



CITY OF BELLE ISLE, FL CITY COUNCIL MEETING

Tuesday, August 20, 2026 * 6:30 PM
MINUTES

Present was:

Mayor – Jason Carson
District 1 Commissioner – Ed Gold
District 2 Commissioner – Holly Bobrowski
District 3 Commissioner – Karl Shuck
District 4 Commissioner – Bobby Lance
District 5 Commissioner – Beth Lowell
District 6 Commissioner – Christopher Oller
District 7 Commissioner – Jim Partin (conf call)

Absent was:

1. Call to Order and Confirmation of Quorum

2. Mayor Carson called the meeting to order at 6:43 pm, and the Clerk confirmed quorum.
3. City Manager Rick Rudometkin, Chief Grimm, Public Works Director Phil Price, Finance Director Tracey Richardson, Maureen McKuhen, Compliance Officer, and Clerk Lizary Simons were also present.

4. **Invocation and Pledge to the Flag** - Comm Lowell, District 5, led the invocation and Pledge to the Flag.

5. Public Comments & Announcements

Mayor Carson opened the floor for public comments and announcements.

Anita Sacco, residing at 4913 Jinou Avenue, said she has lived in the Lake Conway Estates community for 46 years and expressed concern about large boats on trailers, recreational vehicles, and other trailers parked in front of residential homes. She questioned whether allowing variances or special consideration for individual properties could result in repeated exceptions that eventually diminish the effectiveness of the City's existing code. Ms. Sacco also asked about the status of prior discussions regarding voluntary annexation of nearby property, expressing concern that the large parcel could potentially be developed in the future as surrounding areas continue to experience growth. She further questioned whether the City Planner's annual work product warrants the proposed contract fee and asked whether the City Planner works remotely or is present at City Hall. Ms. Sacco concluded by stating that she fully supports the Police Department's use of Flock cameras.

The following individuals spoke in favor of the proposed cleanup and dredging of the Venetian Canal:
Paula Sleiman-2202 Venetian Ave, John Govdiano-2224 Hoffner Avenue, Chris Glann-5408 Parkway Drive and Nicholas Santopolo-2202 Venetian Avenue.

There being no further comment, Mayor Carson closed public comment.

6. Presentations - na

Appeal of Courtesy Notice Issued for Camper/Canopies on July 22, 2026 - CE-26-0084

CM Rudometkin introduced Maureen McKuhen as the City's new Community Compliance Officer(CCO), replacing Matthew Rabae, who previously served as the Code Enforcement Officer. He explained that the position was revised to place greater emphasis on customer service and voluntary compliance. The Code Compliance function is now a non-uniformed City operation and falls under the purview of the City Clerk and City Manager. The City Manager welcomed Maureen and expressed appreciation for her work and service to the City.

CCO Maureen McKuhen stated that on July 22, she issued a citation to Mr. Mannix for having a canopy and camper in the driveway located in front of the residence at 3549 Country Lakes Drive. She referenced Section 31-30(2)(b), which addresses the length of time a camper may remain outside the home, and Section 51-02(1) and (9), which addresses canopy structures and provides that canopies are not permitted in residential districts.

Mike Mannix, residing at 3549 Country Lakes Drive, addressed Council regarding the City's regulations for parking recreational vehicles and trailers. He explained that after replacing a long-standing boat with a smaller camping trailer and installing a canvas canopy for protection, Code Compliance informed him of the applicable City Code requirements. He thanked staff for being supportive and informative and stated that subsequent meetings with City staff helped him better understand the regulations. Mr. Mannix expressed concern that the Code permits boats in front yards when applicable requirements are met but does not similarly permit campers, trailers, or RVs. He suggested that Council consider reviewing the definitions and regulations for front and side yards, noting the differences in lot sizes and configurations throughout Belle Isle. He stated that he supports requirements for improved surfaces and other applicable regulations but believes the current provisions may not fit every property. He requested that Council consider an appropriate process to review and potentially refine the regulations governing RV and trailer parking, emphasizing that his request was intended as a community-wide consideration rather than solely for his property. Mr. Mannix also explained that the property has swales along the side yards, making those areas unsuitable for parking because of drainage and water flow. Photographs were referenced to illustrate the property configuration, setback, and visibility from the roadway.

Nancy Joe Mannix added that their property is significantly set back from the roadway, with the proposed camper parking location approximately 140 feet or more from the road on their driveway. She noted that, visually, the camper would be considerably farther from the roadway than vehicles that could otherwise be permitted in a side yard closer to the curb.

Mayor Carson Council expressed appreciation for the residents' collaborative effort in bringing the matter forward. It was noted that certain provisions of the City Code have not been reviewed in some time and may warrant reconsideration to address future community needs.

CM Rudometkin clarified that Mr. Mannix had not received a violation with a fine and acknowledged his concerns regarding the City's current regulations. He explained that the existing Code prohibits certain uses, including canopies and the parking of RVs or trailers in specified areas, and that these provisions were previously adopted by Council to maintain certain community standards. He noted that staff is required to enforce the Code currently in effect and that enforcement is not personal or specific to any individual resident. Council may choose to review or amend these provisions in the future as part of broader discussions regarding the City's Charter and Code, but until changes are adopted, staff must continue enforcing the existing regulations. CM Rudometkin stated that the standard \$50 appeal fee generally applies to appeals of a violation carrying a fine. In this case, Mr. Mannix requested to appear before Council regarding a warning notice and paid the \$50 fee to have the matter heard. Council was advised that it could consider the appropriate disposition of the warning notice and the associated appeal fee.

Chief Grimm clarified that the residents had appealed a Notice of Violation, not a fine, and had paid the applicable appeal fee. Council was advised that a formal determination was still necessary to either uphold or dismiss the Notice of Violation, similar to the process used for other appealed violations.

Comm Bobrowski moved to refund Mr. Mannix the \$50.00 appeal fee.
Comm Gold seconded the motion, which passed unanimously, 7:0.

Comm Bobrowski discussed the need to revisit the City's ordinance governing RV and trailer parking, including consideration of setbacks from the right-of-way and circumstances where a property owner cannot reasonably access a side or rear yard. It was noted that any revisions should account for differing lot configurations while continuing to address aesthetics, commercial utility trailers, drainage, and protection of the City's lakes. She expressed support for allowing Mr. Mannix to temporarily keep the vintage trailer in its current location, provided it was not covered with a blue tarp, and suggested a six-month period to allow Council time to review and potentially develop revised regulations that better address residents' circumstances. She further noted that there are other properties throughout the City with items such as jet skis parked in front yards and not being properly maintained. Concern was expressed about using Code Compliance resources on residents who are actively trying to comply when other properties may have more apparent or ongoing violations that also require attention.

Attorney Langley clarified that code enforcement will not enforce this particular ordinance that has been brought for this particular property for a period of six months, and that'll then give the council and staff opportunity to perhaps amend the code. If the council does not amend the code, the city could still enforce the code against the property owner after a period of six months. Attorney Langley clarified that Council's action should address the specific property and warning currently under appeal. If Council wished to provide similar relief or direction citywide, it was recommended that this be addressed through a separate motion, since the matter before Council pertained only to the individual property.

CM Rudometkin noted that reviewing the ordinance would require broader discussion and preparation as part of the City's upcoming Charter and Code review. With the City currently focused on the budget process and the upcoming holidays, he anticipated the review would likely begin early next year and agreed that a six-month period would provide reasonable time to consider the matter.

Council and staff discussed whether to consider temporary exceptions on a case-by-case basis rather than apply them citywide. Staff clarified that the City already has a process for issuing temporary parking permits, including for RVs, when appropriate circumstances exist. Concern was expressed that creating broader temporary exceptions could become overly subjective and make enforcement difficult once the temporary period expires. The recommendation was to leave the existing citywide process in place, address temporary parking requests individually, and limit Council's current action to the specific Mannix appeal while the broader ordinance is reviewed at a later date.

Comm Bobrowski moved that code enforcement will not enforce this particular ordinance that has been brought for this particular property for a period of six months, and that'll then give the council and staff opportunity to perhaps amend the code. Comm Lance seconded the motion, which passed unanimously, 7:0.

Proclamation - 2027 Municipal Elections Districts 5 & 6

Mayor Carson presented and read the Proclamation for the 2027 Municipal Election Districts 5 & 6, with qualifying to commence Nov. 9– 13, 2026, with an election date of March 9, 2027.

7. Consent Items.

- a. Approval of City Council Workshop Minutes – August 4, 2026
- b. Approval of City Council Meeting Minutes – August 4, 2026
- c. Approval of OC Interlocal For Cost Sharing Of Aerial Photography Acquisition FY 2026/2027
- d. Approval of OC Interlocal Non-Ad Assessment Agreement FY 2026/2027
- e. July 2026 Monthly Reports: PD, Finance (<https://cleargov.com/florida/orange/city/belle-isle>), Code Enforcement and OC Fire

Comm Lance moved to approve the consent items as presented

Comm Lowell seconded the motion, which passed unanimously 7:0.

8. Unfinished Business

- a. ORDINANCE 26-04 SECOND READING AND ADOPTION - AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF BELLE ISLE, FLORIDA, AMENDING CHAPTER 50, CITY OF BELLE ISLE CODE OF ORDINANCES; AMENDING SECTION 50-78 GOVERNING ARTIFICIAL TURF REQUIREMENTS; PROVIDING FOR DEFINITIONS; PROVIDING REQUIREMENTS FOR INSTALLATION AND MAINTENANCE OF IMPERVIOUS AND PERVIOUS ARTIFICIAL TURF; PROVIDING FOR CODIFICATION, SEVERABILITY, CONFLICTS, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE. b. RESOLUTION 26-08 - A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF BELLE ISLE, FLORIDA, EXEMPTING THE CITY FROM SECTION 50-102(A)(9) OF THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

CM Rudometkin read Ordinance 26-04 by Title.

Mayor Carson opened for Council discussion.

There being no discussion, Comm Bobrowski moved to adopt Ordinance 26-04 as presented

Comm Lowell seconded the motion, which passed unanimously upon roll call 7:0.

9. New Business

a) Discussion on Dredging Venetian Canal

CM Rudometkin opened the discussion and noted that Commissioner Bobrowski had initiated the matter with Council's consent and had provided supporting information for Council's review. Staff also distributed additional information, and hard copies were available. He stated that, based on discussions with the City Attorney and the information contained in the agenda materials, the issue was more complex than it may initially appear and involved relevant history and additional considerations. He acknowledged residents' interest in having the matter addressed and turned the discussion over to the City Attorney for initial comments.

Attorney Langley provided an overview of the history, ownership, jurisdiction, and potential maintenance responsibility for the canals. He explained that the subdivision plat is an older plat dating back to when Belle Isle was identified as the "Town of Belle Isle." Unlike modern plats, it does not clearly identify ownership or expressly dedicate the canals to the City, County, State, or another governmental entity. He explained that case law addressing older plats may treat a canal or right-of-way shown on a plat without a stated dedication as an offer of dedication to the public; however, an offer of dedication does not automatically transfer maintenance responsibility. A governmental entity must take some action demonstrating acceptance, and the government cannot be compelled to accept that responsibility. Based on the information reviewed, the City Attorney stated that there was no known history of the City of Belle Isle maintaining the canals and no City record showing that Council formally accepted responsibility for their maintenance. However, there is a history of Orange County dredging the canals, which raised the question of whether the County may have assumed responsibility through its actions.

Attorney Langley also discussed information provided by the City's engineering consultant indicating that the canals are located within the Lake Conway Water and Navigation Control District. He explained that Orange County Code, Chapter 33, Article II, establishes the District and provides authority to regulate and control lakes and canals, including dredging, filling, pumping, navigation, and preservation of the waterways. The District's jurisdiction extends into municipalities located within its boundaries. He further noted that the County Code provides for the repair of canals within the District as necessary for navigation and the purposes of the District. Based on those provisions and the County's history of dredging, there is an argument that Orange County, through the Lake Conway Water and Navigation Control District, may have accepted responsibility for the canals. Staff had attempted to obtain clarification from Orange County and was awaiting a response. The District's current public information similarly identifies canal maintenance among its activities. He advised that if Council wished for the City to undertake dredging or assume future canal maintenance responsibilities, the City should first coordinate with Orange County to determine whether the County objects and to clarify the respective jurisdictions. He recommended that any City assumption of responsibility be accomplished through a formal resolution of Council and that the City and County establish how their respective responsibilities would operate given the County's existing ordinance and jurisdiction. Council would also need to determine how canal maintenance or dredging would be funded. The General Fund was identified as one possible source; however, the City Attorney noted the current financial environment and uncertainty surrounding potential constitutional changes affecting municipal revenues. A special assessment was also discussed as a possible funding mechanism because the canal system could arguably provide a benefit to properties throughout the subdivision. Such an assessment would require additional professional analysis to determine the benefited properties, appropriate allocation of costs, and the period over which assessments would be collected.

CM Rudometkin added that staff had also reviewed whether stormwater revenues could be used for canal dredging. He explained that stormwater funds may potentially be used when dredging can be demonstrated to serve a legitimate stormwater-management purpose but would be difficult to justify if the work were primarily intended to improve navigation or recreation. Staff noted that the City had previously cleaned the canal outfall pipe, but distinguished that stormwater-related work from assuming responsibility for general canal dredging and maintenance.

Commissioner Bobrowski provided background on the Venetian Gardens canals, explaining that the issue began more than a year ago after residents raised concerns regarding the deteriorated and increasingly unnavigable condition of the canal. She stated that she visited the area and was concerned by the amount of accumulated muck and debris. The matter had also been raised with the Navigation Board, and one homeowner had contacted Orange County regarding permits to privately remove accumulated material. Comm Bobrowski said the homeowner was advised by the County that the canal was Belle Isle's responsibility, prompting further research into ownership and maintenance obligations. She stated that she had spoken with several representatives from the Orange County Environmental Protection Division (EPD). She noted that property records for homes along the Venetian canal generally show private property lines ending at the shoreline, unlike some other canals where property lines extend toward the center of the waterway. Based on her review of the 1925 plat and historical information, she believed the canal was included among the infrastructure associated with Venetian Gardens for which Belle Isle assumed responsibility. She disagreed that Orange County's

previous dredging established County ownership or responsibility, explaining that Orange County dredged portions of the canal in approximately the 2000s with affected homeowners contributing approximately \$15,000 to \$18,000 each. She characterized that work as a project performed for the homeowners rather than the County accepting ownership or continuing maintenance responsibility. She further explained that the entire canal may not require dredging. In her view, the most significant problems are near the Venetian roadway/bridge, where accumulated sediment restricts water movement and navigation. Although the City recently spent approximately \$6,000 cleaning two outfalls, she expressed concern that they would become obstructed again if the surrounding canal remained filled with sediment. She stated that she had obtained a maintenance history dating back to 2003, including surveys, engineering information, studies, and billing records, which could assist the City in evaluating the issue without duplicating previous work.

Comm Bobrowski reported that she had also discussed with EPD the possibility of addressing the canal as a stormwater or drainage right-of-way, which could potentially allow the City to maintain it similarly to other drainage facilities. She suggested that homeowners could assist by trimming low-hanging vegetation and proposed initially dredging approximately 50 to 75 feet in each direction from the Venetian crossing, rather than undertaking the entire canal at once. She believed improving water movement in this area could allow natural circulation to assist with accumulated material elsewhere. She raised questions about the City's responsibility for the boat ramp, noting that it is located at the end of a right-of-way and is also experiencing sediment buildup. She emphasized that canal-front residents have paid property taxes for many years but, in some locations, are unable to effectively use the canal. She suggested that the City consider funding improvements over multiple years and referenced approximately \$178,000 in unanticipated Hurricane Irma reimbursement funds as a potential consideration. She noted that Hurricane Irma deposited branches and debris in portions of the canal and stated that removal of that material had not been submitted for FEMA reimbursement at the time.

Comm Bobrowski emphasized that she did not support delaying action for several years solely to conduct additional studies regarding ownership. Based on her interpretation of the historical plat and discussions with EPD, she believed the City had responsibility for the canal and should begin addressing the most severely impacted areas. She also referenced Belle Isle's historical purpose of protecting the Conway Chain of Lakes and stated that maintaining the waterways aligned with that responsibility. Additional discussion addressed Turtle Cove and the Conway Canal. Comm Bobrowski described a historical situation in which a resident allegedly placed telephone poles and other materials in a natural waterway, restricting water flow through Turtle Cove. She also described a separate incident in which fill material was placed in the cove, creating an island and further restricting navigation for several homeowners. She stated that these areas involve submerged sovereign waters and would require separate attention. Her immediate priority, however, was addressing the Venetian canal, particularly around the bridge, where she stated the culverts had previously been approximately 90% obstructed before being cleaned. She cautioned that improvements to the Venetian canal should also consider downstream impacts on Turtle Cove.

Comm Lowell asked, Does anyone know how many total panels there are on the Conway Chain of Lakes? Mr. Evertsen said about 12 or 15.

Comm Lowell also questioned whether the condition of the canal has been worsened by the drought and lack of rainfall over the past several years, noting that some homeowners outside the canals are also experiencing limited water access. She expressed concern about setting a precedent, questioning whether other lakefront property owners who pay higher taxes could similarly request City assistance with dredging, docks, erosion, or other water-access issues.

Comm Bobrowski said that the issue is not the current water depth, but the accumulation of muck and debris affecting navigation. The canal was described as the only City-owned canal in Belle Isle, distinguishing it from privately owned canals. She noted that the current low water level may provide an opportunity to perform maintenance using a hydro-jet process to move accumulated material rather than traditional bucket dredging. The most significant problem was identified around the roadway and extending to the 45-degree bend on the north side. Residents maintain other portions of the canal, although approximately three areas may require additional deepening due to sand and infiltration.

John Everson, a Belle Isle resident and Navigation Board member, stated that the Navigation Board reviewed the plat and determined, based on the language in the plat, that the canal is owned by Belle Isle. He identified his primary concern as the heavy accumulation of muck near the stormwater outfalls at Venetian, which he stated resulted from material deposited through the City's storm drains over many years. He said cleaning the material around the outfalls is necessary for both navigation and water quality, as nutrients in the accumulated mud and leaves can wash into the lake. He stated that maintenance of the outfalls does not require permitting and could be funded with stormwater utility funds as maintenance of the City's stormwater system. Mr. Evertsen also questioned the position that the City had not accepted the plat, noting that the City constructed the Venetian boat ramp and park within a road right-of-way shown on the plat. He stated that Orange County was unlikely to maintain the canal and that Navigation Board funding could take many years. He recommended that the City first remove the accumulated material at the stormwater outfalls and then

develop a plan for addressing the remainder of the canal. He offered the Navigation Board's assistance in answering questions and helping the City with the canal.

Mr. Evertsen noted that approximately \$2 million is available in the account, with approximately \$1.2 million designated for the baffle box project associated with the Orange County and Citadel Island stormwater system. The current water level was reported to be approximately one and a half feet lower. Once those funds are reimbursed, they are expected to be returned to the account and used to begin dredging other canals, including Barbie and Willoughby. Comm Lance questioned why those canals would take precedence; it was explained that they were prioritized based on the order previously approved by vote, with Venetian believed to be third on the list.

Attorney Langley stated that it was clear the City had accepted and maintained the roads, but he was not certain that the City had similarly accepted ownership or maintenance responsibility for the canals through any action taken after the plat was recorded. He also noted that the Navigation Board was established by an act of the State Legislature, believed to be in 1957. He expressed concern about concluding that the City is responsible when state law provides that the Board is responsible for functions involving the canals, including construction and repair, drainage, and regulation and control of water levels.

Discussion continued regarding the responsibilities of the Navigation Board and Orange County. Mr. Evertsen stated that the Board makes recommendations to the County. Attorney Langley noted a distinction between the County choosing not to perform work and whether it may be legally obligated to do so. He reiterated that he was not suggesting Council could not take action, but was identifying the available considerations and options.

Mr. Evertsen clarified that his letter focused primarily on maintenance of the stormwater outfalls, stating that the accumulated material was deposited through the City's system and that the City is required to remove that material.

Discussion continued regarding the stormwater drains and culverts on Venetian Drive. Staff did not know when the drains were originally installed but confirmed the pipes were cleaned about a month and a half earlier. Staff explained that the roadside drains are approximately 15 inches, limiting the amount of material that can pass through them, and noted that vegetation and other conditions along the canal may also contribute to accumulated debris. Staff clarified that the larger culvert beneath the roadway is approximately 36 inches and, when recently cleaned, contained sediment estimated at slightly less than 50 percent of its capacity. Staff confirmed that the City had performed maintenance on the pipe beneath the roadway but stated that determining whether such maintenance established City ownership of the canal was not within staff's authority.

Concern was expressed about leaving responsibility unresolved between the City and County while the canal remains in its current condition, including the potential safety risk posed by the accumulated muck. Council also asked whether any dredging cost estimates were available. Comm Gold noted a preliminary estimate obtained through Google AI, based on an assumed canal length of approximately 1,500 feet and width of up to 60 feet, suggesting a range of approximately \$125,000 to \$750,000, not including processing-related costs. It was then clarified that the canal is approximately 30 feet wide, and no formal cost estimate was presented.

Comm Lance stated support for cleaning the canals on the Conway Chain of Lakes, referencing approximately 26 years of prior service on the Navigation Board. He recalled that the Board had previously cleaned canals throughout the area and confirmed that the Venetian Canal has significant debris near the culverts and that lake levels are currently approximately one and a half feet lower. He noted that the Navigation Board is state-chartered and has responsibilities related to canal maintenance. He referenced a 1996 Florida Supreme Court case concerning ownership of areas below and above the high-water mark and stated that other canals may also have property lines ending at the high-water mark. He also noted that residents have already been paying into an MSTU that funds the Navigation Board and expressed concern that creating another assessment could result in residents paying twice for canal maintenance.

Comm Lance stated that the Navigation Board has funding and a fiduciary responsibility to use those funds appropriately. He acknowledged that other canal projects are currently ahead of Venetian on the priority list, with Barbie/Willoughby preceding Venetian, but suggested that Venetian should be considered for a higher priority. He noted that previous efforts involving Barbie/Willoughby encountered additional constraints, including hardpan and the inability to obtain hold-harmless agreements from all affected property owners. He stated that similar agreements from affected residents may be necessary for canal work. He also discussed debris resulting from Hurricanes Irma and Ian, stating that FEMA funding may have been available for storm-related canal debris removal and that the City and Navigation Board should monitor those opportunities more closely in the future. He encouraged residents to assist by keeping leaves and vegetation out of the canal and preventing fertilizer runoff that could contribute to water-quality and vegetation problems. Based on residents' longstanding MSTU payments and the Navigation Board's previous canal maintenance activities, the Council member stated that he believed precedent had been established for the Navigation Board to take responsibility for funding and pursuing the cleaning of the Venetian Canal. He committed to assisting residents and the

City in finding a way to have the canal cleaned without waiting several years. Discussion ensued.

CM Rudometkin discussed the funding, ownership, and maintenance questions associated with dredging the Venetian Canal. He noted that reimbursement would need to be considered if the City initially funded the work, including whether reimbursement could come from the Navigation Board, Orange County, residents, or another source. He stated that although the canal is within City limits, he was not convinced that the City owns it and had obtained a third-party opinion from the City's civil engineer because of the uncertainty. He stated that if Council wanted the canal cleaned, staff would carry out that direction; however, the primary concern was how the project would be funded. He explained that the matter was more complicated than simply allocating funds because questions remain regarding ownership and maintenance responsibility, an RFP may be required for the work, environmental requirements must be considered, and staff needs to verify whether the work qualifies for any statutory maintenance exemption.

CM Rudometkin distinguished between ownership and maintenance responsibility, stating that even if Council did not resolve ownership, it could decide whether the City should participate in maintaining the canal. He suggested exploring a potential partnership with the Navigation Board. He clarified that the County uses an MSTU, while the City's stormwater funding is a special assessment, and noted that a special assessment for the affected community could potentially provide funding for future canal dredging. He stated that he did not necessarily agree that all of the accumulated muck resulted from City storm drains, noting that vegetation, acorns, leaves, and other material also enter the canal. He clarified that approximately \$112,000 in Hurricane Irma reimbursement would return to the stormwater fund. While it had been suggested that stormwater funds could be used for the canal work, he stated that staff had also found information suggesting they possibly could not and would need to research the issue further. Because the City was already near completion of the budget process, the City Manager recommended completing the budget and returning to Council with additional information. He stated that staff could return within approximately 60 days after October 1 with information requested by Council. No formal dredging cost was available; the only figure discussed was a preliminary estimate of approximately \$125,000 to \$750,000, described as a rough estimate based on the map. He also reminded Council of other financial obligations, including roads and drainage, and the potential financial impact of Amendment Three in November.

Comm Partin then referenced an August 19, 2025 email stating that money had been budgeted to clean the area on both sides of Venetian and asked whether that work had been completed. CM Rudometkin explained that the budgeted project involved the City's stormwater infrastructure at Venetian Road. The City had cleaned the 15-inch drainage pipes, the approximately 36-inch pipe beneath Venetian, and the concrete outfall areas extending approximately three to five feet from the roadway. The larger pipe was reported to have been approximately 50% filled with sediment. He confirmed that the budgeted work had been completed but emphasized that the contractor did not extend beyond the concrete outfall areas into the canal itself. The City considered its maintenance responsibility for that project to extend from the roadway grates through the drainage pipes and into the immediate concrete outfall area; the additional muck being discussed was located farther into the canal.

Discussion continued regarding the Navigation Board's available funding and future financial constraints. It was noted that if the proposed property tax amendment passes, the Navigation Board could also experience a significant reduction in funding because the previously increased MSTU rate is scheduled to sunset in approximately a year and a half, potentially reducing available funding by nearly 50%. Mr. Evertsen outlined existing Navigation Board expenses, including street sweeping for Belle Isle, lake navigation activities, approximately \$109,000 for marine patrol activities, approximately \$45,000 annually for cleaning baffle boxes and inlet baskets, and approximately \$100,000 for new lake markers. He provided the City Attorney with a highlighted statute that he stated contains maintenance exemptions for canals, outfalls, and drainage canals. He referenced his approximately 30 years of experience cleaning canals and stormwater outfalls and expressed confidence in the exemption. Mr. Evertsen recommended that the City Manager or Mayor attend a Navigation Board meeting to formally raise the matter and work toward moving the project forward.

After further discussion, Attorney Langley summarized the discussion and stated that there appeared to be a desire to address the canal, but questions remained regarding jurisdiction, responsibility, and funding. He recommended that Council direct the City Manager and City Attorney to consult with Orange County attorneys and EPD to obtain the County's position on whether the Navigation Control District has jurisdiction and responsibility for maintaining the canal. Attorney Langley agreed that the canal is not privately owned and was publicly dedicated, but stated that the remaining question is whether Orange County accepted that dedication through the state law establishing the District and giving it authority to control, regulate, and maintain canals within its boundaries, including within Belle Isle. He emphasized the need to clarify the County's position before the City takes action that could conflict with the District's authority. If Orange County formally determines that the canal is Belle Isle's responsibility and Council accepts that position, the City Attorney recommended that Council next adopt a resolution formally accepting ownership and maintenance

responsibility for the canal. The City would then need to determine how the maintenance and dredging would be funded.

There being no further discussion, Comm Bobrowski moved to direct the City Attorney to enter into conversations with EPD and the Orange County Attorney to verify ownership of said Venetian Canal and report back to us within 60 days. Comm Lance seconded the motion, which passed unanimously 7:0.

- b) RESOLUTION 26-07 - A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BELLE ISLE, FLORIDA, ESTABLISHING THE LAW ENFORCEMENT TRUST FUND AS A SPECIAL REVENUE FUND PURSUANT TO SECTION 932.7055, FLORIDA STATUTES; APPROVING THE DEPOSIT OF CONTRABAND FORFEITURE PROCEEDS; PROVIDING FOR THE FUTURE APPROPRIATION AND EXPENDITURE OF FUND RESOURCES; PROVIDING FOR ACCOUNTING, REPORTING, CONFLICTS, SEVERABILITY, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

CM Rudometkin read the Resolution by Title

The City Manager presented the resolution establishing a fund for contraband forfeiture proceeds, noting that Council had previously discussed the matter and that the resolution was necessary to create the appropriate fund. The Police Chief confirmed that establishing the fund would allow current and future forfeiture proceeds to be properly deposited and that it was required before the funds could be spent. Chief Grimm clarified that the proceeds must be placed in a specific law enforcement fund and cannot simply be distributed by percentage or placed into another general-purpose fund.

Comm Bobrowski moved to approve Resolution #26-07, a resolution of the City Council of the City of Belle, Isle, Florida, establishing the Law Enforcement Trust Fund as a special revenue fund pursuant to Section 932.7055, Florida statutes approving the deposit of contraband forfeiture proceeds, providing for the future appropriation and expenditure of fund resources, providing for accounting, reporting, conflicts of availability, and effective date. Comm Partin seconded the motion, which passed unanimously upon roll call, 7:0.

- c) Approval of City Planner April Fisher Contract 2026/2027

CM Rudometkin presented the annual contract renewal for April Fisher, noting that her current contract expires at the end of September. Ms. Fisher could not attend the meeting due to family medical matters but indicated she was willing to continue providing services to the City for another year. He stated that Ms. Fisher continues to do a great job and that retaining her as a consultant provides cost savings to the City. The proposed contract includes an increase similar to those requested by other vendors, which had already been included in the budget and reviewed twice by the Budget Committee. Staff requested Council approval to renew Ms. Fisher's contract for another year.

Comm Lance moved to approve the contract extension with Fisher Planning & Development Services Inc. for the city planner position as outlined in the update document.

Comm Bobrowski seconded the motion, which passed 5:2, with Comm Partin and Comm Oller, nay.

Mayor Carson announced and added Item D under New Business to address actions taken during the Budget Workshop. Attorney Langley clarified that formal motions are not permissible during a workshop, although Council may reach consensus, and advised that Council could ratify the votes taken during the workshop.

Comm Bobrowski moved to ratify the workshop votes concerning school crossing guard wages and the COLA percentage. It was clarified that the motion was ratifying the votes as they occurred during the workshop and was not reopening the discussion.

Comm Lance seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

10. Attorney's Report - NA

11. City Manager's Report

- a. City Manager's Report & Work Plan

CM Rudometkin provided an update regarding the Hurricane Ian FEMA reimbursement. He reported receiving correspondence from KPMG and DEP and stated that he and the City Attorney were reviewing the matter. He explained that he would not sign the form as presented because he did not want it to appear that the City was accepting the current offer of zero reimbursement. CM Rudometkin stated that an appeal process is available and that he would work with the City Attorney to prepare a letter explaining why the City does not accept the determination and intends to appeal. The letter will be brought to Council for review before FEMA issues its final determination. Once FEMA provides its final determination, the entire matter will return to Council for a workshop to review the determination and discuss the City's next steps in the appellate process.

b. Chief's Report

Chief Grimm presented the July Month in Review, noting increases in DUI incidents and fraud cases. He reported that two crashes were DUI-related and encouraged Council and residents to remain aware of fraud and scams. Residents were encouraged to contact the Police Department when uncertain about suspicious offers or communications so staff can assist with verification and provide fraud information. Chief Grimm also provided an update on school traffic, stating that traffic was difficult during the first days of school but had steadily improved. By the end of the second week, morning traffic was operating nearly as smoothly as possible and was moving at approximately the same pace experienced at the end of the previous school year. Additional improvement is anticipated once school construction is completed and the traffic pattern changes.

In response to a question regarding the previously discussed FDOT signage project, the Chief stated that the project had been approved by FDOT but was still awaiting funding. Staff will continue following up with FDOT. It was noted that the process would take time, with hope that the improvements could be completed by the end of the school year.

Mayor Carson asked for an update on the Flock Cameras. Council discussed placing a Flock camera informational item on the next September meeting agenda to discuss privacy requirements and related questions. It was also noted that Orange County had recently arrested individuals in connection with vandalism of Flock cameras. The Mayor and Police Chief will prepare the agenda item for the next meeting. Council further thanked the Police Department and staff for its service and noted that northbound traffic on Orange Avenue during the school period has improved compared with the previous year.

c. Public Works Report

Phil Price reported that the City will complete a paving project on McCoy Road between Daetwyler and Via Flora, limited to the westbound lane. Work is scheduled to begin at approximately 8:00 p.m. Sunday and be completed by 6:00 a.m. Monday. Information regarding the project was posted on Facebook and distributed to the public. He also reported that staff continue to address routine maintenance and mowing despite the summer heat. Council expressed appreciation to the Public Works staff for their continued efforts and hard work.

d. Community Compliance Officer

CCO McKuhen presented the July Code Compliance monthly report, noting that since beginning on July 6, she was provided 103 existing cases and was able to close 60 cases during July. She reported that RV-related cases represented the largest category, with 11 cases opened and 14 closed. For structure-related cases, including canopies, eight cases were opened, and one was closed during July, with additional cases subsequently closed in August. Council expressed appreciation for the report and discussed providing regular Code Compliance statistics to help demonstrate the Department's activity and progress. By consensus, Council agreed to include the Code Compliance report monthly under the City Manager's Report at the second Council meeting of each month.

12. Mayor's Report

Mayor Carson thanked Council and staff for their continued work and discussion on the budget, recognizing the number of significant issues being considered. He expressed appreciation for the ability of Council and staff to discuss differing viewpoints while maintaining professionalism and decorum. He reported efforts to support the Police Department and Public Works employees working outdoors in the heat. He contacted individuals in the fitness industry regarding possible donations or reduced pricing for hydration products and cooling equipment. He noted that Wilderness Athlete provided a sample package of hydration products and bottles and that he had also contacted companies regarding cooling towels. He emphasized the importance of keeping employees hydrated and safe while working in high temperatures. Mayor Carson recognized Police, Public Works, and City staff for their work, much of which may not be visible to residents. He specifically emphasized that his priority is the safety and security of the City's residents and children and expressed appreciation for employees who work each day to maintain the City, its parks, streets, and public safety.

13. Commissioners' Report

Council thanked staff, the Police Department, and Public Works for their continued support.

Comm Lowell clarified for the record that Navigation Board funding supports Marine Patrol services for both Belle Isle and Orange County, not solely Belle Isle. The Council member stated that Orange County receives funding as well, believed to be a larger amount, and expressed the view that Orange County's enforcement activity is less significant.

Comm Lance recognized a Daetwyler Shores resident who has raised concerns regarding the area's water lines and initiated efforts to address the issue. He thanked those who have been proactive in responding and assisting with the situation. He welcomed Mrs. Sacco and Mr. Miller and thanked them for attending and remaining engaged in City matters. Mrs. Sacco noted that she continues to watch Council meetings remotely. He also announced that Orlando Magic player Jonathan Isaac would speak at a men's breakfast at Discovery Church the following Tuesday morning and provided information for those interested in attending.

14. Adjournment

There being no further business, Mayor Carson called for a motion to adjourn, which was unanimously approved at 8:45 pm.