sitting area, with a few chairs or a bench, to watch the sunsets.

Discussion ensued regarding the encroachment.

Ms. Mayer stated that, if structures would be part of the lanai, it may impact the buildings and change the view. A precedent was set since there was a lawsuit between a resident and the HOA and a fence had to be removed; therefore, Mr. Mize's request could not be approved, since there could be liability and exposure to the District.

On MOTION by Ms. Mayer and seconded by Mr. Teckorius, with all in favor, the request for a License Agreement between the District and David W. & Cathy L. Mize, 12617 Blue Banyon Ct., for encroachment into the District's lake maintenance easement, was denied.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Discussion: Recent Review and Finding Regarding Drainage Outlet at East Property

Mr. Adams stated that, recently, he, Mrs. Adams, Mr. Kayne and Mr. Teckorius reviewed the concerns regarding the drainage reconfiguration, at the east property, and whether it was constructed according to plan, functioning properly and could, potentially, create upstream impacts, which was a major concern on the Moody River west side, since the outfall was into the east property and eventually into the river. Mr. Kayne provided a written opinion of the findings and whether there were issues of concern; a copy of Mr. Kayne's email was provided.

Mr. Kayne stated that, since the meeting, he spoke with a South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD) representative, who did not appear to have any issues with the current configuration. He tried to contact a representative from Briggs Engineering, since there were two permits for reconfiguration, for the outfall. One was permitted and certified so, with that as evidence, plus his observation of what was installed, he did not have any current issues with the outfall. The parcel that Briggs Engineering rerouted, throughout, was engaged; the structures were installed but not certified. He tried to find out when certification would occur but the Engineer of Record was not available. At this time, Mr. Kayne had no issues with the system, as designed, permitted or accepted.

Mr. Teckorius stated that Moody River had an approved septic stormwater system and the CDD was responsible for operating and maintaining it. During construction, Meritage Homes of Florida, Inc. (Meritage) had a permit to install a new 42" pipe, for rerouting. The pipe was going to be capped to the existing pipe, to intercept the one by Meritage and it would be accepted by the HOA. The HOA retained an Engineer to inspect the marina, including the pipe, but nobody seemed to care that the pipe was compromised, non-certified and that construction was occurring.

Mr. Kayne stated that Moody River Estates East was permitted for the entrance, the round-about, parking lot, boat ramp and a portion of the alcove light. It was permitted, constructed, certified and accepted, by the Engineer of Record and/or the SFMWD and, whoever permitted it, was responsible for the operation and maintenance (O&M).

Discussion ensued regarding clogging, permits, construction and certification.

Mr. Adams stated that the CDD's Districts Engineer's opinion was that the HOA was not hurt by downstream discharges. The permit for the operator of the pipe work, who accepted the downstream discharges, had an obligation to construct it, according to engineered modeling and approved plans, constructed and certified as complete, by the entities that the District had to rely upon, such as the Engineer of Record, regarding the downstream system and, more importantly, the SFWMD. Additionally, there were very significant rainfall events, over the summer, with a full system, which was obviously discharging at a higher rate than designed, without compromise to the streets, etc.

Discussion ensued regarding the pipes, costs of reconfiguration, other Engineers, Moody River discharge versus the Moody River pipe and the Moody River HOA Board of Directors.

Mr. Adams stated that, from the District's perspective, there were no discharge issues and the District was no longer a party to this issue. The Moody River HOA must do its due diligence, accordingly. Mr. Adams would attach an email containing the engineer's opinion on this matter to the front of the next meeting minutes,.

Discussion ensued between Mr. Adams and Ms. Mayer regarding liability related to the pipe. Mr. Adams explained the governing authorities, modeling by the Engineer, permitting and certifications.

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Acceptance of Unaudited Financial Statements as of June 30, 2017

Mr. Adams presented the Unaudited Financial Statements as of June 30, 2017. Assessment revenue collections were at 101% and expenditures were at 76%.

ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Approval of May 18, 2017 Regular Meeting Minutes

Mr. Adams presented the May 18, 2017 Regular Meeting Minutes and asked for any additions, deletions or corrections. The following change was made:

Line 107: Change “Mrs. Keller” to “Ms. Mayer”

On MOTION by Ms. Mayer and seconded by Ms. Keeler, with all in favor, the May 18, 2017 Regular Meeting Minutes, as amended, were approved.

- Action Items

Mr. Adams stated that Item 1, would be picked up going into Fiscal Year 2018.

Items 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 were removed, since they were completed.

TWELFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Staff Reports

A. District Counsel

Mr. Eckert stated that a legislative bill was proposed, which would require CDD Board Members to undergo ethic’s training, each year, the same as other officials and city officials however, it did not pass. He anticipated that the bill would be brought up again in January when the session resumed. If passed, the training would be for the individual, not by seat, since many CDD Board Members served on different boards.

B. District Engineer

There being no report, the next item followed.

C. District Manager

There being no report, the next item followed.

D. Operations Manager

Mrs. Adams presented the Operations Report.

THIRTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Public Comments (*non-agenda items*)

Mr. Geltner, a resident, inquired if anyone knew about the planting occurring in the conservation area, behind his residence planting. Mr. Adams replied that some plants were destroyed and, as part of the remediation process, replacement native plants were being installed. In response to Mr. Geltner's question, Mrs. Adams stated that the HOA asked permission to enter the 20' of the conservation area, on Skyline, to pick up the trash. She had no issues with the HOA's request. Mr. Geltner asked if it was the same for Crescendo. Mr. Adams replied no, it was only for the Skyline area. Once construction settled, exotic and invasive plant removal, treatments and picking up of trash would be twice, per year, which would suffice. Mr. Geltner recalled Mr. Teckorius stating that there was a previously existing 42" outfall pipe and then a new 42" pipe, and asked if water was going through both pipes and if one could tell if the water was coming through, by looking into the outfall pipe. Mr. Adams replied affirmatively, if water was flowing through. Mr. Adams observed the old pipe and it appeared that a minor amount of flow was going through, since there was a stir-up due to the fish. That supported Mr. Teckorius' concern that the pipe might not be fully plugged and it may be leaking. As part of Mr. Kayne's opinion memo, he recognized elevations and that it was flowing out of Moody Central at 4' 1". The invert downstream on the underwater one, the newly configured one, was at 1'.5" with 2'.6" of head drop. Mr. Kayne clarified and presented a brief description and explanation.

On behalf of his neighbor, who emailed Mrs. Adams about the fountain noise, Mr. Paul Hoffman, a resident, stated the fountain was not running during the designated hours and the hours of operation appeared to change daily. Mrs. Adams replied that the timers came with the fountains and were not precise; there would be a flexation of minutes. The only resolve would be to install a digital timer, which was forthcoming. Changing the fountains to operate from 10:00 a.m.. to 8:00 p.m., would not occur now but, once the daylight savings time ends, in the fall, and it was darker in the evening, he could adjust the timing. A Board Member stated that the lights were sometimes on until 11:00 p.m. Mrs. Adams stated that it should be on 15-minute variables and that something was not right. She and Mr. Adams would check on it with the contractor.

Ms. Teresa Silva, a resident, stated that a 15' tree was cut down, in the preserve, and asked what the difference was between an invasive and an exotic. Mr. Adams stated that there were a few exotics, which were maintained by the HOA's landscaper; the trees were there for a number of years and were maintained by the HOA's contractors, without realizing the trees were exotics. When it was discovered that the trees were exotics, a Notice to Remove was sent and gave a very short deadline for removal. The District's contractor removed the trees to remediate the violation and the District would look to the HOA to replace them. Ultimately, replacement with a similar size tree would cost about \$1,000. Ms. Silva inquired if the trees were monitored. Mr. Adams replied no but certain areas were assigned, by agreement, to an Association and it was assigned to a Facilities Maintenance Agreement, which was completed in 2005, when the District began. Ms. Silva wanted to know if there was a clear understanding of who did what. Mr. Adams replied that it was clear, for a number of years, while the developer was in charge of the Board. When the Board transitioned to the residents, there were a lot of questions about responsibilities and the District referred to the Agreements. Since Ms. Bryant's arrival, she and Mrs. Adams coordinate many things. Discussion ensued regarding the District maps and boundaries, coordination of work, code enforcement agencies, etc.

Ms. Tamra Greider, a resident, was aware that some homeowners wanted consideration to attend meetings and, perhaps, had interest in running for the Board. She would appreciate it if the Board Meetings could be rescheduled to later in the day so that she and other residents could participate without leaving work, during the day. Some residents have interest but are unable to attend the meetings due to work schedules. Mr. Adams replied, "so noted".

FOURTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Supervisors' Requests

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

FIFTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Adjournment

There being nothing further to discuss, the meeting recessed at 2:34 p.m. and was , continued to continued to September 6, 2017 at 1:00 p.m., at this location.

On MOTION by Mr. Pye and seconded by Ms. Mayer, with all in favor, the meeting recessed at 2:34 p.m. and was , continued to continued to September 6, 2017 at 1:00 p.m., at this location.

[SIGNATURES APPEAR ON THE FOLLOWING PAGE]

COPEAL
Secretary/~~Assistant Secretary~~

She H-Mayer
Chair/~~Vice Chair~~

HANDOUT 8-17-17
ATTACH TO MINUTES

Chuck Adams

From: Wes Kayne <WesK@barraco.net>
Sent: Wednesday, August 16, 2017 10:14 PM
To: Chuck Adams; Cleo Adams; John Teckorius
Cc: Carl A. Barraco
Subject: Moody River Estates - Basin 2 Outfall

All,

District Management (Chuck and Cleo), District Engineering (Wes), and Supervisor Teckorius met on August 9, 2017 at Moody River Estates to discuss the District's outfall reconfiguration within the Moody River Estates Waterfront Park. A reconfiguration of the existing 42" conveyance which serves as the outfall for Moody River Estates Basin 2 was included in the South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD) Permit for the Moody River Estates Waterfront Park (App. No. 150109-22). These modifications were permitted by SFWMD and accepted as certified by Morris-Depew Associates, Inc. As evidenced by the fact that the modifications were both permitted and certified within the Moody River Estates Waterfront Park, we do not believe there is an issue with the outfall conveyance reconfiguration. Furthermore, based on review of the permitted plans and the available conditions observed in the field we are not aware of an issue or deficiency with the outfall conveyance as permitted and constructed.

The design elevations according to the SFWMD permit plans and calculations are as follows:

Moody River Basin 2 Control Elevation = 4.1' NGVD

According to the Moody River Estates Waterfront Park plans:

Mean High High Water Elevation = 1.5' NGVD

Mean Low Low Water Elevation = 0.1' NGVD

Outfall pipe design invert = -0.7' NGVD

2.6'
HEAD

At this time no further action will be taken by District Engineering unless directed to do so by District Management or the Board of Supervisors.

Thank you,

Wes Kayne, P.E.
Project Engineer
Barraco and Associates, Inc.
Civil Engineers ~ Land Surveyors ~ Planners
2271 McGregor Boulevard, Suite 100
Fort Myers, FL 33901
(239) 461-3170 Phone
(239) 461-3169 Fax
<http://www.barraco.net>

File: 22898

--

This message has been scanned for viruses and dangerous content by **MailScanner**, and is believed to be clean.