

## **Island Park Woodland Homeowners Association, Inc.**

16295 S. Tamiami Trail #105, Fort Myers, FL 33908

Email: [info@IPWHOA.org](mailto:info@IPWHOA.org) Website: [www.IPWHOA.org](http://www.IPWHOA.org) Facebook.com/IPWHOA

### **Special HOA Seawall Meeting**

Saturday, April 12th, 2025 @ 9:00am | Island Park Woodland Community Area

#### **Meeting Introduction**

Maria Tunis, President of the HOA, opens the meeting and introduces the board members present, including Nancy Blakely, Lyndee (secretary), and Wade Ralph, who is joining by phone from Ohio. This is a special HOA meeting focused solely on decisions regarding the seawall. Ballots had been sent out previously for absentee voting, but attendees did not need to bring them to the meeting.

#### **Overview of Two Seawall Quotes**

Conrad is acknowledged for gathering two different quotes for the seawall project—one around \$6,200 and another around \$42,000. He explains that the \$6,200 quote covers cleaning up the buildup of gravel and silt that has accumulated at the south end of the seawall due to rain. This plan involves vacuuming out the silt, replacing it with riprap (larger, more stable stones), and possibly conducting minor annual maintenance which could be handled internally with a rented trash pump.

#### **Higher Quote and Structural Considerations**

The \$42,000 quote from the same company involves more extensive work and was partly solicited for comparison purposes. One proposal involves installing a PVC seawall rather than a concrete one, which wouldn't match the existing structure. Florida Structural, the contractor that built the original section of the seawall, would be a preferred choice if the project involves connecting to the existing structure to maintain the warranty. The familiarity of Florida Structural with the 10 Mile Canal and their past work in the area were seen as advantages.

#### **Tree Line, Past Quotes, and Material Clarifications**

Discussion continues on the scope of the work relative to a specific palm tree. Russ clarifies that the current quote goes up to the tree but doesn't require its removal. He also addresses a previous, outdated quote he had shared, which was about \$8,000 less. The original quote was from nine months ago, and prices have increased about \$1,000 per month. Florida Structural's updated quote is now valid until the end of the month and includes extending the same panel type currently in use. While this newer quote doesn't address silt removal directly, Russ volunteers to manage that separately if needed. The quote includes removal of gravel and other debris from the kayak launch area, backfilling, and adding the concrete cap, ensuring a seamless continuation of the existing seawall. The area around the tree, which hasn't shifted in decades, is considered stable and doesn't need additional riprap.

#### **Financial Review and Feasibility**

Jim questions why the seawall wasn't completed during the initial build. Maria explains it was due to financial constraints at the time, as funds were needed for other repairs. Now, however, the HOA has sufficient funds. There's about \$56,880 in checking and \$15,435 in contingency, with an \$8,000 payment still due for tennis courts, leaving \$7,000 in contingency. The HOA expects around \$30,000 from dues by June 1, matching their annual budget. Maria stresses that as a nonprofit, the HOA should not hoard funds. However, there is concern about potential unforeseen costs that may arise during construction, which could exceed the \$45,000 quoted.

## **Contingency, Silt Concerns, and Ongoing Maintenance**

Further concerns are raised about the open-ended nature of the contract and the potential for cost overruns. Maria and Russ discuss how excess funds can be legally retained as reserves for future repairs rather than refunded. Russ reiterates that silt removal isn't included in the current quote but assures members that he is willing to manage the task himself if it becomes necessary. The gravel runoff from the sloped launch area will be addressed as part of the new seawall extension. While silt buildup is a persistent issue due to the property's location on a curve, it's acknowledged that this problem will exist regardless of whether riprap or a full seawall is installed. A resident shares their positive experience using riprap alone on their property without facing silt problems, suggesting it may be a cost-effective option. However, another member points out that the current flow differs significantly in their corner of the canal.

## **Ongoing Concerns About Silt and County Dredging Plans**

The discussion resumed with concerns about the silt issue surrounding the dock and ramp area. It was noted that if the county proceeds with removing the land currently visible, it could resolve many of the existing sedimentation problems. However, skepticism remains as it's unclear whether the county will follow through, despite having surveyed the area about a year ago. Their proposed 10-step dredging plan is still in development, led by someone named Roland. A major point of concern is the eventual removal of the natural landscape behind the seawall and ramp, which could significantly alter the area.

As for the present decision, the group is voting between implementing riprap or continuing with the previously agreed-upon seawall plan. Unfortunately, due to a nine-month delay, the project's cost has increased by \$1,000. One member shared concerns that further postponements could raise costs by \$10,000-\$20,000 more. Financial contributions from some homeowners remain pending, and one property in foreclosure led to the loss of an assessment fee due to Florida statutes that limit back-dues collection to just one year. Attempts to reframe assessments as dues for better recoverability were discussed but left unresolved.

## **Financial Perspectives and the Value of Raised Dues**

A community member took a moment to thank the board for their earlier decision to raise annual dues from \$120 to \$240. This increase enabled the creation of a dedicated reserve fund, originally intended for the prior dock. Because 50% of the increased dues went into this fund, the neighborhood now has funds to work with for new projects. The speaker emphasized that \$240 annually is still relatively minor and necessary as costs—like landscaping—continue to rise each year.

## **Reevaluating Priorities: Seawall Extension vs. Community Enhancements**

The conversation then shifted to a deeper analysis of whether the seawall extension is truly necessary or simply a convenience. It was acknowledged that the current dock has survived two significant hurricanes and is holding up well. Concerns about sediment were downplayed, with a suggestion that the existing dock continues to serve its essential purpose.

One resident openly stated that they had changed their stance: while previously in favor of extending the dock, they now believed the estimated \$42,000-\$50,000 could be better used on other community enhancements. Ideas like replacing the aging playground equipment, building a pavilion for meetings, or generally investing in quality-of-life improvements were raised. The argument was that the seawall extension would not directly increase property values and thus may not be the best use of community funds.

## **Debate Over Convenience vs. Necessity and Boat Access Issues**

Tensions surfaced over whether the dock extension served the whole community or only benefited a few frequent boaters. Some argued that the extension would ease congestion during busy boating weekends and allow two boats to comfortably load and unload, particularly larger boats. Others pushed back, saying

that such situations occur infrequently and the inconvenience of waiting a few minutes at the ramp is not worth the high expense.

There was also discussion about the rising cost of the project—now \$8,000 higher than the original quote. One speaker shared their frustration about the increase and their efforts to negotiate the price back down. A second, cheaper quote (\$42,000 vs. \$46,000) was also circulated, but it included PVC panels that some attendees rejected outright.

### **Clarity on Voting Process and Proxy Concerns**

The meeting began winding toward a vote, but confusion arose over what exactly was being voted on—options A, B, and C were mentioned without clear definition in the moment. A member expressed concern that individuals who submitted proxy votes might not have fully understood what they were voting on, leading to a call for better communication and participation in future meetings. The chair acknowledged the concern but emphasized that attendance cannot be forced.

### **Voting on Proposed Projects**

The meeting continued with voting on several proposed projects. The first proposal discussed was for the Florida structure, which had an original cost of \$45,330. The group voted in favor of this proposal, with four votes in the "yay" column.

Next, they discussed a second proposal for PVC panels, which had a cost of \$42,000. This proposal did not receive any votes and was effectively rejected, as there were no "yay" votes.

The third proposal was for the removal of silt sediment and installation of 20 tons of riprap with a filter, costing \$6,200. This proposal received broad support, with eight "yay" votes. The tally for the votes including the Absentee ballots was five for the Florida Structure, three for the PVC panels, and 15 for the sediment removal and riprap installation.

### **Budget Allocation and Project Flexibility**

Following the votes, the group discussed what to do with the remaining budget. The board mentioned putting some funds aside for future maintenance projects, such as tennis court resurfacing, which recently cost \$15,000. They suggested earmarking an additional \$10,000 for future landscaping needs.

One member inquired about the flexibility of the funds. It was confirmed that if new projects arise, the money could be redirected, provided the change was properly documented. The group discussed using general reserve funds, which could be shifted to different projects if necessary, whereas specific reserves couldn't be repurposed in this way.

### **Landscaping and Community Maintenance**

The meeting turned to ongoing landscaping and maintenance issues. A neighbor had dumped debris in a shared area, which was deemed unsuitable for landscaping. Additionally, the board discussed the problem of residents parking their vehicles and trailers on gravel areas, which was not ideal. The plan was to install barricades, such as large stone posts with rope, to discourage this behavior and maintain a tidy appearance.

There were also concerns about children throwing rocks, especially as new riprap would be added to the landscape. The group agreed to discourage this behavior by educating families and potentially fining parents if issues continued.

**Adjournment of meeting:** Motion by Maria Tunis, seconded by Nancy Blakley.