

1 **extenuating circumstances were approved on a MOTION by Ms. Hansen, a**
2 **second by Mr. Truckey, and all in favor.**

3 **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

4 **A. Rose Jarris - Orchid Cove**

5 Ms. Jarris provided a letter circulating around the community that she initiated regarding
6 issues she sees with the Board. She stated that water rates should not be increased
7 without a spending plan, and that it is fiscally irresponsible to implement rate increases
8 without an infrastructure plan identifying how the funds will be used. She also
9 commented on gates, citing Reflection Lakes as a gated community ranked number four
10 for threats, theft, and robbery, noting that issues can occur in any community. She
11 urged the Board to prioritize infrastructure before spending money on clubhouses or
12 gates. She indicated the letter is gathering signatures throughout the community and
13 has not yet been finalized. Mr. Dorrill responded that the utility rate structure is based on
14 a civil engineer's capital improvement plan, which has been updated and will be
15 updated again to include the new utility crossings on the US 41 bridge, as discussed at
16 last month's meeting. He stated the utility and recent investments, including new disc
17 filters and several hundred thousand dollars' worth of work, are included in that plan. He
18 added that the rate increase was workshopped through four public meetings and
19 presentations. Mr. Lombardo clarified with Ms. Jarris that the letter is still a draft, not yet
20 finalized, and has not yet been sent.

21 **B. Mike Thompson - Newport Cay**

22 Mr. Thompson stated that he began conversations on Nextdoor several weeks ago and
23 questioned why utility bills had increased. He referenced the bills directing customers to
24 the website for more information but said he could not find an explanation there. He
25 asked why there was an increase. Mr. Dorrill responded that there were four public
26 meetings over the past year, and the Board hired one of Florida's most recognized utility
27 rate consultants to present and prepare the analysis. He explained the change was
28 driven by the fact that the utility system had historically operated under a subsidy model,
29 with costs offset through non-ad valorem assessments on the tax bill. With the change,
30 tax bills decreased by nearly \$1,200. Mr. Thompson stated his decreased by \$800. Mr.
31 Dorrill noted that other taxing entities have increased their assessments and that the
32 Port is now annexed into the Mosquito Control District. He added that the Board
33 adopted a new base rate structure as part of a business and consumption model
34 commonly used by utilities.

1 Ms. Hansen stated that the non-ad valorem assessment was previously \$1,899.63 and
2 is now \$721.26, reflecting a savings of \$1,178.37. She noted the meter rate now
3 included on the water bill is \$1,542, resulting in a difference of \$363.63, or \$30.30 per
4 month. Mr. Kish noted his fire tax alone increased by \$400. He explained that
5 transitioning to a consumption model was necessary for the County to consider taking
6 over the District utilities, as they would not evaluate the system while it remained on the
7 tax bill, and that was the primary motivation. He referenced an average monthly water
8 bill from Lely of \$301, noting District billing is bi-monthly and rates are comparable to
9 the rest of the County. Ms. Hansen also clarified that non-ad valorem taxes are not
10 deductible.

11 Ms. Hansen addressed criticism of the Board on Nextdoor and the spread of false
12 information. She noted a claim that FEMA grants were not pursued, when in fact Mr.
13 Truckey actively works to secure such grants. She expressed appreciation for residents
14 who attempt to provide accurate information and encouraged others to contact Board
15 members or Mr. Dorrill directly rather than relying on Nextdoor. Mr. Dorrill's personal
16 phone number is publicly available.

17 Mr. Thompson also stated that at a CID meeting several years ago he was told he did
18 not have the right to vote because he is not a Florida resident, as he resides in North
19 Dakota for part of the year. He encouraged making seasonal residents feel welcome
20 and that they have a voice even if they cannot vote. Ms. Hansen assured him that no
21 one on the current Board shares the view that his voice does not matter.

22 **C. Katherine Kehlmeier - Newport Drive, Sunset Cay Lakes**

23 Ms. Kehlmeier followed up on comments from last month and reviewed Ms. Hansen's
24 tax bill as she had previously done with Mr. McNamee's. She stated that Ms. Hansen's
25 and Mr. McNamee's were comparable, and that for single-family homes the difference
26 between 2024 and 2025 taxes was \$81.59. She stated that when factoring in the new
27 structure and \$128.63, or \$36.38, single-family home taxes only increased by \$81.59.
28 She noted that condominiums, however, used to be assessed 0.8 and are now being
29 assessed at 1.0 resulting in an increase of \$362.19. She stated this increase is unfair to
30 condominium owners and too significant, and that condominiums should not be
31 compared to single-family homes. Ms. Hansen responded that the prior water billing
32 structure was not fair for everyone. The purpose was to make water meter charges fair
33 and equitable for all.

1 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES - DECEMBER 2025**

2 **The minutes were accepted as presented on a MOTION by Mr. Truckey, a second**
3 **by Ms. Hansen, and all in favor.**

4 **UTILITY OPERATIONS SUMMARY**

5 Operations at the facilities throughout the month were conducted in accordance with
6 contract and regulatory requirements. All wastewater plant and water distribution
7 requirements were met. The reuse pump system is functioning properly. The canal
8 pump station had been operating on two pumps but is currently down to one, as one
9 unit tripped and has not reset since the last meeting. The system received and treated
10 3.06 million gallons of wastewater. In December, 2.93 million gallons of drinking water
11 were produced and distributed, and 9.57 million gallons of reuse water were distributed.
12 All pump stations were inspected weekly and odor control checks were performed. A
13 total of 20,000 gallons of sludge were disposed of. One line break was repaired. Usage
14 totaled 665 gallons of chlorine. The 75-horsepower reuse motor remains out for repair;
15 the pump end was expected to arrive this week with installation anticipated next week.
16 A temporary diesel backup pump was installed after the canal pump went down,
17 providing sufficient emergency pumping capacity in place of the 75-horsepower unit at
18 the plant. Rehabilitation of the Newport master lift station is underway.

19 Mr. Dorrill requested an update on the right-of-way permit for the upcoming project to
20 replace the US 41 bridge crossing. Mr. Gilinsky stated he has not been involved in that
21 permitting process and did not have an update. Mr. Dorrill requested that he coordinate
22 with District Engineer Jared Brown. Mr. Dorrill noted Mr. Brown believes a permit will be
23 required even though the work is replacement in nature and emphasized the importance
24 of staying on top of the matter.

25 Mr. McNamee stated that comments circulating on Nextdoor and through public
26 discussion suggest the District has not been maintaining the water treatment plant
27 infrastructure and asked Mr. Gilinsky to respond. Mr. Gilinsky stated both the water and
28 wastewater treatment plants have received substantial maintenance and upgrades
29 recently and that he has not been denied requests for necessary work. He described
30 the facility as producing high-quality water and noted the wastewater plant is operating
31 at roughly half of its capacity. Mr. Dorrill added that in just over two years approximately
32 \$500,000 has been invested, including new filters, pump station rehabilitations,
33 replacement of the raw water main, and the upcoming US 41 bridge crossing project.

1 He stated capital replacement and upgrades are likely to total about \$1 million over two
2 years.

3 Mr. Truckey stated it is disheartening that some community members believe the plants
4 are not being maintained, noting extensive work including grant-funded improvements.
5 He cited installation of a new computer control system costing nearly \$100,000 and
6 replacement of a wellfield diesel generator through grant funding after the previous unit
7 failed. He noted that when he joined the Board the sewer plant operated only on one
8 side and at limited capacity, whereas both sides are now operating. Mr. Gilinsky
9 confirmed the plant is now running at optimal capacity. Utility staff cleaned membranes,
10 completed overhauls, and implemented a new SCADA system allowing tighter
11 operational parameters and remote monitoring and control. He stated the system could
12 be operated via phone if necessary and that Starlink was installed recently due to
13 reliability issues with CenturyLink, improving emergency communication. Ms. Hansen
14 confirmed the SCADA system provides alerts for leaks and operational anomalies. Mr.
15 Gilinsky explained alarms are triggered by abnormal flow rates, allowing adjustments to
16 maintain system pressure and prevent excessive water loss, noting the system
17 represents a significant improvement over prior capability. Mr. Kish asked whether
18 residents could tour the facility, and Mr. Gilinsky responded that tours are welcome.

19 Mr. Truckey noted that in evaluating system vulnerabilities, the sand filter was identified
20 as a critical weakness due to maintenance demands. The Board subsequently installed
21 a disc filter that can be cleaned and returned to service within hours. Mr. Gilinsky
22 explained the disc filter can handle greater flow volumes and prevent overflow during
23 flooding events when surface water enters the system. He added that the sand filter
24 remains as a backup because it can operate without power, providing redundancy that
25 previously did not exist.

26 Mr. Truckey also stated the District began participating in LMS meetings and secured
27 representation on the LMS board, allowing access to FEMA-related funding pools. He
28 reported the District scored highly in grant ranking for a water storage tank project
29 addressing storm resilience concerns. The grant application has progressed through
30 state and federal review and awaits FEMA funding approval for installation of a
31 250,000-gallon storage tank. He noted significant improvements have been completed
32 that had not previously been undertaken.

33 Mr. Dorrill stated early discussions are underway with utility staff regarding evaluation of
34 a wastewater surge tank to improve operational efficiency by balancing peak flow
35 periods.

1 Mr. Lombardo noted FEMA grants are among the slowest funding sources but ultimately
2 worthwhile, citing examples of multi-year delays experienced by other jurisdictions. He
3 stated the District is pursuing SRF funding through Florida Rural Water for faster access
4 to capital and emphasized leveraging state and federal funding to minimize costs to
5 residents.

6 Ms. Jarris clarified her earlier comments were not intended to suggest infrastructure
7 was neglected but rather expressed concern about transparency regarding
8 expenditures. Mr. McNamee responded that rate adjustments were necessary to
9 address prior under-budget billing and reduce deficit spending based on consultant
10 recommendations.

11 Mr. Truckey discussed additional challenges, including saltwater intrusion over the weir
12 following changes related to Everglades restoration flow patterns. He stated intrusion
13 affects freshwater infrastructure and increases operational costs. He explained backup
14 canal pump stations support fire suppression systems and are not designed for
15 saltwater exposure. Potential solutions include desalination infrastructure or expansion
16 of the wellfield, both requiring regulatory approvals. Consultations with DEP are
17 ongoing.

18 An audience member asked whether raising the weir had been considered. Mr. Truckey
19 stated discussions have occurred with South Florida Water Management and the Army
20 Corps of Engineers, but assistance has not been provided. He referenced pending grant
21 funding for well piping upgrades and noted comparisons to other funded regional
22 projects. He emphasized the Board's goal is maintaining system reliability while
23 remaining fiscally responsible and noted the District ended the prior year approximately
24 \$500,000 under budget. Mr. Dorrill added that a mid-year rate structure review
25 workshop is scheduled for April prior to preparation of the FY 2027 budget.

26 Mr. McNamee stated his taxes are currently lower than when he first moved to the
27 District despite increased expenses, citing improved revenue recovery and grant
28 funding efforts. Mr. Truckey concluded by noting the complexity of balancing
29 assessments among diverse property types and emphasized that rate determinations
30 involve extensive analysis and will be revisited in April.

31 Dan Wellumson - Marina Condo Association - Mr. Wellumson thanked the Board and
32 stated he felt much more informed about the water system and plant than he had been
33 earlier. He expressed concern about the saltwater intrusion mentioned by Mr. Truckey
34 and felt that issue should be prioritized over expenses such as a gate or clubhouse. Mr.

1 Truckey responded that the proposed clubhouse would function as a hurricane shelter.
2 If the structure meets hurricane shelter qualifications, grant funding may be available
3 because such facilities are recognized as necessary community infrastructure. Once
4 built, it would become a community asset and responsibility. Mr. McNamee added that
5 exploration of a clubhouse and gates has been based on resident requests and that
6 such topics are brought forward for community discussion. Mr. Wellumson replied that
7 during hurricanes residents typically evacuate rather than remain in place needing
8 shelter.

9 Rick Mishler - Stella Maris S - Mr. Mishler stated he has been a seasonal resident for 25
10 years and noted that voting restrictions for non-residents are governed by state law, not
11 a CID Board decision, though he wishes he could vote in Board elections. He observed
12 that many HOAs were not represented at the meeting and that residents want different
13 things. He commented that a vocal minority often attempts to influence Board direction.
14 He stated he supports having a clubhouse with a consistently operating restaurant and
15 bar rather than limited or inconsistent operations, noting that new developments
16 typically prioritize construction of a clubhouse.

17 Pete Castellaneta - Sunrise Cay - Mr. Castellaneta asked why the utility bill was
18 removed from the non-ad valorem tax bill instead of increasing funding there for water
19 infrastructure. Mr. Lombardo stated the topic has been addressed through workshops
20 and public meetings over more than a year and that answers have been provided. He
21 clarified he was not instructing anyone not to respond but emphasized the need to
22 follow meeting decorum and agenda structure, noting Board members are subject to
23 Sunshine Law constraints and must complete agenda items efficiently. He stated public
24 comment opportunities had already occurred and would occur again at the end of the
25 meeting, and that discussion of non-agenda items can lead to confusion or frustration.
26 He reiterated that the prior billing structure was atypical statewide and that changes
27 were discussed extensively before being adopted.

28 Mr. Dorrill responded that the billing change transitioned the utility from a subsidy-based
29 model to a business and consumption-based model consistent with how utilities are
30 valued and operated statewide. He stated he was unaware of other Southwest Florida
31 utilities using the prior subsidy approach and that the change established a comparable
32 operational framework. Mr. Castellaneta asked why a base rate similar to Collier
33 County's \$85 was not adopted. Mr. Dorrill replied that his own County bill is \$185 per
34 month and noted he recently spoke with their CFO. He stated a comparative rate survey
35 of Southwest Florida utilities is expected to be presented at the next meeting.

1 Mr. Truckey added that the Board is not required to allow public comments throughout
2 the meeting, noting Robert's Rules of Order permit limiting comments to designated
3 agenda periods. He stated the current Board allows audience participation during
4 discussion but is not obligated to do so.

5 Mr. Gilinsky added that the utility previously hosted an open house in February when
6 many residents are in town. He stated staff would be willing to coordinate another open
7 house next month following the Board meeting. A time and date will be coordinated that
8 is convenient for the Utility Company.

9 **MANAGER'S REPORT**

10 **D. CID Safety Rule of Decorum**

11 The suggested CID rules of decorum were presented for potential incorporation into the
12 administrative policies and procedures. Recent incidents of disruptive behavior were
13 noted, including one that required a response by law enforcement who interviewed
14 several residents in the community. The Sheriff's Office advised that basic rules of
15 decorum would provide the Chairman the authority, if necessary, to call individuals out
16 of order or recess a meeting until order is restored. The proposed rules were drafted
17 with assistance from Mr. Lee and reviewed by Mr. Lombardo for legal sufficiency.

18 Mr. Lombardo shared suggested additions commonly used in other districts that are not
19 presently included. He stated that many districts, counties, and cities enforce a three-
20 minute time limit for speakers, applied consistently to all participants. He referenced
21 governing considerations including First Amendment protections, Florida Statute 286
22 regarding open meetings, and Sunshine Law requirements. He explained that many
23 jurisdictions structure public comment in two forms: one period at the beginning of the
24 meeting for non-agenda items and another allowing comment on individual agenda
25 items. In both instances, speakers are typically limited to three minutes. Mr. Lombardo
26 noted that comparable boards, such as Marco Island, do not treat public comments as
27 question-and-answer sessions. Instead, comments are received, and officials may
28 address them afterward or invite clarification if needed. He stated that Sunshine Law
29 requirements make these meetings the primary opportunity for feedback from the
30 public, consultants, and Board members, and therefore comments are generally limited
31 in time and placement within the agenda. He requested the Board's feedback on
32 implementing such measures.

33 Mr. Lombardo added that another common practice among jurisdictions is consolidating
34 comments of similar nature to one speaker or a smaller group. He clarified that POI's

1 sister jurisdictions generally allow three-minute comments twice during meetings and
2 require speaker slips for recordkeeping; without submission, individuals are not
3 permitted to speak. He emphasized that there were no concerns with the rules as
4 drafted but that the objective is balancing freedom of expression with the Board's ability
5 to conduct orderly business. He asked whether the Board wished to include time limits,
6 structured placement of comments for agenda versus non-agenda items, and
7 restrictions on when comments occur during meetings. Mr. Dorrill noted that clients
8 such as Pelican Bay, Pelican Marsh, Tiburón, Lely Resort, and other CDDs follow
9 similar practices, and that the intent is to ensure disruptive or threatening behavior is not
10 tolerated.

11 Mr. Truckey made a motion to accept the CID safety rules of decorum. Ms. Hansen and
12 Mr. Kish expressed support for implementing the three-minute rule. Ms. Hansen stated
13 she has no objection to audience members asking questions relevant to ongoing
14 discussion. Mr. Dorrill clarified that points of information would remain at the discretion
15 of the Chair, who may determine whether a comment qualifies. He noted the three-
16 minute limit would apply to designated public comment periods at the beginning or end
17 of meetings in accordance with Florida law. Mr. Kish clarified that comments could be
18 revisited later in the meeting if appropriate. Mr. Dorrill agreed and noted such matters
19 could be addressed under Supervisor Requests. Mr. Lombardo stated he will
20 incorporate the three-minute provision and additional structural language into the
21 document.

22 **Mr. Truckey made a MOTION to accept the CID safety rules of decorum with the**
23 **added changes and bring back another draft. Ms. Hansen made the second and**
24 **all were in favor.**

25 The document will be brought back to go through the formal approval process. There
26 will be a newspaper ad, there will be a draft that the public can review and comment on.
27 Mr. Lombardo emphasized that every single CDD he and Mr. Dorrill work with has
28 enacted rules like this.

29 **E. Utility Rate Survey**

30 Informational item. Mr. Dorrill reported that he has requested the rate consultant provide
31 the most up-to-date survey of rates tied to meter sizes, including comparisons at 5,000
32 and 10,000 gallons of residential consumption. The information is being prepared and
33 will be shared at next month's meeting. If received in time, Mr. Dorrill intends to include
34 it as an informational insert with the February 15 utility bill. The material would outline

1 base rates and illustrate additional charges for single-family and condominium units
2 consuming between 5,000 and 10,000 gallons per month. Mr. Kish expressed interest in
3 gaining a better understanding of base rates for condominiums, B and D boat slips,
4 commercial slips, hotel-condominiums, and liveaboards, noting he is less concerned
5 with consumption and more focused on base rates. It was noted there are 118
6 liveaboard boat slips categorized in the marina; a few are hard-piped while others rely
7 on pump-out service, and all have sewer availability. Mr. Dorrill clarified that commercial
8 slips are currently treated the same as residential for operations and maintenance billing
9 purposes.

10 Mr. Dorrill stated he has been working with Mr. Truckey to further evaluate hotel-
11 condominium accounts tied to meter sizes. The adopted rate structure allows billing
12 either by industry-standard meter equivalency or by the actual number of units served
13 by a meter. Mr. Dorrill noted that Building F of the hotel condominiums may require
14 review, as many as 24 units could be served by a single meter. Mr. Truckey added that
15 some buildings have individual meters while others share a large master meter, creating
16 challenges in determining appropriate base rate assignments. He noted that a base rate
17 needs to be determined whether it is a single meter serving multiple units or a meter
18 serving a single residence.

19 It was explained that in lieu of more detailed information, current base rates correspond
20 with industry-standard utility equivalency factors for that meter size. However, some
21 meters in the community serve multiple units due to plumbing configurations, and the
22 adopted structure allows charging based on actual unit counts if documentation
23 confirms those connections. Work is ongoing using a schedule previously shared, and
24 Mr. Dorrill will coordinate with Ms. Hansen on the review. Initial focus will be on 2-inch
25 potable water meters and associated sewer charges. Mr. Dorrill will ask utility staff to
26 identify which 2-inch meters serve potable water versus irrigation.

27 Mr. McNamee expressed interest in establishing base rate tiers of 1.0 for single-family
28 residences, 0.8 for larger condominiums, 0.6 for the small hotel-condominium units, 0.5
29 for liveaboards, and 0.25 for water-only boat slips. He noted that condominium
30 increases appeared larger than residential increases because condominium units were
31 no longer billed at 0.8. He stated he would prefer returning to prior base rate allocations
32 while maintaining the current billing structure rather than reverting to non-ad valorem
33 assessments. He acknowledged the appropriate time for review would be April and
34 noted uncertainty regarding base rates for commercial docks.

1 Mr. Dorrill stated he is developing a more accurate census of units served by specific
2 meters. Mr. McNamee asked whether HOA presidents for marina docks and hotel-
3 condominiums could provide meter and account counts. Mr. Dorrill responded that
4 some information has been compiled through corporate records, though some
5 condominium bills are routed to accounting offices out of state. He stated obtaining
6 updated contact lists for associations would be helpful. Mr. Dorrill and Ms. Hansen will
7 continue reviewing information and bring gaps to the Board if assistance locating
8 contacts is needed. He noted the utility contractor does not maintain that level of
9 account detail. Mr. Truckey asked about addressing discrepancies; Mr. Dorrill
10 responded that field verification could be conducted with the District Engineer and utility
11 staff, with corrective billing prepared if directed by the Board, potentially as early as
12 February. Mr. Kish reiterated his focus on billing accounts rather than pipe size, stating
13 each account should have an assigned base rate. Mr. Truckey reiterated concern about
14 existing discrepancies.

15 Mr. McNamee asked Mr. Dorrill to explain the effect of moving the 3/4-inch meter size
16 down because there were no 5/8-inch meters. The smallest meter size in the community
17 was 3/4-inch, so the \$128 threshold was pushed down from the proposed 5/8-inch meter,
18 which then pushed the next threshold down. The nationwide standard for a 2-inch meter
19 is 8, and here it was set at 5. This will need to be revisited because it was Mr. Dorrill's
20 and the utility rate consultant's interpretation that they were going to address and adjust
21 those at the same time. The threshold base charge will remain \$128 bimonthly.

22 Mr. McNamee commented that when changes are made, what has been historically
23 received in non-ad valorem taxes needs to be taken into account because lowering the
24 base rates as suggested would reduce income. Mr. Dorrill responded that the biggest
25 source of income last year was irrigation. He added that eliminating tiered rates for
26 irrigation water and moving to a flat rate had the biggest financial implication, and he
27 would like the Board to add that to the list of items to potentially reconsider. Mr.
28 McNamee agreed. Mr. Truckey stated that tiered rates were not fair across the board,
29 which was why they were eliminated. This will be discussed further at a subsequent
30 meeting.

31 **F. Irrigation Filters**

32 Conical shells were being sucked into the intake valve, clogging filters throughout the
33 community due to the large volume of irrigation water being drawn from the canal. Soto
34 worked to install and replace some of the cartridge filters. Mr. Dorrill asked if this was an
35 ongoing problem. Mr. Baird stated that the replacements appear to be working fine.

1 With the 75-horse main pump out of service, irrigation water must be pulled from the
2 canal. Sewage alone is insufficient to meet irrigation demand, so the total volume is
3 composed of bypass, raw canal water, and treated sewage effluent. Chloride levels are
4 monitored because, beyond a certain concentration, they can damage grass.

5 Mr. McNamee asked whether the possibility of installing another freshwater well near
6 the water treatment plant, dedicated to irrigation “make-up” water, could be discussed
7 with the engineer. Mr. Dorrill responded that in the urban area, it is nearly impossible to
8 obtain a well of that size west of I-75 or Collier Boulevard. He noted he could ask the
9 engineer whether the existing consumptive use permit allows the maximum pumpage
10 and whether a new well could feasibly be drilled to supplement raw water. Mr.
11 McNamee asked if the next step would be installing an additional holding tank to meet
12 the difference. Mr. Truckey replied that this is already in process with the planned
13 250,000-gallon storage tank. He noted discussions with South Florida Water
14 Management regarding possible well-field expansion, with the permit process handled
15 by DEP. Mr. Dorrill stated the first step is to determine the current limits of the
16 consumptive use permit for all sources before proceeding. Mr. Kish asked how the
17 3,300 homes planned on Oil Well Road and the 1,300 homes across from Publix would
18 affect the aquifer. He suggested that a storage tank filled during the rainy season could
19 provide a solution.

20 **G. Russ Weyer**

21 The methodology and impact/fee/ERC rate analysis was scheduled to begin with Mr.
22 Weyer. In advance, Mr. Kish and Mr. Dorrill held a teleconference with him in
23 November, and Mr. McNamee and Mr. Dorrill held a teleconference in December in
24 anticipation of a January start. Mr. Weyer has since sold his business to PFM Group
25 and has not been responsive to Mr. Dorrill’s requests following the holidays. Mr. Dorrill
26 has contacted their Orlando office to determine if another individual is available to
27 perform the work if Mr. Weyer is unavailable. He will provide an update once a response
28 is received. No fee proposal or engagement letter has been received to date, which Mr.
29 Weyer has historically provided.

30 **FINANCIALS - NOVEMBER 2025**

31 Mr. Dorrill presented the financials as of the second month of the fiscal year. The
32 District had \$5,281,000 in cash on hand at the end of the month, split between the
33 operating account, \$4,025,000 and the utility account, \$1,000,256. The District
34 continues to maintain a very strong cash position in both accounts. Additionally, the

1 District holds approximately \$16 million in fixed assets, including \$7,404,000 net of
2 depreciation for the utility plant and associated infrastructure, as well as roads and
3 streetlights. Outstanding payables totaled \$60,000 at the end of the month and are
4 shown separately on the liability portion of the balance sheet.

5 November represents the low water mark for revenues, as new revenues are not
6 received until that month. In November, the District received 45% of anticipated
7 revenues, including \$345,000 in non-ad valorem assessments and \$10,300 in interest
8 earnings. Some expenses are seasonal or front-loaded, such as tax collector and
9 property appraiser fees and insurance premiums. The District also paid \$9,000 in taxes
10 on the commercial property at the entrance of the community due to its commercial
11 zoning. Mr. Dorrill noted that these financials do not yet include recently invoiced capital
12 improvements for lift station rehabs, costing approximately \$60,000 each; these will be
13 reflected next month because they were processed, paid, and reimbursed to Florida
14 Utility Solutions at that time.

15 Mr. McNamee requested that non-recurring bills, such as legal and engineering, be
16 reviewed as he has done in the past to ensure they are appropriate and aligned with the
17 Board's direction. Mr. Dorrill confirmed he will provide these going forward, starting with
18 bills from the beginning of the fiscal year.

19 Mr. Kish inquired about the reserve account. Mr. Dorrill explained that a contingency
20 reserve is budgeted, and he routinely updates the forecast for fund balances and
21 reserves as part of the budgeting process. CDDs are not required to maintain
22 designated reserves. The contingency reserve is reflected on the balance sheet as fund
23 equity and will be updated when the Board receives the tentative budget in May.

24 **The financials were accepted as presented on a MOTION by Mr. Truckey, a**
25 **second by Mr. Baird, and all in favor.**

26 **ATTORNEY'S REPORT**

27 Mr. Lombardo shared that at the last meeting he was asked for the specific amount
28 related to the motion for fees, which is approximately \$70,000. That amount has been
29 filed and is set for hearing. These fees are being pursued in connection with the Prep
30 Mac lawsuit based on Prep Mac not accepting the settlement offer previously provided
31 by the Board.

32 Mr. Lombardo also stated that, as requested, he circulated a memo regarding the
33 Marina ERC purchase that did not occur. As detailed in the memo, the Marina twice,

1 through two different site development plans, submitted a utility availability letter. Mr.
2 Lombardo has copies of those letters, which are included in the memo. The letters,
3 prepared by the District, the prior manager, and the prior engineer, clearly calculated
4 that the Marina was required to purchase 16.7 additional ERCs. After speaking with the
5 engineer and the manager, it does not appear that this purchase ever occurred. In Mr.
6 Lombardo's view, this is an issue that needs to be addressed.

7 The question then becomes how to address it. The memo suggests that some of the
8 ERCs held back in Parcel 13 could be sold to the Marina. However, the delay involving
9 Russ Weyer is creating a significant issue, as the District was relying on Mr. Weyer to
10 assist with valuing the ERCs. While Mr. Lombardo's opinion, based on all documents
11 provided, is that the Marina does need to purchase these ERCs, the Board must
12 determine the appropriate price. Without knowing that number, it is difficult to move
13 forward or make a demand. The Marina could theoretically purchase ERCs from
14 another seller, but Mr. Lombardo is unaware of any other available seller.

15 What is clear is that any site plan approval from Collier County requires demonstration
16 of utility availability. Importantly, it was not the Board that provided this letter to the
17 County; the Marina provided it, representing that capacity existed and that the ERCs
18 could be purchased, yet they were never purchased. This issue has been discussed
19 previously, including a discussion on the record about potentially using the ERC issue
20 as part of a global settlement of the Prep Mac lawsuit. That proposal was rejected at the
21 time. Nonetheless, the issue still needs to be addressed.

22 Mr. Lombardo emphasized that he is sharing this information to outline the factual
23 status of the situation, but that he needs direction on the financial ask before proceeding
24 with something like a demand letter. His hope is that if the replacement company is
25 engaged in February, the District can arrive at a valuation. Without that number, it is
26 difficult to resolve the issue.

27 Mr. Lombardo also reported that the District has not heard back from counsel for
28 Lindsey Case regarding their status. Based on the opinion received from the Salvatori
29 firm, a decision will need to be made at the next Board meeting regarding whether the
30 Board will take any action related to the takedown agreement. That decision does not
31 need to be made today, but it does need to be made at the next meeting. Mr. Lombardo
32 stated that he can follow up again with Mr. Case's counsel, Greg Truxton, to determine
33 whether there have been any developments. At this point, Mr. Lombardo has answered
34 every question posed by Lindsey Case's counsel and has met with them along with the
35 District's real estate counsel. The matter is now in Mr. Case's court.

1 Mr. Kish asked whether the County's impact fee for a single-family home could be used
2 as a guide. Mr. Lombardo responded that it could not, as County impact fees are based
3 on the County's system. The District's impact fees and base rates are based on the
4 District's actual system, including its capital size, maintenance costs, and future
5 expansion needs. Using another entity's fee structure would be arbitrary; an
6 individualized analysis of the District's system is required.

7 Mr. McNamee raised concerns regarding tracking where the 1,032 ERCs are assigned,
8 noting that this was one reason the Marina purchase fell through and asserting that the
9 16.7 ERCs should have been assigned to another parcel. Mr. Lombardo clarified that a
10 2018 letter from the prior manager specifically indicated that those ERCs were allocated
11 to Parcel 13. The letter does not state that the CID maintains a bank of unallocated
12 ERCs. Rather, it explains that the CID had recently acquired Parcel 13 and therefore
13 had the ability to transfer existing ERCs from that parcel. This was not a banking
14 approach but a transfer of ERCs tied to an existing property.

15 Mr. McNamee continued to express concerns about tracking the 1,032 ERCs and
16 requested a spreadsheet or other method to address this issue. Mr. Lombardo replied
17 that the engineer has been tasked with attempting to address it and that the engineer
18 needs to be present at a meeting, either in person or via Zoom. If, after reviewing all
19 documents, the engineer confirms that there is no reliable way this information has been
20 tracked, then the Board will need to discuss next steps. The lack of a tracking method is
21 hampering the Board's ability to take what would otherwise be straightforward action
22 across multiple operational areas. Mr. Lombardo recommended bringing the engineer to
23 the February meeting, even if only by Zoom, to address two questions: first, whether
24 any such tracking exists, which he assumes it does not; and second, what actions
25 should be taken next to determine allocations as accurately as possible so the District
26 can move forward. Mr. Dorrill added that the engineer has indicated there is currently no
27 database or tracking system but that he can get the engineer on the phone for the next
28 meeting.

29 Mr. Dorrill stated that, concurrently, the PFM Group would also be asked to send an
30 engagement letter to establish an ERC charge as part of the overall analysis, since
31 there is currently no basis for determining the value of an ERC. An engineering or
32 econometric basis is needed. Once established, the existing capacity could be allocated
33 across the remaining unbuilt lots, creating a schedule that has never previously existed
34 in the community.

1 Mr. McNamee emphasized the urgency of the issue, noting that the Marina ERCs have
2 gone uncollected for nearly eight years and carry significant financial implications. Mr.
3 Truckey stressed the importance of taking action and resolving issues rather than
4 deferring them to future meetings. Mr. Dorrill responded that there is no accounting
5 record of how ERCs were invoiced or paid. The engineer investigated this several
6 months ago and confirmed that no records were ever kept. Mr. Dorrill has contacted the
7 successor firm to Mr. Weyer's company to designate someone to take on the project.
8 The engineer will play a role in establishing ERC valuation.

9 Mr. Truckey referenced Mr. Case's property, noting that a resolution was passed
10 requiring four ERCs per acre. He stated that Mr. Case is currently paying approximately
11 \$70,000 in O&M charges. At 53 acres and four per acre, he should be paying
12 approximately \$200,000. Mr. Dorrill responded that this analysis was included in the
13 scope of services for Mr. Weyer's update, along with double lots and commercial boat
14 docks.

15 Mr. Lombardo clarified that the Board had adopted an assessment methodology that
16 specifically allocated that parcel. The agreement that was terminated concerned ERC
17 purchases, not O&M transfers; O&M charges have continued and have always been
18 assessed. Mr. Case never purchased the ERCs. Mr. Truckey reiterated that Mr. Case
19 should be charged four per acre as required by the rules. He noted that Mr. McNamee
20 is charged four per acre on his property, he is paying seven on the lot he has left. He is
21 currently paying more than Mr. Case and the former hotel site. Mr. Truckey emphasized
22 that the Board voted to charge vacant property four O&M units per acre and that Mr.
23 Case should be charged accordingly.

24 Mr. Lombardo explained that the most recently approved assessment methodology
25 would need to be formally amended to revert to the default acreage allocation for Mr.
26 Case's parcel. The adopted methodology includes a specific allocation for that parcel,
27 which differs from the default, and would need to be amended by the Board to reinstate
28 the four-per-acre standard. He added that Chairman McNamee's property is also
29 specifically listed in the methodology. Each parcel has its own row and allocation in the
30 spreadsheet, which provides direction to staff for assessment.

31 Mr. Truckey responded that when the Board votes to apply four per acre to vacant
32 property, the spreadsheet should automatically reflect that rule. Mr. Lombardo replied
33 that his understanding is that the Board voted to approve the specific spreadsheet itself,
34 which contains parcel-by-parcel direction. This issue arose at the time, and the
35 expectation was that the methodology would be updated once it became clear that the

1 takedown agreement was no longer in effect or was disputed. What is undisputed is that
2 the ERCs were never purchased. Mr. Lombardo agreed that without ERCs, Mr. Case
3 should be treated the same as vacant property but emphasized that this change must
4 be reflected in the methodology to be implemented.

5 Mr. Truckey asked why this could not be addressed at the next meeting. Mr. Dorrill
6 responded that the District had been attempting to engage Mr. Weyer to complete what
7 would be the third update to the methodology in the past two years. Mr. Truckey noted
8 that the four-per-acre standard originated from his methodology. Mr. Dorrill replied that
9 all determinations were parcel-specific and made at the same time the Board addressed
10 other parcels, such as adding the cell tower parcel, which had never previously
11 contributed, to the assessment schedule. The methodology assigns parcels to
12 categories such as single-family or vacant based on zoning, and all details are
13 documented. While the District is eligible to make these changes, a revised schedule is
14 required.

15 Mr. Truckey asked how long this issue has been under discussion. Mr. Dorrill
16 responded that since the budget workshop last year, the District has discussed
17 engaging Mr. Weyer to perform the analysis. During teleconferences with Mr. Dorrill and
18 Mr. Kish, and separately with Mr. Dorrill and Mr. McNamee, Mr. Weyer assured them he
19 would begin work in January. As of the second week of January, he has not responded
20 to Mr. Dorrill and has not provided an engagement letter or start date.

21 **ENGINEER'S REPORT**

22 No report was given at this time.

23 **OLD BUSINESS**

24 Mr. Dorrill distributed the January updated task list that the Board has requested on a
25 monthly basis. Items have begun to be removed from the list as they are completed,
26 and the vast majority of tasks have been accomplished. The primary remaining item is
27 the question of whether CDDs are eligible to charge franchise fees, presumably related
28 to cable television or internet services. Mr. Lombardo does not believe they are but will
29 provide a formal memo addressing the question.

30 The Orchid Cove streetlight billing matter remains ongoing. The Board's liaison
31 continues to work through the issue and develop a proposal. The District has received
32 some pushback from Orchid Cove. A simple one-and-a-half-page agreement entered
33 into two years ago appears to have been satisfied; however, Mr. Dorrill believes Orchid

1 Cove's position is that the agreement applies in perpetuity. Additional issues will be
2 evaluated, including the appropriate number of streetlights. At Mr. Truckey's request, he
3 and Mr. Dorrill are working together on this matter.

4 The Board previously discussed re-inviting Representative Mello after the legislative
5 session began. Mr. Lombardo plans to invite her to either the March or April meeting to
6 allow more time with the community and receive session updates. While the original
7 focus was the fire district issue, Mr. Lombardo believes the discussion could also
8 include comprehensive Everglades Restoration issues.

9 The mosquito control equipment will be sold either in conjunction with the Lely CDD
10 auction scheduled for this spring or through the County, if possible. The County utilizes
11 a professional auction service that extensively markets its auctions in exchange for a
12 commission. Mr. Dorrill has offered the remaining chemicals to the mosquito control
13 district but has not yet received a response.

14 **NEW BUSINESS**

15 No new business was discussed at this time.

16 **SUPERVISORS' REQUEST**

17 **A. New Field Manager**

18 Billy Sparacio is a new member of Mr. Dorrill's staff. Kevin Carter worked in field
19 management with Mr. Dorrill for nearly 13 years and has accepted a full-time
20 employment position with the Lely CDD. He remains available for consultation.

21 Mr. Sparacio holds a degree with two majors from Colgate University, where he was an
22 accomplished football player. He has lived in Collier County throughout his adult life and
23 has worked in both public and private education. Most recently, he served as the
24 Athletic Director at First Baptist Academy. He brings extensive experience in project
25 management and construction, having overseen approximately five to six million dollars
26 in athletic facility development. He has already participated in an orientation session
27 with Mr. Carter and has been introduced to the other Board members.

28 Mr. Sparacio has approximately the same level of CDD experience as Mr. Carter did
29 when he first began working with Mr. Dorrill, which is minimal. For that reason, Mr.
30 Carter will remain available for consultation in three primary areas: FEMA grants,
31 representation on the LMS committee, and drainage issues in single-family
32 neighborhoods.

1 Mr. Sparacio will assume responsibility for contract administration related to
2 landscaping matters and FUS, as required, consistent with the duties previously
3 handled by Mr. Carter. Mr. McNamee welcomed him aboard.

4 **B. Grant Update**

5 Mr. Truckey provided an update that they are in the process of extending all existing
6 grants. He has been completing the required paperwork over the past several days to
7 extend the grants into 2026 and 2027. It is currently unknown when FEMA will formally
8 address the grants, but the requests have been submitted and are under consideration.

9 **C. Everglades Restoration Project**

10 Regarding the Everglades Restoration Project, Mr. Truckey asked Mr. Lombardo
11 whether his firm has ever sued the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Mr. Lombardo
12 responded that it has not. He stated that he believes there is a viable claim under the
13 Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Program, as the governing act requires either
14 preventing damage or paying for damage caused. Mr. Lombardo believes the matter
15 needs to be pursued because, based on meetings that were attended, it is clear the
16 agencies disagree with the characterization of what is occurring. However, as Mr.
17 Truckey outlined, the underlying facts are relatively straightforward.

18 There was a plan to construct a berm to protect Port of the Islands. This plan was
19 heavily discussed at Port of the Islands meetings more than a decade ago and was
20 reviewed through the appropriate channels. At some point, the decision was made not
21 to build the berm. That decision was never discussed with the community; it simply
22 occurred. Now that canal cutting is actively underway and the berm was never
23 constructed, it is difficult to imagine that this is not having an impact on the community.

24 Mr. Truckey added that numerous impacts are emerging over time. Water quality issues
25 are developing because there is no longer adequate flushing, and the marina
26 discharges gray water that is no longer flushed as it once was. There are also saltwater
27 intrusion issues resulting from the restoration project, as well as flooding issues and
28 associated costs totaling millions of dollars. Mr. Truckey emphasized that these impacts
29 need to be heard and addressed.

30 Mr. Lombardo stated that he believes now is the appropriate time to take action. He
31 noted that the Corps presented a significant amount of well data at the second meeting.
32 If litigation is pursued, Mr. Lombardo requested the opportunity to review that data with
33 Mr. Truckey and discuss his reaction to it, as that data represents the Corps' immediate

1 and primary defense. The Corps' current position, as presented, is that the well data
2 indicates the observed impacts are attributable solely to sea level rise and are unrelated
3 to their actions. Mr. Lombardo does not believe that conclusion is correct and stated
4 that the data appears to have been selectively presented to support that narrative. He
5 believes that the District has a good understanding of the argument the Corps is likely to
6 make and can anticipate their initial approach. In his opinion, it is time to act.

7 Mr. Lombardo further stated that he finds it striking that the federal government and the
8 South Florida Water Management District met with the community, held town halls, and
9 committed to building a berm, only to later remove it from their plans without further
10 discussion with the Board or the community. He believes this is a significant indicator of
11 a larger issue, noting that if it were truly clear that the berm was unnecessary, the
12 agencies could have easily met with the Board to explain that determination. This issue
13 came to light as a result of Supervisor Truckey's efforts to examine the situation more
14 closely following the community experiencing atypical sheet flow post Hurricane Ian that
15 was not seen during prior storms that had passed nearby.

16 Mr. McNamee expressed support for initiating the litigation process and moving forward.
17 If the Board wishes to retain specialized counsel, Mr. Dorrill and Mr. Lombardo
18 recommended Lewis, Longman & Walker, a firm experienced in claims involving these
19 agencies. Mr. Lombardo stated that it would likely also be necessary to retain a
20 consultant to corroborate the data analysis, and he believes Lewis, Longman & Walker
21 could assist with that process. Mr. Lombardo offered to reach out to the firm to
22 determine whether they would be willing to provide a proposal. He noted that his firm
23 has not handled litigation of this nature and that it would be appropriate for the Board to
24 engage specialized counsel for this issue.

25 Mr. Lombardo clarified that the recommendation of Lewis, Longman & Walker arose
26 from discussion during the meeting, and he does not yet know whether the firm would
27 be willing or able to take on the matter. However, he will contact them and report back
28 to the Board. He emphasized his belief that this is an issue the District must become
29 involved in, stating that the facts presented by Mr. Truckey are alarming and, at a
30 minimum, warrant thorough investigation. He also noted that the responses Mr. Truckey
31 received from the South Florida Water Management District and the Corps were
32 extremely dismissive, which may indicate the need for careful and deliberate scrutiny.

33 Mr. Lombardo confirmed that he will email Lewis, Longman & Walker. If they respond,
34 he will attempt to schedule a call with them and Supervisor Truckey prior to the next
35 meeting to evaluate the issues and avoid unnecessary delays. If Lewis, Longman &

1 Walker declines but recommends another firm, Mr. Lombardo will pursue that
2 alternative and bring a proposal to the Board.

3 Mr. Dorrill expressed his agreement with Mr. Lombardo and added that Lewis, Longman
4 & Walker works closely with RMA Geologic, which serves as groundwater and recharge
5 flood experts for much of Florida's west coast. He noted that Lewis, Longman & Walker
6 focuses almost exclusively on environmental, natural resources, and water permitting
7 law in Florida and would be the preferred firm for this matter.

8 **D. Security**

9 Mr. Baird raised the petition regarding security and gates, which received more than
10 170 signatures. Mr. Baird made a motion to direct the District Manager to issue RFPs to
11 explore gating the community, including contacting Carter Fence, and to approve a
12 budget of up to \$100,000 toward the potential construction of gates.

13 Mr. Dorrill reminded the Board that a previous RFP for a security assessment consultant
14 resulted in no responses. He stated that he would prefer the motion allow him to directly
15 contact key providers to determine whether they would be willing to submit proposals,
16 rather than issuing another RFP. He identified Allied Security, Envera, MLR Electric,
17 and New IQ as potential vendors. These firms install security kiosks, gate systems,
18 cameras, and license plate reader cameras. Mr. Dorrill expressed a preference for
19 working directly with firms responsible for design and installation rather than pursuing
20 another formal RFP process.

21 Mr. McNamee referenced concerns raised by individuals who oppose gating and asked
22 how the Board would determine whether to proceed. Mr. Dorrill suggested a two-phase
23 approach. The first phase would involve passive measures such as security cameras
24 and license plate reader cameras. A second phase could include more substantial
25 infrastructure, such as physical gates, kiosks, and virtual guards. He noted that some
26 clients use both approaches. The passive phase would involve a lower cost and rely
27 primarily on cameras and license plate readers, particularly if those systems could be
28 integrated with the Sheriff's 911 system, which already utilizes a large network of
29 cameras. The second phase, involving gated entries, kiosks, and virtual guards, would
30 be significantly more expensive and constitute a larger project.

31 Mr. McNamee asked how the concerns of Orchid Cove and the marina, both of which
32 expressed opposition to gates during the meeting, would be addressed and how the
33 Board would ultimately make its decision. Ms. Hansen suggested conducting a physical

1 assessment to identify vulnerable areas within the community, such as locations where
2 individuals could access private property from the seawall and addressing those areas
3 with targeted solutions such as fencing.

4 Mr. Dorrill noted that some of his clients use virtual guards and advanced camera
5 systems, though none currently use license plate reader cameras integrated with the
6 Sheriff's system. He stated that such integration is possible but requires compatible
7 technology. Mr. Dorrill recommended contacting the four vendors previously identified
8 and beginning with the simplest approach, starting with security cameras and then
9 license plate reader cameras. Mr. McNamee requested that Mr. Dorrill proceed with
10 contacting the vendors and obtaining proposals, noting that the Board is not required to
11 solicit sealed bids at the initial \$100,000 threshold.

12 Mr. Truckey reported that he has spoken with the Sheriff's Department, District 5,
13 regarding increased law enforcement presence in the community. He stated that
14 deputies have been present more frequently and described recent overnight patrol
15 activity, including drone surveillance of the community streets. Mr. Truckey noted that
16 standard nighttime staffing typically includes two deputies in Naples and two in
17 Everglades City, with none stationed in Port of the Islands. He raised the question of
18 reallocating resources to include a deputy stationed in Port of the Islands.

19 Mr. Dorrill added that two of his other CDD clients employ off-duty, armed, uniformed
20 sheriff's deputies. The current rate for this service is approximately \$80 per hour with a
21 four-hour minimum. He stated that there is value in the visible law enforcement
22 presence this arrangement provides.

23 Mr. Truckey encouraged residents to contact Board members with additional security
24 ideas and emphasized that the community has expressed a strong desire for action, as
25 demonstrated by petitions, letters, and public input. He stated that while there may be
26 differing opinions regarding gates, alternative solutions should be proposed if gates are
27 opposed, and that the Board must take steps to address the community's security
28 concerns.

29 **Mr. Baird made a MOTION to allow Mr. Dorrill to solicit the firms he alluded to for**
30 **proposals. Ms. Hansen made the second and all were in favor.**

31 **E. Beautifying Newport**

32 Ms. Hansen noted that she saw a post on Nextdoor expressing interest in beautifying
33 the Newport entrance, although the resident who made the post has since left. Mr. Baird

1 stated that this matter was already addressed through direction given to Soto at the
2 previous meeting to proceed with improvements to that entrance. Mr. Truckey added
3 that LCEC is scheduled to install a meter to provide power to the area and energize the
4 meter base, at a cost of \$30.

5 Mr. Baird also noted that there is a spool of cable in the same area that has been
6 present for approximately three years, with a truck tire leaning against it, and that it
7 should be removed. Mr. Sparacio will coordinate with Mr. Gilbert to determine whether it
8 can be removed.

9 **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

10 **A. Unidentified Resident**

11 Applauded the Board for taking action today to move a couple of items forward and
12 asked if there is a time constraint for the ERC/Marina issue. Mr. Dorrill responded that
13 the time constraint would be tied to adoption of the final budget. If the methodology is
14 going to be changed to address four units per acre or to consider commercial boat slips
15 at a higher rate, he would need to know that before adopting the final budget in July or
16 August, which is why they were trying to engage Mr. Weyer in January. The resident
17 asked which item discussed earlier was on a time constraint. Mr. Lombardo clarified that
18 this was Parcel 13, which has a one-year timeframe beginning in March 2025. He
19 clarified that this item is not related to the ERC determination and instead requires
20 direction from the Board. He confirmed there is urgency.

21 **B. Lisa Sager - Sunset Cay**

22 Thanked the Board for the great job they are doing. She advocated for understanding
23 regarding why the Board may seem frustrated at times, stating she would feel the same
24 way if she were trying to do the best for the community while constantly receiving
25 criticism. She believes there needs to be more kindness and unity in the community.

26 **C. Steve Gunther - Orchid Cove**

27 Expressed his gratitude to the Board. He shared that he has asked to partner with a
28 Board member to go to LCEC to try to get a rate review. He believes Orchid Cove is
29 being overcharged and that bills are not consistent, and that a face-to-face rate review
30 could resolve many of the issues. Mr. Truckey responded that he has spoken with Mr.
31 Gunther about this and has contacted LCEC, including speaking with them yesterday or
32 the day before. He obtained a copy of their rate sheet, which is available online and
33 details every option for poles, fixtures, and lighting. He stated that he will not argue the

1 issue when LCEC has clearly indicated the rate sheet governs pricing. He noted that the
2 decorative poles in Orchid Cove cost more because they are decorative. Mr. Dorrill
3 added that LCEC's rates and fees are set by tariff schedules approved by the Public
4 Service Commission. Mr. Truckey explained that the total cost includes the pole, the
5 fixture, and the energy charge, which together create the total amount. Mr. Gunther
6 stated that when he has tried to discuss the bill with LCEC, he is told he is not
7 authorized, which is why he needs a Board representative present. Ms. Hansen agreed
8 to go with him. Mr. Dorrill directed Mr. Gunther to have Mr. Sparacio be his first point of
9 contact.

10 Mr. Gunther shared that he researched the Everglades Restoration Project several
11 years ago and stated that berms were taken out of the plan in 2013, both in Port of the
12 Islands and in the Six L's Farm area. He noted that Six L's Farm brought in legal
13 counsel and was able to have the berm included.

14 Mr. Gunther raised concerns about mixed financial messaging. He stated that rates are
15 said to need to be raised because not enough money is being collected, yet last year
16 the budget came in approximately \$500,000 under, while new expenditures such as
17 cameras and lawsuits are being discussed. He believes it would be helpful for the
18 community to better understand fixed operational costs at the water plant and the
19 financial statements. He noted there is a CIP plan for multiple infrastructure
20 improvements and stated it would be helpful to have a prioritized list of projects,
21 including the water plant, water pipes, road paving, and similar items. Mr. Dorrill
22 responded that the CIP is available on the website, covers a one- to five-year scope,
23 and was updated when Dorrill Management came on board. He stated it will be updated
24 to include new projects such as the bridge crossing and other items not previously
25 contemplated. Mr. Gunther stated that he would like to see the projects prioritized for
26 the next few years, identifying key projects, funding sources, and costs.

27 **D. Frank Lee - 275 Cays Drive**

28 Stated that he, along with Dale Woodhouse and Ron Westerman, were the individuals
29 who initiated the petition for a community security assessment. He thanked the Board
30 for their diligent consideration of the request and stated that the suggestions made by
31 Mr. Dorrill and the actions taken by the Board exceeded what was requested. He
32 commented that the code of conduct is helpful and that he senses a positive turn in the
33 community. He also complimented Mr. Lombardo for his invaluable input during the
34 meeting.

1 **ADJOURNMENT**

2 Mr. Dorrill requested that Mr. McNamee let him know when he will be back in town to
3 review the representation letter for the 2025 audit. The fieldwork has been completed,
4 and a letter from General Counsel is needed to finalize the audit and produce the final
5 copy.

6 The next meeting will be on February 20, 2026, at 9:30 a.m. **On a MOTION by Ms.**
7 **Hansen and a second by Mr. Truckey, with all in favor, the meeting was adjourned**
8 **at 12:13 p.m.**