

1           **PORT OF THE ISLANDS COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT**  
2                                   **NAPLES, FLORIDA**

3                           Workshop Meeting of the Board of Supervisors  
4                                   June 14, 2024

5   The workshop meeting of the Port of the Islands Community Improvement District Board  
6   of Supervisors was held on Friday, June 14, 2024, at 9:30 a.m. at the Orchid Cove  
7   Clubhouse, 25005 Peacock Lane, Naples, Florida.

8   **SUPERVISORS PRESENT**

9   Steve McNamee, Chairman  
10   Dan Truckey, Vice Chairman, via Zoom  
11   Russell Kish, Supervisor  
12   Kevin Baird, Supervisor  
13   Anna-Lise Hansen, Supervisor

14   **ALSO PRESENT**

15   Neil Dorrill, Manager, Dorrill Management Group  
16   Kevin Carter, Dorrill Management Group  
17   Tony Pires, District Counsel  
18   Robert Ori, CPA for Raftelis

19   **ROLL CALL/APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

20   Four Supervisors were present in person, establishing a quorum. Mr. Truckey  
21   participated via Zoom. The meeting was convened at 9:30 a.m. The meeting was also  
22   properly noticed. The notice and affidavit are on file with the District Office at 5672  
23   Strand Court, Naples, FL 34110.

24   **Mr. Truckey's participation via Zoom due to extenuating circumstances was**  
25   **approved on a MOTION by Mr. McNamee, a second by Ms. Hansen, and all in**  
26   **favor.**

27   **PUBLIC COMMENT**

28   No public comment was received at this time.

1 **MANAGERS REPORT**

2 **A. Utility Rate Study**

3 Raftelis representative Mr. Robert Ori, provided an introduction and shared that the  
4 scope of work was a revenue requirements analysis, which forecasts expenditure and  
5 funding needs for utilities. The analysis evaluates the ability of revenues derived from  
6 rates, including current non-ad-valorem assessments, to meet expenditure needs. It  
7 identifies necessary rate adjustments and highlights surpluses where applicable.  
8 Additionally, it assesses liquidity, debt, and determines an optimal rate structure and  
9 implementation plan, with projections extending through 2028, focusing on 2025 as a  
10 test year for potential rate adjustments. Mr. Ori mentioned that a big issue they  
11 identified was developing a funding strategy for the capital improvement plan.

12 The combined systems currently generate approximately \$1.5 million in revenue.  
13 Operating expenses exceed \$800,000 and are expected to rise to \$900,000 by 2028,  
14 reflecting an average annual increase of 4.4%. Over the fiscal years through 2028,  
15 there is a projected capital requirement of \$9.3 million. To meet this, \$5.9 million will be  
16 funded through the issuance of additional debt within the system, while 63% of the  
17 capital plan, totaling \$3.4 million, will come from operating reserves. Currently, the  
18 system operates without any outstanding debt, but it is anticipated that about \$6.265  
19 million in debt will be issued. The capital value financed by debt issuance is \$5.9 million,  
20 with the first year's interest capitalized and funded from the loan proceeds. The debt  
21 deferral provides flexibility in rate adjustments. Assuming a 4% interest rate and 3%  
22 inflation annually, the principal amount of debt is projected to be \$433,000 by 2028. It is  
23 recommended to implement an 8% rate increase in the initial two years, followed by  
24 adjustments in the range of 5-6.5% in subsequent years, based on the proposed  
25 financial plan. Beginning fiscal year 2025, an assumed 3% inflation rate annually is  
26 factored into the financial projections.

27 The discussion included plans to discontinue non-ad-valorem assessments and  
28 implement a meter-based base facility charge. This change was considered beneficial  
29 due to the elimination of tax collector fees and potential revenue losses from  
30 prepayments for early payments, aiming to improve accuracy in customer billing. It was  
31 noted that few utilities employ a base facility charge as a non-ad-valorem assessment.  
32 Mr. Ori gave the example that Collier County uses a rate structure attached to the  
33 meter. He presented current rates for water and wastewater, which are currently  
34 uniform, and noted that the District may want to reallocate these costs in the future.  
35 Specific rates presented by Mr. Ori included most meters at \$118.87 and an existing

1 base charge per ERC of \$116.92, which includes an early payment discount.  
2 Transitioning to a meter-based approach would reduce the number of ERCs compared  
3 to those currently listed on the tax roll. Multifamily accounts currently assessed via the  
4 tax roll would switch to ERCs based on meter equivalent factors derived from demand  
5 criteria, specifically water flow. When asked about knowing where the various meter  
6 sizes are located within the District, Mr. Ori indicated there was no current data  
7 available. Additionally, Mr. Ori recommended increasing the potable water cap for  
8 wastewater billing to 100%, up from the current 75%.

9 The discussion compared non-ad-valorem assessment versus meter-based  
10 approaches. Non-ad-valorem assessments were noted for their high collection rate, as  
11 they share the same payment status as property taxes and minimize bad debt write-  
12 offs, regardless of property occupancy or seasonality. However, once levied, rates  
13 cannot be adjusted for non-ad assessments, unlike meter-based approaches which  
14 offer flexibility for rate adjustments at any time.

15 In conclusion, existing rates are projected to be insufficient through fiscal year 2028 due  
16 to rising operating expenses, capital costs, and additional debt service. Rate  
17 adjustments have been identified for fiscal years 2025 through 2028, and the Board  
18 accepted the proposed monthly user rate adjustments. The proposed rate adjustments  
19 were accepted, including a transition to meter-based charging for fixed services. This  
20 transition will maintain the current billing process while implementing a meter-based  
21 base facility charge in fiscal year 2026 to allow for adequate preparation for the  
22 transition. The meter-based approach will help equalize ERCs. Condominiums can be  
23 billed on a unit-based approach instead of a meter based one, it is recommended to  
24 develop a master meter. Mr. Ori noted that many Counties utilize unit-based rates.  
25 Condominiums at the hotel will likely use a master meter and factor the cost into the  
26 condominium fees. Mr. Ori suggested doing a survey or inventory of the actual meter  
27 sizes per account as that information is currently not contained in District records. This  
28 could then be linked to the non-ad-valorem tax roll to see the full progression and what  
29 is there now.

30 Mr. Truckey mentioned that the water from the docks is not able to be run back to  
31 through the sewer system, he asked if that meter would include the sewer charge or if it  
32 would just have the water charge. Mr. Ori said it would just have the water charge. Ron  
33 Westerman of Cays Drive asked if Florida Utility Solutions would be able to provide the  
34 information needed to connect the meter sizes to the tax roll information. Mr. Ori said if  
35 all the meters have a backflow preventor it could be possible, and that location data

1 would be helpful to link the meter with the account holder. Mr. Kish asked if the hotel is  
2 charged monthly or bi-monthly, Mr. Dorrill said bi-monthly. Mr. McNamee pointed out  
3 that the current utilization of only 71% of ERCs contributes to high costs, and he would  
4 like to build out to a fuller capacity of utilization. He asked if the anticipated sale of  
5 ERCs to Mr. Case, 33 ERCs each year for the next three years, will lead to a loss of  
6 income if rates are moved to a meter base rate. Mr. Ori said that non-ad-valorem  
7 assessment can only be charged to a developer if there is a benefit to the property and  
8 the benefit being discussed is the base charge for water service. If there are water lines  
9 in front of the houses, the assessment should be paid as the property is benefiting from  
10 the line being there. He noted that there is case law on this. Mr. Pires noted that the  
11 process to modify a rate is simpler than increasing a non-ad-valorem assessment.

12 To avoid rate shock, the accepted plan includes gradual increases to transition to a  
13 different funding source. Mr. Ori discussed the advantages of an SRF loan, noting that  
14 repayment does not begin until three years after approval or upon project completion,  
15 which for this projected is approximately three years. The loan amount is adjusted  
16 based on actual funds borrowed, and interest accrues only on disbursed amounts,  
17 avoiding interest payments on the entire loan amount regardless of utilization. Mr.  
18 Truckey asked about the possibility of charging maintenance fees for the water system  
19 on vacant land. Mr. Ori confirmed that such charges are appropriate if the landowner  
20 benefits from the maintained asset. He mentioned seeing other utilities charge a line  
21 maintenance fee for vacant properties with existing lines, clarifying that these fees are  
22 not usage charges, and he considers maintenance charges reasonable in such  
23 circumstances. There was discussion about delinquent bills and water shut offs.  
24 Increasing the late fee was mentioned and it was said that a \$25 fee is not much  
25 motivation to pay a \$12,000 late water bill.

26 Mr. Pires believes there's a higher likelihood of Collier County assuming control of the  
27 utility operations in Port of the Islands if presented in a rate and fiscal structure familiar  
28 to them, moving away from the non-ad-valorem assessment system. Mr. Dorrill  
29 expressed that from a regional perspective, the revenue potential of this community  
30 makes it an attractive customer base for Collier County.

### 31 **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

32 No additional public comments were received at this time.

### 33 **ADJOURNMENT**

34 The next meeting will be on July 19, 2024, at 9:30 a.m.