

1                   **LELY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT**  
2                                   **NAPLES, FLORIDA**  
3                   Workshop Meeting of the Board of Supervisors  
4                                   February 18, 2026

5    A workshop meeting of the Lely Community Development District Board of Supervisors  
6    was held on Wednesday, February 18, 2026, at 1:00 p.m. at the LCDD Maintenance  
7    Building, Naples, Florida.

8    **SUPERVISORS PRESENT**

9    Anne Marie Bularzik, Chair

10   William Lee, Vice Chair

11   Gerry Campkin, Treasurer

12   Kenneth Drum, Secretary

13   Andrew Fox, Supervisor

14   **ALSO PRESENT**

15   Neil Dorrill, Manager, Dorrill Management Group

16   Kevin Carter, Operations Manager

17   Tony Pires, District Counsel

18   Freddie Bowers, Director of Community Patrol

19   Christopher Dorrill, Field Manager

20   **WORKSHOP - LAKE BANK EROSION ANNUAL REVIEW**

21   A workshop discussion was held regarding the District's ongoing lake bank erosion  
22   repair program. Mr. Carter introduced Mr. Bill Boetta of Bowman, who attended in place  
23   of the District engineer, Kevin Dowty who is on paternity leave. Mr. Carter explained that  
24   the purpose of the workshop was to review the status of the lake bank erosion repair  
25   program and the work scheduled for the current year. This is the seventh year of lake  
26   bank erosion repair work. Over the previous six years the District has completed  
27   approximately \$1.4 million in repairs. The work planned for the current year will bring

1 the total program cost to approximately \$1.7 million over the seven-year period, which  
2 he characterized as a significant investment by the District.

3 Mr. Carter explained that the District's responsibility is limited to the lakes identified in  
4 yellow. Bowman previously conducted a comprehensive inspection of all lakes and  
5 identified those requiring erosion repair. The District has now reached the end of that  
6 original list of prioritized lakes and will have Bowman conduct a new survey next year.

7 Mr. Drum asked whether the nine-inch erosion standard was still being used. Mr. Carter  
8 confirmed that the District continues to follow the South Florida Water Management  
9 District standard, which identifies erosion exceeding nine inches as the threshold  
10 requiring corrective work. Mr. Carter explained that the District continues to utilize the  
11 geotube system. He reported that the District has changed contractors over time and  
12 that the most recent contractor, American Shoreline, performed the work during the  
13 prior year and did a wonderful job. He noted that a key advantage of American  
14 Shoreline was that they were able to dredge sufficient sand directly from the lake  
15 bottom to fill the geo-tubes which decreased project costs. Previous contractors could  
16 not do so and needed additional sand to be hauled to the site, creating additional cost  
17 and logistical challenges.

18 Mr. Carter reviewed the three lakes scheduled for repair during the current year. The  
19 work will include Lake 5 near the weir by the U.S. 41 entrance, Lake 39 located within  
20 the Palomino area, and Lake 17. Lake 5 is located behind the commercial area near  
21 Hobby Lobby. It represents an extensive portion of the work and includes shoreline  
22 areas where erosion has progressed significantly enough to cause trees to fall into the  
23 lake.

24 American Shoreline's bid for this year's work totaled \$295,600, which was below the  
25 \$315,000 budgeted for the project. The District also maintains approximately \$35,000  
26 within the budget for engineering services, bringing the total program allocation to  
27 approximately \$350,000. Mr. Drum asked whether project costs were increasing  
28 compared with previous years. Mr. Carter indicated that the pricing was generally  
29 consistent with prior years. American Shoreline's ability to avoid importing sand has  
30 helped keep costs lower than in previous contracts. Sand costs in previous years were  
31 anywhere from a few hundred dollars to \$7,000 like in 2024. Mr. Carter emphasized the  
32 quality of American Shoreline's work and that they have been excellent to work with.

33 Mr. Fox suggested that the engineer conduct the new survey inspection before the next  
34 budget cycle so the Board can determine whether additional funding should be

1 allocated for future work. Mr. Drum asked whether completed repairs have required any  
2 maintenance or follow-up work. Mr. Carter indicated that no repairs have been required  
3 to date and that the expected life span of the geo-tube system is approximately 20 to 30  
4 years. The system has performed well, and residents have generally been satisfied with  
5 the results, particularly because the repairs often restore several feet of previously  
6 eroded shoreline. Mr. Carter said the only issue with geo-tube is that when the lake  
7 recedes, they are visible. Otherwise they are very resilient, and it is the preferred  
8 method from SFWMD for erosion control. Residents are typically very satisfied with the  
9 amount of land they get back when the work is done in their community.

10 Mr. Fox asked about “blue lakes” and noted that if the yellow lakes cost the District  
11 approximately \$1.7 million over seven years, repairs to the blue lakes could potentially  
12 cost \$3 to \$4 million. He asked when the District would begin engineering work to  
13 identify and evaluate those lakes. Mr. Pires responded that the issue would need to be  
14 addressed as part of the settlement agreement process and explained that costs cannot  
15 be estimated by simply extrapolating from the yellow lakes because each lake is  
16 different and repairs are typically based on the linear feet of shoreline requiring  
17 stabilization.

18 Mr. Fox asked whether the District’s engineer could perform the evaluation and  
19 establish priorities for which lakes should be repaired first, noting that he did not want  
20 the community to spend money on multiple engineers if the District would ultimately be  
21 responsible for the work. He is fine if Stock paid for the work but does not want the  
22 Master Association to do so. Mr. Pires responded that the settlement agreement could  
23 include a process in which the District’s engineer evaluates the lakes and prepares a  
24 recommended priority schedule based on the severity of erosion and proximity to  
25 homes or structures. He noted that the District’s overall approach has been to ensure  
26 that the lakes are in acceptable condition before the District could accept them. Mr.  
27 Pires advised that further discussion of the settlement agreement should not occur  
28 during the workshop because negotiations are ongoing.

29 Mr. Boetta explained that Bowman has recently implemented a GIS-based inspection  
30 system that allows field inspectors to walk the shoreline and digitally map erosion  
31 conditions in real time. This technology will allow future inspections to be documented  
32 more accurately and efficiently than previous manual mapping methods.

33 Mr. Boetta explained that erosion is categorized into three cases. Case one represents  
34 erosion slightly above the nine-inch threshold, case two represents erosion between  
35 approximately 12 and 24 inches, and case three represents severe erosion between

- 1 approximately 24 and 36 inches. While these classifications guide the process,  
2 prioritization also considers proximity to homes or structures. Erosion located near  
3 residential property is typically addressed before erosion located in non-residential  
4 areas. Mr. Boetta added that he has consistently been satisfied with American Shoreline  
5 Restoration’s work and noted that it is the only company he has not needed to return to  
6 correct deficiencies.
- 7 Mr. Fox asked how many of the blue lakes are the responsibility of the Master. Mr. Pires  
8 responded that this is part of what is being worked on in the settlement agreement. Mr.  
9 Drum asked about the golf course. Mr. Pires replied that is getting into the settlement  
10 agreement and discussion related to it is not permitted.
- 11 Dr. Bularzik summarized that the District’s lake bank erosion repair program has  
12 addressed the majority of the originally identified lakes and that the current year’s work  
13 will likely complete the list established by the initial engineering study. The next  
14 suggested step would be to have the engineer perform a new inspection to determine  
15 whether any additional erosion has developed since the original survey. Mr. Carter  
16 added that the residential areas have been prioritized first. Dr. Bularzik requested the  
17 next report denote which case number each identified lake is to help keep track.
- 18 With no further questions, a brief recess was taken.