

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

3                   **Regular Meeting of the Board of Supervisors**

4                                   **April 19, 2026**

5    The Regular meeting of the Port of the Islands Community Improvement District Board  
6    of Supervisors was held on Thursday, April 19 2026, at 9:30 a.m. at the Orchid Cove  
7    Clubhouse, 25005 Peacock Lane, Naples, Florida.

8    **SUPERVISORS PRESENT**

9    Anna-Lise Hansen, Chairman

10   Dan Truckey, Vice Chairman

11   Russell Kish, Supervisor

12   Kevin Baird, Supervisor

13   Lisa Sager, Supervisor

14   **ALSO PRESENT**

15   Neil Dorrill, Manager, Dorrill Management Group

16   Zachary Lombardo, District Counsel

17   Matt Gillispie, Florida Utility Solutions

18   **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

19   The pledge of allegiance was recited in unison.

20   **ROLL CALL/APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

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

24   Mr. Dorrill presented the agenda and noted that the vacant Board seat previously held  
25   by Mr. McNamee is represented under Item 2A. Three individuals have submitted letters  
26   of interest and were included in the agenda backup. Mr. Dorrill stated that the Board

1 could allow interested individuals to introduce themselves, discuss the vacancy, and  
2 either make an appointment at this meeting or continue the item until the next meeting.

3 **The agenda was approved as presented on a MOTION by Ms. Hansen with a**  
4 **second by Mr. Truckey, and all in favor.**

5 **A. Supervisor Vacancy**

6 The Board discussed whether to consider all candidates and continue the appointment  
7 to the next meeting or move forward at this meeting. Mr. Dorrill stated that there were  
8 no sealed or blind votes for this type of appointment and that any nomination, second,  
9 and vote would occur in open session.

10 Mr. Canover was not present. Ms. Lisa Sager introduced herself and stated she had  
11 been a resident of the community for six years. She previously lived on Stella Maris and  
12 currently lives on Sunset Cay. She stated she had worked for 25 years at a telephone  
13 company in billing and related functions. She stated she loves the community, would  
14 like to learn more about it, and would like to help in whatever way she can. Mr.  
15 Westerman was not present and it was stated that he had withdrawn.

16 Mr. Kish noted Ms. Sager had attended many meetings and discussed moving forward  
17 with her appointment.

18 **On a MOTION by Mr. Kish, with a second by Mr. Baird and all in favor, Ms. Lisa**  
19 **Sager was appointed to fill the balance of Mr. McNamee's term on the Board of**  
20 **Supervisors.**

21 Mr. Dorrill administered the oath of office to Ms. Sager. Ms. Sager then joined the  
22 Board. Mr. Dorrill stated that his staff would obtain Ms. Sager's preferred email address  
23 and phone number and would complete the certificate of oath paperwork.

24 **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

25 Mike Hoekstra - Dockmaster, Port of the Islands Marina - Mr. Hoekstra requested  
26 clarification regarding the utility base rate being charged to the marina. He stated the  
27 marina's water bill had previously been approximately \$3,500 for two months and was  
28 now approximately \$26,000 for two months. Mr. Dorrill stated the matter would also be  
29 discussed later in the agenda and explained that he had contacted the marina  
30 condominium and hotel condominium in advance of the meeting. He stated that, after  
31 the prior meeting, the District reconciled the number of actual units served through the

1 meters and previously did not have that information. He further stated he would review  
2 Mr. Hoekstra's bill because the marina bill should include the water base rate but not  
3 sewer.

4 Mr. Dorrill stated there were 175 individually owned condominium units at the marina.  
5 He explained the Board's prior rate action was intended to charge, for commercial and  
6 residential users, either the equivalent rate in the adopted schedule or the actual  
7 number of units being served. A two-inch meter has a five-unit equivalency rate, but the  
8 adopted base rate was intended to replace the prior non-ad valorem assessment that  
9 subsidized the utility system and appeared on the tax bill. He stated that the 175 units  
10 historically paid that utility assessment through the tax bill, and his interpretation of the  
11 rate adopted effective October 1 was that the same units would now be charged  
12 through the base rate.

13 Mr. Hoekstra asked whether the rate was \$128 per slip and whether the charge applied  
14 to each hose bib. Mr. Dorrill stated the rate was approximately \$128 per unit per month,  
15 billed bimonthly, and the charge related to ownership units being served, not water  
16 consumption. Mr. Hoekstra stated he wanted to provide information to owners so he  
17 would not receive a large number of calls. Mr. Dorrill stated the item would be discussed  
18 further during the agenda item and that, at midyear, he would provide a revenue update  
19 in anticipation of budget work and potential utility rate changes later in the summer.

20 It was noted the charge was not a water consumption charge and was a fee to cover  
21 maintenance and upkeep of the utility system. Mr. Dorrill stated the prior non-ad  
22 valorem tax assessment for utility operations and maintenance was removed from the  
23 tax bill and replaced with the base rate.

24 Ken McLaren - Marina Slip Owner. Mr. McLaren stated he had purchased 115 slips  
25 approximately eight years earlier, at a time when the marina had derelict boats and  
26 other problems. He stated they had lost money for six years, invested approximately  
27 \$1.5 million into marina improvements, and believed the marina now looks good and is  
28 an asset to the community. He stated the marina is paying bills for slips that do not use  
29 water and that more than half of the slips do not use water except perhaps to wash a  
30 boat once a month.

31 Mr. McLaren stated he understood the logic of assessing based on potential liveaboard  
32 use even though he disagreed with it. He stated the marina could eliminate liveaboard  
33 rights for slips that are not actual liveaboards. He stated the marina previously had 60  
34 liveaboard-authorized slips and added 50 during the renovation without knowing those

1 would later be charged at a different rate. He stated the marina currently has  
2 approximately 46 actual liveaboards and asked why the marina was being charged as  
3 though all slips were liveaboards. Mr. Dorrill stated the intent of the base rate was to  
4 replace the same fee previously paid on individual property tax bills. Mr. McLaren stated  
5 the prior tax bill reduction for his docks was approximately \$11,000, while the new  
6 proposal would add approximately \$72,000 in cost.

7 Mr. Truckey stated that houses and condominiums pay the base charge whether  
8 occupied year-round, seasonally, or only occasionally, because the utility system must  
9 be maintained and available regardless of use. He stated that for liveboard slips, the  
10 water and wastewater system must be available when the slips are used, including  
11 restroom and pump-out requirements. Mr. McLaren stated he understood the concept  
12 but hoped marina representatives would be included in the process. Mr. Dorrill stated  
13 the item would continue to be discussed during the agenda item.

14 Mr. McNamee stated that, when he was still on the Board, he had asked that Mr.  
15 McLaren be included in discussions with Mr. Weyer, staff, and the Board. He clarified  
16 there had been no specific mention of a committee, but his intent was that their views  
17 be incorporated before the Board made any final decisions. Mr. McNamee also thanked  
18 Ms. Sager for stepping up to serve and offered to help her as needed.

#### 19 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES - MARCH 2026**

20 Page 4 Line 26 - Add language stating that Ms. Brakefield advised Mr. McNamee may  
21 not serve as a go-between between supervisors. Mr. McNamee, like any other resident,  
22 may speak to individual Board members, but he may not relay positions or  
23 communications between Board members.

24 **The minutes were approved as amended on a MOTION by Ms. Hansen, a second**  
25 **by Mr. Truckey, and all in favor.**

#### 26 **UTILITY OPERATIONS SUMMARY - MARCH 2026**

27 Mr. Gillespie presented the monthly utility report. He stated operations at the water and  
28 wastewater facilities were conducted in accordance with contract and regulatory  
29 requirements. All wastewater treatment plant requirements were met, all water  
30 distribution requirements were met, and the reuse system was functioning as intended.  
31 The canal pump station remained on one pump.

1 For the month of March, the District received and treated 3.42 million gallons of  
2 wastewater, produced and distributed 2.49 million gallons of drinking water, and  
3 distributed 9.95 million gallons of reuse water. The District disposed of 27,000 gallons of  
4 sludge. There were no odor complaints. There was one line break repair. All nine auto-  
5 flushers were checked. The system had 864 meters, and four meter rereads were  
6 performed for accuracy. The combined water and wastewater facilities used 575 gallons  
7 of chlorine.

8 Mr. Gillespie reported that staff pressure washed the water and wastewater treatment  
9 plants, painted exterior piping and motors at the plants, performed weekly pump station  
10 inspections, and performed the weekly odor control checks. Staff repaired a leaking  
11 backflow preventer at Evening Star Cay, replaced a broken six-inch cleanout at 160  
12 Cays Drive, replaced a leaking backflow on Peacock Lane, addressed a low-pressure  
13 irrigation complaint on Sunset Cay, and installed a new pump in the Cays master lift  
14 station.

15 Mr. Gillespie reported that, due to consistent compliant lead and copper monitoring  
16 results, the Florida Department of Environmental Protection granted reduced monitoring  
17 in the distribution system, moving from annual monitoring to monitoring every three  
18 years. Mr. Truckey clarified that this reduction applied to distribution system lead and  
19 copper monitoring and did not change required monitoring of wells or other drinking  
20 water sampling requirements.

21 The Board discussed continued sampling of marina water. Mr. Gillespie stated sampling  
22 had been performed monthly and asked whether the Board wished to continue at that  
23 frequency. The Board agreed that, based on the results and lack of issues, quarterly  
24 sampling was appropriate.

25 Mr. Dorrill thanked Mr. Gillespie and his team for hosting the recent open house at the  
26 utility facilities. He stated approximately 50 people attended, the feedback was very  
27 positive, and residents were impressed with the technology, particularly at the  
28 membrane softening plant. Mr. Gillespie stated they were happy to host the event and  
29 that it was beneficial because utility work is usually in the background and residents do  
30 not always know where their water comes from or where wastewater goes. Mr. Dorrill  
31 stated the District would plan to repeat the open house during peak season, and Mr.  
32 Gillespie suggested adding it to the calendar for January planning. Mr. Kish stated he  
33 had visited the plant at other times and noted the facilities are always clean, not merely  
34 cleaned for the open house.

1 The Board then discussed the canal pump station. Mr. Truckey stated the District could  
2 not safely run the canal station with current salinity conditions and needed to identify a  
3 solution because the District's fire flow requirements would not be met solely by the new  
4 water tank. The Board discussed possible alternatives, including drawing from the lake  
5 on the Case property, relocating or supplementing the pump station, and pursuing  
6 another well. It was stated that the canal water near the station was comparable in  
7 salinity to the Gulf and that the District's irrigation and fire-related systems were not  
8 designed for salt water.

9 Mr. Gillespie stated the canal pump station currently does not run because both reuse  
10 pumps at the plant are running. He explained the canal station is intended as a backup  
11 if power failed at the wastewater plant, the generator did not run, and a series of events  
12 caused the reuse pumps to go down. In that scenario, the canal station would  
13 pressurize the reuse main to provide fire flow. He stated that if the District wanted to  
14 shut off the canal pump station, it should confirm the legal and permitting implications  
15 before powering it down. He stated another well may not be sufficient as a direct backup  
16 to the canal station, and the District may need another pump station on a lake with its  
17 own generator or a similar backup arrangement.

18 Mr. Truckey discussed the concern that salt water could damage irrigation  
19 infrastructure, fire sprinkler piping, pumps, and vegetation. High tides were causing salt  
20 water to flow backward over the weir and into the freshwater system and that the  
21 existing pump station intake is located close to that area. The Board discussed the  
22 potential relationship between the Everglades Restoration Project and the changed  
23 salinity conditions. Mr. Lombardo stated the Board had previously considered retaining  
24 counsel, but the proposal appeared speculative in terms of potential results. He stated  
25 that if the District wanted to pursue a legislative or negotiation approach, it would need  
26 data and an engineering analysis to support the issue rather than anecdotal  
27 observations alone.

28 Mr. Dorrill stated his takeaways were to determine chloride monitoring levels in the  
29 current irrigation quality water, review historical results, identify levels at which chlorides  
30 begin to affect vegetation, and obtain a proposal from the District's civil engineer to  
31 evaluate a new well or other raw water source that could be blended with treated  
32 effluent. The Board agreed it needed data at the pump station intake to determine  
33 whether the canal station is a viable backup and to support any discussions with  
34 governmental agencies.

1 Mr. Gillespie stated staff could collect samples at or near the intake location and send  
2 them to a lab. The Board discussed sampling frequency and the need to capture high  
3 tide or reverse-flow events. It was agreed that weekly sampling would provide a better  
4 data set than monthly sampling. Mr. Lombardo stated that, as long as staff could  
5 confirm where the samples were taken and the lab independently verified the  
6 salinity/chloride results, the data should be useful. Mr. Gillespie stated the sample  
7 location would be included on the chain of custody submitted to the lab.

8 The Board also discussed possible use of a temporary or emergency pump from a lake,  
9 dry hydrant concepts, and whether Greater Naples Fire District should be asked how it  
10 would address a fire flow emergency. Mr. Lombardo stated it was reasonable to ask  
11 Greater Naples Fire District for comment. Mr. Dorrill stated that, absent unexpected  
12 chloride results, decisions should be based on the data collected from the existing  
13 blended irrigation water and the canal intake.

14 The Board directed staff to begin salinity/chloride testing at the canal pump station  
15 intake location, coordinate with Johnson Engineering regarding initiation of the  
16 permitting process for a separate well or other source, and continue evaluating lake or  
17 pump station alternatives. Mr. Gillespie asked whether to leave power on to the canal  
18 pump station for the time being. The Board agreed to leave the power on pending  
19 further data and evaluation.

## 20 **MANAGER'S REPORT**

### 21 **A. Methodology and Impact Fee**

22 Mr. Dorrill introduced Mr. Weyer, the District's assessment methodology consultant,  
23 who attended by Zoom. Mr. Dorrill stated Mr. Weyer had performed the recent  
24 methodology analysis for the operation and maintenance non-ad valorem assessment.  
25 The current update focused on double lots, county-owned lots or parcels, condominium  
26 pads, and commercial boat slips as distinguished from personal recreational boat slips.  
27 Mr. Dorrill also noted a separate task order for Mr. Weyer to evaluate and propose a  
28 new utility impact fee or Equivalent Residential Connection charge. He explained that  
29 the county requires evidence of available utility capacity when a building permit is  
30 sought, and utilities charge a capacity fee to reserve capacity for a new unit coming  
31 online. He stated the more pressing matter for this meeting was the non-ad valorem  
32 assessment methodology update.

33 Mr. Weyer stated he had been the District's assessment methodology consultant for  
34 approximately five or six years and that the last full report was completed in 2023 with

1 smaller updates thereafter. He stated he was asked to review the current methodology,  
2 update it, and address areas in which the Board had particular interest, including  
3 parcels that had been split or aggregated, allocation of assessments to vacant county-  
4 owned lands such as the North Hotel site and Orchid Cove units, the condominium  
5 marina boat slips, eco tours, fishing guides, jet skis, and District-owned Parcel 13.

6 Mr. Weyer stated the District is unique because it includes a resort marina with a  
7 transient population and residential neighborhoods with both seasonal and year-round  
8 residents. He stated the methodology uses an equivalent residential unit, or ERU,  
9 anchored by single-family and multi-family residential units, with one residential unit  
10 assigned one ERU and other land uses assigned variations of an ERU based on parcel  
11 size or land use. An example would be the commercial parcels on 41 that have yet to be  
12 constructed on. The measurement is currently parcel size but once something  
13 commercial was built on it land use would be taken into consideration and the ERU  
14 would be recalculated.

15 Mr. Weyer stated there were 745 total units plus hotel rooms, nine units on multiple lots,  
16 and 183 remaining units outside of residential, including the 175 marina boat slips. He  
17 stated his preliminary analysis did not anticipate significant adjustments to the method  
18 of allocation by ERU, but rather clarification of assessments based on updated review.

19 Regarding residential parcels, Mr. Weyer stated that where two owners split a lot  
20 between them, resulting in 1.5 lots for each owner, his recommendation remained that  
21 each 1.5-lot ownership be assessed one ERU because the half lot cannot  
22 independently support a separate residence unless the split is reversed. He stated that  
23 if the lots were recombined so a separate buildable lot existed, the additional ERU  
24 would be recognized at that time. Regarding double lots, he recommended two ERUs  
25 because the vacant portion of the double lot has the potential to be built upon as a  
26 separate residence.

27 Mr. Weyer reviewed government-owned property. He stated that property owned by  
28 counties and municipalities is generally exempt from ad valorem taxes and that non-ad  
29 valorem assessments on government property are generally limited, particularly where  
30 property serves a public purpose. He noted, however, that the District already assesses  
31 certain government property where there is revenue-generating activity, such as the  
32 county marina site. He discussed county-owned parcels, including 27 Orchid Cove  
33 condominium units or pads, a two-acre parcel, and the former hotel site. Mr. Dorrill  
34 stated the Board wanted to preserve the ability to assess such parcels, if appropriate,

1 during the budget process, and asked Mr. Weyer to take a hard look at applying base  
2 units per acre or per condominium pad for those properties.

3 Regarding commercial properties, Mr. Weyer stated the current methodology uses the  
4 acreage of vacant commercial parcels until a specific use is approved and constructed.  
5 He stated the approach uses a residential density conversion of approximately four  
6 units per acre. Once development occurs, the methodology would need to be revisited  
7 based on the approved use.

8 Regarding marina boat slips, Mr. Weyer stated his prior recommendation used the boat  
9 slip GIS acreage, approximately 11.2 acres, multiplied by the four-unit-per-acre factor,  
10 resulting in approximately 44.8 ERUs, which when divided by 175 boat slips produced  
11 approximately 0.25 ERU per slip. He stated his updated preliminary recommendation  
12 was to assign one ERU to liveaboard slips because they function like residential units,  
13 to assign commercial use slips between 0.5 and 0.75 ERU, with 0.75 ERU as his  
14 preliminary recommendation, and to apply the acreage methodology to the remaining  
15 recreational slips. Mr. Weyer clarified that this is not the final report, the final will be  
16 presented at next month's meeting. For the hotel they are currently assigned 1 ERU per  
17 hotel room and recommend keeping it that way. Mr. Weyer said the Gun Club ERU's  
18 should continue to be calculated based on the assessment methodology presented in  
19 June 2023 at 8 ERU's.

20 No ERU's are assigned to District owned properties. The District is a form of special  
21 government and is not in the commercial operations business. Eventually once the  
22 parcel is sold to a private user, then ERU's will be assigned to that parcel based on its  
23 entitlements and one of the ERU calculations previously as described.

24 Mr. Truckey asked about the boat slips and if they go down to a .25 there could be  
25 arguments about the condos decreasing to .25 - .4 since they are stacked on top of  
26 each other resulting in minor land usage. Mr. Weyer responded that there is a huge  
27 difference because condos are residential units whether they are stacked on top of each  
28 other or not. The boat slips don't serve a residential purpose apart from the  
29 liveaboards. That is the way that it is calculated. Acreage is only used for parcels that  
30 do not have anything built on them and commercial uses.

31 Mr. Kish asked where the 46 units came from for liveaboards. Mr. Weyer said he heard  
32 that this morning that there are 46 out of 175. He said those numbers are not finite yet,  
33 he just needs to be given the information on which ones are and which are not. Mr.  
34 Hoekstra distinguished that 116 are designated as liveaboards. Mr. Lombardo stated

1 that, in his view, the District should rely on the approved site plan because it is a public  
2 entitlement document. He stated that if the marina wanted to reduce the number of  
3 liveaboard entitlements, it could seek a site plan amendment, but the District otherwise  
4 needed to use the approved entitlement rather than asking about actual occupancy  
5 each time the methodology is updated. Mr. Weyer agreed.

6 Mr. Truckey questioned the preliminary 0.75 ERU recommendation for commercial  
7 slips, particularly commercial tour operators and fishing guide operations. He stated that  
8 the manatee tour boats may make four or five trips per day, bring people into the  
9 community throughout the day, and generate trips, parking, and restroom use that may  
10 exceed a typical residential unit. Mr. Weyer stated his preliminary recommendation  
11 reflected that the use was not 24 hours per day like a liveaboard unit, but he agreed to  
12 review the issue from a trip-generation, road impact perspective. He said ultimately it is  
13 a Board decision; he is just giving recommendations. He said you could look at trip  
14 generation and use the Institute of Transportation Engineers manual and give that  
15 another factor of consideration for commercial slips. Mr. Truckey was in favor of that as  
16 they are creating more of an impact and usage than a residential slip.

17 Mr. Lombardo shared that the Institute of Transportation Engineers trip generation  
18 manual, which is commonly relied upon by local governments and traffic engineers to  
19 estimate trips by land use type. He stated that presenting both the current methodology  
20 and an ITE-based alternative would allow the Board to choose between options  
21 supported by data. He also stated the District could retain a traffic engineer to perform  
22 actual trip counts, although that would involve additional cost. Mr. Weyer stated he  
23 would review the ITE manual and other available data and present alternatives for  
24 commercial slips.

25 Mr. Truckey returned to the 1.5-lot issue. He expressed concern that when lots are  
26 combined or split, the utility system still has pipes and infrastructure extending past the  
27 property and, if an ERU is effectively removed, the burden is shifted to other users. Mr.  
28 Weyer clarified that the discussion involved the O&M non-ad valorem assessment  
29 methodology and not the utility ERC capacity charge. He stated that ERCs are capacity  
30 credits that can be conveyed and tracked separately, while the O&M methodology  
31 allocates annual costs based on the Board's adopted methodology. Mr. Weyer stated  
32 that the O&M methodology is based primarily on trip generation and that the half lot  
33 does not generate trips unless it becomes buildable again. Mr. Truckey asked that the  
34 issue be carefully evaluated and explained in the updated methodology. Mr. Kish

1 shared that a commercial boat company owner had shared that one year he had 18,000  
2 customers and that .75 ERU does not make sense to him.

3 Mr. Weyer stated Parcel 13 had been included in his preliminary review as District-  
4 owned property. Mr. Dorrill clarified that Parcel 13 had been sold, that there is a  
5 separate ERC agreement related to the parcel, and that the purchaser is in default  
6 under that agreement. He stated the purchaser had started, but had not completed, the  
7 Collier County PPL and Site Construction Plan process, leaving the property in  
8 development limbo. Mr. Lombardo stated the separate ERC agreement should not  
9 change the underlying O&M assumptions for the parcel. Mr. Weyer stated that once  
10 final approval is received, the ERUs can be updated based on the approved number of  
11 units.

12 Mr. Dorrill asked Mr. Weyer to examine county-owned parcels, including the vacant  
13 Orchid Cove condominium pads and former hotel site, and provide the Board with base  
14 units per pad or per acre. Mr. Weyer stated he would provide an updated version of the  
15 O&M methodology and an initial version of the ERC analysis for the next meeting.

16 The Board noted that the O&M solution and ERC analysis are related but separate  
17 items. Mr. Dorrill stated staff and the District Engineer had already spent approximately  
18 two hours with Mr. Weyer reviewing background information, current depreciation  
19 schedules, replacement values, and related data for the ERC work.

20 Mr. Dorrill asked whether the Board wanted to continue or take a brief recess. The  
21 Board stood in recess for five minutes and was scheduled to reconvene at  
22 approximately 10:15 a.m.

### 23 **B. Utility Billing Update**

24 Mr. Dorrill has previously shared with the Board a year-to-date summary. Numbers will  
25 be updated as mid-year utility bill for the District went out yesterday. Combined water,  
26 wastewater, and irrigation summary for the first two bills that began October 1.  
27 \$582,321 was billed in the first two bills evenly split between water and wastewater  
28 base rates. Have received \$574,607. In addition there were some late fees that were  
29 subsequently charged, some of which are still outstanding. Year to date \$12,000 has  
30 been charged in late fees. Working on 95-97% collection rate. Current mid-year actual  
31 bill is \$891,529. Original budget for water charges both base rate and anticipated  
32 consumption amount for the year was \$312,000. Have actually billed \$370,000. Waste  
33 water was originally budgeted at mid-year \$337,000, have actually billed \$377,000.

1 Irrigation charges originally budgeted for \$305,000 have billed \$120,000. Miscellaneous  
2 charges for new accounts or late fees had originally budgeted \$35,000 and have  
3 actually billed \$23,000. Overall over budget on the revenue side. Some of these are  
4 going to be the disputed base charges that have been applied to the hotel and marina  
5 condominiums and will have to see how that is settled. For the year-to-date actual total  
6 revenue over budget \$130,000 based off of what has been billed. While there are  
7 separate arguments or decisions to be made, Mr. Dorrill still feels strongly that the  
8 Board's intent has been valid.

9 With the help of Florida Utility Solutions a good inventory of meter locations has been  
10 created. Primarily focused on larger two-inch meters for the actual number of units  
11 being applied. Mr. Dorrill has to go back and make sure that none of the liveboards  
12 include wastewater. Mr. Truckey corrected that all the liveboard's wastewater is  
13 collected into the District's system. Mr. Dorrill said if any changes to the rates as  
14 approved by the Board are desired, he has to give advanced notice of that through the  
15 utility bill.

16 Mr. Truckey thinks the base rate is too high. Mr. Kish agreed. With the increase in  
17 revenue, he suggested applying that increase to lower the base rate. Mr. Dorrill  
18 commissioned a survey of all of the utility systems included in the last bill and there is a  
19 high base rate, but the intent was to offset the former revenue that came from the tax  
20 bill. The irrigation rates are the lowest of the 12 public utility systems. He would like to  
21 go back and revisit some of those areas. Out of the 12 the District was tied for fifth.

22 Mr. Truckey compared rates from Collier County and Everglades City. Collier County  
23 rates are \$150 for two months. The District is at \$256. Everglades City is \$220 and they  
24 include the first 3,000 gallons with their base rate. If the increases were applied to a  
25 reduction in the base rate, it is going to put it more at par with those two. 9.5% over so  
26 far. Mr. Kish suggested taking 10% off of base rate to wash. That would reduce it by  
27 \$25. Mr. Dorrill added that the City of Naples, Fort Myers, and Sanibel have plants that  
28 were constructed from federal grants back in the 70s and 80s. The District's was built  
29 off customer revenue and the municipal bonds that were sold to build the facilities. Mr.  
30 Truckey would like to take \$40 off the base rate and still allow for a surplus. This will be  
31 discussed further next month. The proposed budget will be reviewed next month and  
32 that will be the best time to have a decision made on this. The next bill is in June. Mr.  
33 Lombardo added that decision must be made by the July meeting which would require a  
34 budget amendment.

1 **C. Sales Center Update**

2 Final air conditioning renovations \$22,000, the roof repair including the decking  
3 \$16,500. Remaining invoice for remodeling contractor who conducted some demolition  
4 and drywall \$3,000. All in number \$32,132. Mr. Lombardo confirmed in reference to the  
5 lease that most if not all of that qualifies for rent credit. The AC and roof were in lease  
6 itself and the other items can be shared with the landlord for additional approvals.

7 **D. Revised Candidate Oath**

8 Ms. Hansen and Mr. Truckey's seat up for election this fall. Updated oath of office form  
9 for qualifying period.

10 **FINANCIALS - FEBRUARY 2026**

11 Mr. Dorrill presented the financials as of February 28, 2026. The District had a  
12 combined cash on hand amount of \$5.5 million. \$6.9 million in addition assets. Total  
13 assets next of depreciation \$12,735. \$26,000 in payables. Almost \$35,000 received in  
14 non-ad-valorem assessments. Expecting similar amounts for March and April. Total  
15 year-to-date assessments received at 82% or \$653,573. Overall \$179,000 under budget  
16 as no capital landscape outlay had been done through February. On utility side, year to  
17 date total expenditures \$142,000 under budget.

18 **The financials were accepted as presented on a MOTION by Ms. Hansen, a**  
19 **second by Mr. Baird, and all in favor.**

20 **ATTORNEY'S REPORT**

21 **A. Request Shade Meeting Regarding Case Lawsuit**

22 At the last meeting the Board authorized litigation Counsel to file the Case Lawsuit.

23 Mr. Lombardo requested that the Board schedule an attorney-client shade meeting for  
24 counsel to seek advice concerning litigation, specifically settlement negotiations and  
25 strategy related to litigation expenditures. He stated that dates had been reviewed with  
26 litigation counsel and that, although the matter had previously been discussed for  
27 scheduling after the May meeting, the first week in May was preferable if the Board was  
28 available.

29 The Board discussed availability during the first week of May. Thursday, May 7, 2026 at  
30 9:30 a.m. was tentatively selected, subject to confirmation by Mr. Dorrill. Mr. Lombardo

1 stated the meeting would open in public session, recess into the shade meeting, and  
2 then will reconvene in public session at the conclusion of the closed portion.

3 **ENGINEER'S REPORT**

4 No report was given at this time

5 **OLD BUSINESS**

6 No new business was discussed.

7 **NEW BUSINESS**

8 No old business was discussed.

9 **SUPERVISORS' REQUEST**

10 **A. Safety and Security Update**

11 Mr. Truckey asked about the safety and security measures as previously discussed. Mr.  
12 Dorrill stated the District previously issued an RFP for a security consultant to perform  
13 an analysis, but no responses were received. He stated he could obtain proposals from  
14 contractors for security cameras, but would need assistance determining technology  
15 needs, including whether the system would require internet access and whether the  
16 District would rely on vendors for connectivity.

17 The Board discussed the need for security at the District facility because items are  
18 stored in the building and because homeowners associations may want to use the  
19 facility for future meetings. There is a need for internet service at the building. It was  
20 clarified that the desired location for potential cameras is at all three entrances to the  
21 community, along with separate cameras for the facility itself.

22 Mr. Lee suggested the Board consider consistently identifying the facility as the CID  
23 Building, with the community center located in the CID Building, to avoid confusion  
24 caused by prior references to different addresses and facility names. He stated the  
25 official address had been confirmed as Tamiami Trail East through the post office and  
26 fire department. He asked the Board to consider this.

27 Mr. Truckey discussed prior coordination with Collier County regarding patrol presence  
28 in the community. He stated that when the County had a visible presence in Port of the  
29 Islands, response was very quick after motion detectors alerted residents to activity on  
30 the docks. He discussed the possibility of requesting that one officer be stationed in Port

1 of the Islands at night instead of having all nighttime coverage stationed in Naples and  
2 Everglades City. He stated security personnel would create a large ongoing cost and  
3 that cameras alone may not identify suspects when faces are covered. He stated  
4 motion detectors and a visible law enforcement presence may be more effective.

5 Mr. Dorrill stated he has existing camera vendors at Lely Resort and Pelican Marsh and  
6 would seek proposals or estimates for the Board to consider as early as the next  
7 meeting.

#### 8 **B. Rules of Order**

9 Mr. Baird asked whether the Board had adopted the rules of order. Mr. Dorrill stated the  
10 item would be brought back in May because the prior notice had to be re-advertised  
11 after the meeting date changed.

#### 12 **C. Orchid Cove Streetlights**

13 Mr. Baird asked about the Orchid Cove street lights being paid for by the District. Mr.  
14 Truckey said they are still working through the matter and had contacted LCEC. He  
15 explained that LCEC identifies lights by location and pole number rather than by  
16 address, which made the review more complicated. LCEC was expected to provide  
17 information identifying the pole numbers and locations so staff could compare those  
18 records against the District bill. An update is anticipated to be provided at the next  
19 meeting.

#### 20 **D. Road Resurfacing**

21 Mr. Baird asked about long-term planning for road upgrades and whether grants were  
22 available. Mr. Dorrill stated there were no grants available. He stated Collier County has  
23 an annual contract for milling and resurfacing and that the District would be eligible to  
24 piggyback on the County bid, subject to the specifics of the asphalt type, project size,  
25 tonnage, and pricing.

#### 26 **E. Boat Dock Extension Request at 140 Wilderness Cay**

27 Ms. Hansen discussed a variance or boat dock extension request from 140 Wilderness  
28 Cay involving an approximately 68-foot dock. Mr. Kish stated the request appeared  
29 larger than surrounding docks, with the furthest existing dock extending approximately  
30 42 feet, and that the proposed dock was intended for a 50-foot catamaran and a 33-foot  
31 powerboat. He expressed concern that the proposed dock could significantly affect the

1 neighboring property owner's access, view, and ability to construct a dock in the future,  
2 particularly with the side setbacks and riparian lines.

3 Mr. Lombardo explained that the matter would be heard by the Collier County hearing  
4 examiner as a quasi-judicial boat dock extension. He stated that affected neighbors  
5 should appear in person if possible as it is much more impactful, or request to appear  
6 remotely. He stated that it is important that the affected neighbors who have objections  
7 provide written comments to the County planner John Kelly if they cannot attend the  
8 hearing. He explained that the primary review criteria typically include navigation,  
9 riparian rights, view to the channel, access to the channel from neighboring properties,  
10 and channel depth information.

#### 11 **F. County Communication**

12 Ms. Hansen stated she had responded to a communication from Commissioner  
13 Castro's office regarding County activity within the District. She did not see Port of the  
14 Islands listed, contacted them, and received a response that stated the Port of the  
15 Islands marina was open because of them, the marina parking lot had been approved  
16 for repaving, and the County was still seeking someone to take over the store. She  
17 stated she would continue following up because approval of the parking lot repaving did  
18 not necessarily mean the work would be completed.

#### 19 **G. SFWMD Manatee Project Update**

20 Mr. Lombardo reported that the South Florida Water Management District advised the  
21 District it had run out of funding and would not proceed with the manatee project for  
22 which the District had previously sold an easement. He stated the District had been paid  
23 \$50,000 and had not received a notice of commencement. He stated the easement  
24 allows the District to continue subleasing the area to other dock contractors if needed.  
25 Mr. Truckey asked the Board whether putting gravel behind seawall as filling may be  
26 appropriate. Mr. Kish and Ms. Hansen said whatever is needed.

#### 27 **H. Liveaboard Clarification**

28 Mr. Kish requested clarification regarding the legal description of what constitutes a  
29 liveaboard and the responsibilities associated with that designation. He stated that if  
30 some owners wanted to avoid being treated as liveaboards, the District would need to  
31 understand the applicable specifics and what would be required if a later owner wanted  
32 to restore liveaboard status.

1 Mr. Lombardo stated he had previously circulated a draft memorandum on the matter.  
2 He explained that, for purposes of the marina, the District has to rely on the approved  
3 site plan, which identifies how many slips are designated as liveaboard. He stated the  
4 marina is within its rights to amend its site plan to reduce the number of liveaboard slips,  
5 but the District should rely on the recorded site plan rather than determining the status  
6 of each slip by asking individual owners what they intend to do.

7 Mr. Baird brought up the ERCs associated with the marina's prior site plan approval. Mr.  
8 Lombardo stated that the marina had obtained a utility availability letter in 2018 after the  
9 District engineer determined capacity was available if the marina acquired  
10 approximately 16 ERCs. He stated the District had no record that the ERCs were ever  
11 purchased. He stated he did not believe the marina was in current compliance with the  
12 site plan based on that information, but that a formal demand had not been issued  
13 because the District needed Mr. Weyer's analysis to establish the value of the ERCs.  
14 He stated that even if the marina later reduced the number of liveaboard slips, there  
15 may still be a claim for a prior period within the statute of limitations when the marina  
16 was billed based on ERCs that had not been acquired.

## 17 **NEXT MEETING**

18 Mr. Dorrill stated the next meeting would be the closed attorney-client shade meeting on  
19 May 7, 2026, and the next regular meeting will be May 21, 2026. Ms. Hansen left the  
20 meeting at 12:13 p.m. and Mr. Truckey assumed the role as Chair, a quorum still  
21 remained.

## 22 **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

23 Rose Diaz - Orchid Cove - Ms. Diaz asked whether the District's capital improvement  
24 plan on the website could be updated. She stated the posted plan appeared to be  
25 approximately two years old and that it was difficult to understand how the Board's  
26 decisions related to that plan. She requested an updated plan showing what had been  
27 spent, what remained, the District's priorities, and the timeline for the projects. She  
28 stated it would be easier for residents to understand potential water rate increases if  
29 they could see how the capital plan, cash on hand, revenues, and expenditures fit  
30 together.

31 Ms. Diaz also asked about the Graziani's conflict waiver that had been approved at the  
32 prior meeting. Mr. Lombardo clarified that he represents the Graziani's in an unrelated  
33 matter. He explained that, in order for him to represent the District in potential  
34 negotiations with the Graziani's regarding the acquisition of Parcel 13, both parties

1 would need to waive the conflict. He stated the matter was a permissible and waivable  
2 conflict because his representation of the Graziani's is unrelated to that property. He  
3 also noted the District could use conflict counsel if desired and apologized if the issue  
4 was not clear when discussed previously.

5 Michael Jura - Marina - Mr. Jura stated that when he moved to the community  
6 approximately nine years ago, boat slips were treated as 0.25, condominium units as  
7 0.5, and homes as 1.0 for assessment purposes. He stated the methodology had  
8 changed multiple times and that the proposed base rate appeared to treat boats,  
9 condominiums, and homes the same despite differences in water use and impact. He  
10 stated boat owners use substantially less water, many boats have limited capacity, and  
11 some owners are on fixed incomes. He objected to characterizations that boat owners  
12 are wealthy or can simply afford additional costs. He compared the proposed base rate  
13 to base rates in Everglades City and Naples and stated he believed the District should  
14 charge based on usage rather than the ability to use water. He also stated boat owners  
15 were not requesting items such as security systems, road resurfacing, dog parks, or  
16 community facilities, but were being asked to contribute to those costs.

17 Dion Ray - Slip A - Mr. Ray stated it was his first time attending a District meeting and  
18 thanked the Board. He requested clarification regarding the schedule for consideration  
19 of the water and utility rate issue. Mr. Dorrill stated the tentative budget would be  
20 presented at the May meeting, submitted to the County before June 15, and formally  
21 adopted at a public hearing, typically in July or August. He stated any utility rate  
22 adjustment would require advance notice to ratepayers and that the earliest the rates  
23 could be changed would be the June meeting. Mr. Ray stated that the proposed  
24 increase would be more than 1,000% for some boat owners and described his slip as  
25 having seven boats, only one of which is a liveaboard. He stated he only uses his slip  
26 when he comes to prepare for and return from boating trips. He requested an  
27 opportunity for marina representatives to meet with the Board before the May meeting  
28 to avoid the matter becoming a legal issue that would cost both sides money.

## 29 **ADJOURNMENT**

30 The Board will reconvene for the attorney-client shade meeting on May 7, 2026. The  
31 next regular meeting will be on May 21, 2026, at 9:30 a.m.

32 **On a MOTION by Mr. Truckey, a second by Mr. Kish, and all in favor, the meeting**  
33 **was adjourned at 12:24 p.m.**