
RE: Dredging Assessment

From Dana A. Souza <Dana.Souza@mysanibel.com>

Date Mon 6/2/2025 6:53 PM

To Heidi Mazel <heidi.mazel@yahoo.com>

Cc Vicki L. Smith <vicki.smith@mysanibel.com>; Scotty L. Kelly <Scotty.Kelly@mysanibel.com>

Ms. Mazel – Thank you for your email. You did not receive a letter form the City concerning the Wulfert Channel/Dinkins Bayou Dredging Project as your property is not proposed to be in the assessment area. Only waterfront properties that would benefit from the proposed project would be assessed, if approved by the City Council. I have inserted an image below that shows the limits of the assessment area in the Del Sega area. I hope this email answers your question. If not, please feel free to contact me at your convenience.

Best wishes,

Dana



Dana A. Souza
City Manager
City of Sanibel
800 Dunlop Rd. – Sanibel, FL 33957
dana.souza@mysanibel.com www.mysanibel.com
PHONE: 239-472-3700 |

Florida has a very broad public records law. Most written communications to or from the City of Sanibel regarding City business are public records available to the public and media upon request. Your e-mail communications, including your email address, may be subject to public disclosure

From: Heidi Mazel <heidi.mazel@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, June 2, 2025 12:10 PM
To: Dana A. Souza <Dana.Souza@mysanibel.com>
Subject: Dredging Assessment

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

[Report Suspicious](#)

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Ms. Souza, our address is 6447 Pine Avenue, Sanibel, FL 33957. I have received information from the neighbors that a mailing was sent regarding a significant assessment to cover dredging of the canal and surrounding waterways. I did not receive that mailing. However, from what I understood the assessment would be levied on all Del Sega residents, and the amount is approximately \$11,000, with a recurring annual assessment of a lesser amount. Please let me know if that understanding is correct. If so, my comment is that it is becoming impossible to remain a resident of Sanibel. Tourism is drastically down. Both insurance costs and property taxes are becoming prohibitively expensive. Repairs on the house are also increasing in cost. If the idea is to chase everyone off the island so that it is vacant, then the dredging assessment makes sense.

Additionally, whom does this dredging benefit? I don't use the canal. We aren't on the canal. Is the assessment levied on everyone on the island who also does not utilize the canal?

Please let me know the answers to my questions. Thank you.
Heidi Mazel

From: Courtney Lawton <court4jr@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 2, 2025 6:23 PM
To: citymanager <citymanager@mysanibel.com>
Subject: Wulfert/Dinkens Bayou Dredge Question

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

[Report Suspicious](#)

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Hello Ms. Souza,

My husband and I are in an assessment area and are wondering if Blind pass will also be dredged or is it just the channels? We're hoping the entire entry through Blind Pass (up to the bridge) to our homes is addressed since it's so shallow. Just wanted to confirm.

Sincerely,

Courtney Lawton

From: Michael Kluth <kluthdds@msn.com>
Sent: Monday, June 2, 2025 5:27:36 PM
To: Vicki L. Smith <vicki.smith@mysanibel.com>
Subject: Please read before June 3 City Council Meeting

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Hello,

Please see attachment I am sharing, which was written by our neighbors, the Hinckleys. The letter is very well written and well stated and research was done. I could not share my thoughts as well as as expressed in this letter so I am attaching it for your review.

That being said, I would like to add my own thoughts as a homeowner on Sanibel Island since 2012. The letter we received regarding the assessments arrived at our Indiana address only a few days ago. Very little time to prepare a response let alone be able to attend the council meeting tomorrow. We were quite appalled that this meeting is occurring at a time when very few homeowners are present on the island. And we are appalled at the short notice given. Let alone the contents of the letter. After three hurricanes in the past few years, redoing our landscaping and restoring our house to the tune of \$600,000, we are TIRED. We are WEARY. And we are going broke trying to stay on the island.

The letter we received felt like a gut punch. We get the dredging needs to occur. Perhaps find A BETTER WAY TO FUND IT than sticking it to Sanibel homeowners.....again.

Joni Kluth
6407 Pine Ave

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

The Sanibel City Council
800 Dunlop Road
Sanibel, Florida 33957

Sunday, June 1, 2025

RE: The Wulfert and Dinkins Bayou Dredging Project and Special Assessment District

Dear Council Members,

While the navigation issue may be real, we do not feel this SAD is the appropriate solution.

We are writing to oppose the Special Assessment District as currently proposed.

- The notice period for this meeting agenda on June 3rd was way too short. Many affected residents did not receive this notice in time to prepare to comment in an informed manner.
- If you make an approximate count of the affected abutters (i.e., those with boats large enough to encounter problems navigating the Dinkins Bayou entrance or Wulfert Channel) we feel that it will be a small percentage of the affected abutters. Suppose it might be 40 users, yet another 160 abutters are being asked to pay to solve this issue. We have personally navigated all the canals off Dinkins Bayou often, and while we have never counted the number of large draft boats, it is not enormous.
- One resident abutting Dinkins Bayou asserts that he has had no issues using a 28 ft. Dauntless in the waters.
- We have not received a copy of the legal reasoning whereby Sanibel decides that this is its problem.
- Wulfert Channel and Dinkins Bayou are Navigable Waters within the meaning of the act, and as such are the responsibility of the USACE (US Army Corps of Engineers); please see sections of the US CFR attached.
- Abutters are being asked/told to pay for work which will not benefit most of them; however, this dredging project will benefit many non-Sanibel residents, who will not be required to pay for any of this work. This project is at a minimum one which should be funded by Lee County and the State, not by local residents of Sanibel.
- Mention is made of protecting property values of abutters. Is protection of property value actually one of the responsibilities of the City of Sanibel?
- If a future claim is made by a boater alleging that the dredging is improperly done, will abutters in the SAD be liable?
- Sanibel has experienced three hurricanes in three years. The waters of the Caribbean and the Gulf of Mexico are warming so fast that hurricanes now develop independently in those seas, without having begun off the west coast of Africa. Two of those storms (Ian

and Milton) had enormous effects on the profiles of the Wulfert and Dinkins Bayou channels. The proposed 10 year planning horizon is meaningless when we contemplate that more such hurricanes are highly likely to occur within that horizon. What happens then? Will dredging be done sooner than 2035? Who will then pay for it?

- The last dredge of Blind Pass and part of the Wulfert Channel was in 2017. Following that there was a comprehensive, and very public, process to review the dredging template for future work. Those of us who participated provided input to the planning firm about the historic pattern of flows through Sunset Bay. When the firm ran their model with that modification, they found that adding to the dredging template to include Sunset Bay would significantly improve flows through Blind Pass.
- For those interested in the dredging history of Blind Pass, please visit [this page](#).
- The last dredging was done for environmental reasons, not to improve navigation.
- The 2019 management plan in which many of us participated, is reported [here](#). If you scroll down to page 10 of that report, you will see the final preferred option, Figure 5. **That option would resolve whatever issues boaters may feel they now face.**
- The current proposed dredging and funding is a short-sighted effort, with no apparent responses to a re-occurrence in a period less than the 10 year planning horizon. Meanwhile, abutters are expected to pay an annual tax which will not suffice to respond to re-occurring storm changes. When this navigation problem happens again in 5 years, will the SAD feel obliged, or be allowed to make additional assessments?

We urge the Council to at a minimum table this project until answers to these points are more carefully researched. Fundamentally, this dredging should not be undertaken by the City of Sanibel when it so clearly benefits many users from other communities, and so few of the abutters.

If the Council decides to proceed with this effort, then at a very bare minimum the affected abutters should have the opportunity to vote on this proposal; to do otherwise amounts to taxation without representation.

US CFR:

<https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-33/chapter-II/part-329>

<https://www.nap.usace.army.mil/Portals/39/docs/regulatory/regs/33cfr329.pdf>

§ 329.4 General definition.

Navigable waters of the United States are those waters that are subject to the ebb and flow of the tide and/or are presently used, or have been used in the past, or may be susceptible for use to transport interstate or foreign commerce. A determination of navigability, once made,

applies laterally over the entire surface of the waterbody, and is not extinguished by later actions or events which impede or destroy navigable capacity.

§ 329.7 Intrastate or interstate nature of waterway.

A waterbody may be entirely within a state, yet still be capable of carrying interstate commerce. This is especially clear when it physically connects with a generally acknowledged avenue of interstate commerce, such as the ocean or one of the Great Lakes, and is yet wholly within one state. Nor is it necessary that there be a physically navigable connection across a state boundary. Where a waterbody extends through one or more states, but substantial portions, which are capable of bearing interstate commerce, are located in only one of the states, the entirety of the waterway up to the head (upper limit) of navigation is subject to Federal jurisdiction.

329.12 Geographic and jurisdictional limits of oceanic and tidal waters.

(a) ***Ocean and coastal waters.*** The navigable waters of the United States over which Corps of Engineers regulatory jurisdiction extends include all ocean and coastal waters within a zone three geographic (nautical) miles seaward from the baseline (The Territorial Seas). Wider zones are recognized for special regulatory powers exercised over the outer continental shelf. (See [33 CFR 322.3\(b\)](#)).

Sincerely,

Katherine and Dan Hinckley
2498 Harbour Lane
Sanibel, Florida 33957

From: Taylor Heilpern-Baxter <jthbax@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 2, 2025 5:23:22 PM
To: Vicki L. Smith <vicki.smith@mysanibel.com>; Dana A. Souza
<Dana.Souza@mysanibel.com>
Subject: City Council Meeting- Dredging Assessment

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Dear Sanibel City Council Members,

We are writing to express our strong opposition to the proposed dredging assessment that would require 202 property owners to pay over \$10,600, with an additional \$1,200 annually starting in 2026. The maintenance of public waterways (accessed by ALL, residents and non-residents), should not be the responsibility of a select body of residents. I would like to know of the 202 residents, how many own boats and how many care for this proposed plan to come to fruition? Have you completed a survey? How did you determine who and who not to include in the financial responsibility of this? We did not even receive a letter notifying us of this assessment, and we do not own a boat.

As home owners on this island, we care deeply about preserving it and doing all that we can to be valuable members of this community. However, there is a right and wrong way to go about city proposals. We are hearing of this plan for the first time within the last 48 hours and it was through word of mouth.

We respectfully ask that you pause this proposal in its current form and take the time needed to thoughtfully revisit how our public resources are funded- with full transparency and proper notice for all island residents.

Thank you,
The Property Owners of 6424 Pine Ave

From: mike kluth <mikekluth@icloud.com>
Sent: Monday, June 2, 2025 5:20:07 PM
To: Vicki L. Smith <vicki.smith@mysanibel.com>
Subject: Wulfert/ Dinkins dredging

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

[Report Suspicious](#)

To the city leaders of Sanibel ,

I am writing this letter in strong opposition to the proposed dredging of the waterways around our homes .

There are several factors involved in my decision .

1. This is being imposed on residents unfairly and should not be shouldered only by the immediate homeowners . Everyone in a vessel on the waterways can use these areas and should therefore not be paid by a select few residents
2. This is taxation without representation and you are possibly exposing the city to a wide range of lawsuits , both class action and individual .
3. This is “ rushed “ in my opinion and should at least be tabled for further review
4. Imposing an additional annual tax on our homes for “ future work “ is not only burdensome but unfair and will also be fought in the courts . How can we be assured this assessment will not be unilaterally raised whenever the council deems necessary ?
5. I feel our island , and you as city leaders , are entirely focusing on the wrong targets. This particular project does not even dredge out Blind Pass . (The only area that has very shallow water for the majority of the project area and affects passage to Pine Island Sound and the gulf .) The areas that some residents are complaining about have been that way since we bought on Sanibel 15 years ago. The hurricanes did not severely change these areas . The jetty on Captiva did and our lack of installing the same type of jetty on Sanibel.
6. The Very short time frame for this vote seems “ preplanned “ the majority of us residents are at our summer residents or working since this is at 9:00 am . I personally still work and will be treating patients and can not attend . That is just not right .

Professionally yours ,
Michael Kluth , DDS

Sent from my iPhone

From: Bill Baumgartner <wbaumgar@jhmi.edu>
Sent: Monday, June 2, 2025 4:23 PM
To: Dana A. Souza <Dana.Souza@mysanibel.com>
Cc: Betsy Baumgartner <betsy.baumgartner@gmail.com>; Mike Miller <Mike.Miller@mysanibel.com>
Subject: Your recent letter

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

[Report Suspicious](#)

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Dear Dana,

Thank you for your letter regarding the potential assessment for dredging activities in waterways that fall under state or federal jurisdiction. We appreciate the city's effort to address long-standing concerns related to navigability and environmental conditions in these areas.

However, we would like to respectfully raise a concern regarding the proposed financial responsibility being placed on local waterfront residents for a project involving state or federal waterways. As these waterways are not privately owned and are under the regulatory authority of higher levels of government, it is unclear why local residents should bear the cost of a project that arguably serves a broader public interest—particularly when dredging may support commercial navigation, public safety, ecological restoration, or tourism.

We believe it would be more appropriate for the city to first seek support, funding, or cost-sharing agreements from the relevant state or federal agencies before considering local assessments.

We respectfully object to the ongoing tax to pay for future dredging. Having residents' money sit in your bank account obtaining interest doesn't seem right. No one can predict whether current residents will still be in their homes several years from now. Future dredging and its payment methodology should be addressed at that time.

Finally, it seems to us, the timing of this email-notice and the subsequent planned Council meetings to discuss this assessment seems rushed and at a time when many of the affected residents are away for the summer.

We respectfully request that the city provide additional information about addressing funding strategies and potential alternatives. Before moving forward, opportunities for

public discussion should be provided during the upcoming season when the majority of residents have returned to the island.

Thank you for your attention to this matter, and we look forward to continued dialogue.

Sincerely,
Bill and Betsy Baumgartner
2469 Blind Pass Court
Sanibel, FL

From: Jeff Cavanagh <jeffcava64@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 2, 2025 4:02 PM
To: John Henshaw <John.Henshaw@mysanibel.com>; Holly Smith <Holly.Smith@mysanibel.com>; Richard Johnson <richard.johnson@mysanibel.com>; Laura J. DeBruce <laura.debruce@mysanibel.com>; Vicki L. Smith <vicki.smith@mysanibel.com>; Mike Miller <Mike.Miller@mysanibel.com>
Subject: Dinkin Bayou Dredging

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

[Report Suspicious](#)

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Vicki Smith and City Council Members,

Thank you for the work that has been done to address the need to dredge Blind Pass and eventually Dinkins Bayou. I have been communicating the need for dredging Blind Pass for almost a year now with Holly Milbrandt of the city and Steve Boutelle of Lee County. I am sorry but I will not be able to attend the meeting tomorrow as I will be traveling and I just received the letter from you last week. I want to convey my thoughts as this subject is very important to me. Dredging Dinkins and not Blind Pass is putting the cart before the horse. As long as one sticks to the west shore of Dinkins there is not an issue unless it is during the lowest of tides. However, even at the highest of tides, my 23 foot center console will run aground in the marked channel crossing Blind Pass or exiting to Pine Island Sound.

1. What is the scope of the project and what are the full benefits of it?

Will the engineering report and the proposal for the work to be completed be shared with residents before this is approved so that residents can make a more informed decision regarding this project? A cost-benefit analysis seems like it would be important for a project of this magnitude and expense. For example, is the proposed dredging area in line with the area(s) of concern and are there additional benefits such as water quality and storm resilience?

2. The proposed Assessment District seems too limited.

Are there benefits to water quality and /or storm resilience as a result of this project? If this is the case, it seems that the Assessment District should be expanded to include the largest landholders along the Bayous: Lee County, US Fish and Wildlife as well as property owners on Clam Bayou.

Further, there are two communities with community boat ramps that access Dinkins Bayou. It does not appear that these properties are included in the Assessment District, which makes the number of properties in the District smaller than it should be and therefore the cost higher per property owner.

Beyond this, this is not a closed waterway. It is enjoyed by boaters and fishermen from all areas and adds to the appeal of Lee County which makes it a tourism issue as well. It seems that more needs to be done to expand the group of contributors to this project so that the cost is shared more fairly.

3. Is this proposal the most cost effective way to address navigation concerns? Could there be federal funding available to assist?

I understand that an engineering firm prepared a study and that a contractor provided a cost proposal. Is this the most cost effective way to achieve the desired result? Would there be any federal funding available particularly if much of the need to dredge is a result of recent storms?

4. Proposed tax increase.

I understand that this current proposed project is expected to be effective for the next ten years. The proposed tax increase asks that current property owners pay for a project that benefits owners from 2025- 2035 AND property owners that own property from 2035-2045. IF dredging is necessary in 2035, the people that own property in 2035 should pay for that project at that time.

Any number of environmental issues/ events may occur between now and 2035 that may affect whether dredging will be necessary or how extensive any dredging project must be at that time. It does not seem reasonable for current owners to fund an additional future project that is not known in scope or necessity at this time. Many current owners will not even own property on these waterways during 2035-2045.

Regards

Jeff Cavanagh
5690 Sanibel Captiva Rd
Sanibel FL 33957

jeffcava64@gmail.com
616-836-2857

From: kebeane@gmail.com

Date: June 2, 2025 at 3:47:09 PM EDT

To: citymanager@mysanibel.com

Subject: Fwd: proposed dredging assessment 05/21/2025

Douglas & Karen Beane are owners of 2539 Coconut on Sanibel and have not (even as of this date) received any letter [notifying.us](https://www.notifying.us) of this proposed dredging assessment.

Several of our neighbors have been in touch jUNE 1, 2025, so we now have a copy of this full letter with a proposed \$10,000 assessment amount going to 202 residential property owners. There is also a \$1200.00 year amount added to taxes for maintenance of this work. With this short notice I have some questions and concerns especially where I would not be able to make the June 6th meeting

1. Why was not enough notice given (some like us not at all) to these 202 properties in order to attend a meeting June 6th? I would also think that at least 40% of these property owners are not in Sanibel at this time of year.
2. We are currently (as of yesterday June 1st) to be in the 2025 hurricane season so any proposal or any work performed prior to November or December this year might be useless or of no value. Has this proposal gone out to bid to several contractors?
3. This proposal opens up public water access. Why do the 202 residential people who have already incurred such terrible property damage and costs targeted be the largest contributor?
4. Is this the result of the beach nourishment prior to Ian which after Milton and Helene filled the bayous?
5. Doesnt Lee County, Captiva, and DES have a say in all of this?

Shouldn't this be postponed for a later date with open forums for all of us (missing or local) to hear and respond to?

Sincerely,

Karen Beane



Karen Beane
Broker/Owner
Blue Water Realty Group LLC
office: 603-293-0171
cell: 603-387-6966
email: Karen.Beane@BWRsells.com
www.BWRsells.com

From: John Alam <joalam@verizon.net>

Sent: Monday, June 2, 2025 3:18 PM

To: John Henshaw <John.Henshaw@mysanibel.com>; Mike Miller <Mike.Miller@mysanibel.com>; Holly Smith <Holly.Smith@mysanibel.com>; Richard Johnson <richard.johnson@mysanibel.com>; Laura J. DeBruce <laura.debruce@mysanibel.com>; Vicki L. Smith <vicki.smith@mysanibel.com>; Cindy Alam <cindyalam01@gmail.com>

Subject: Support for Wulfert Channel & Dinkins Bayou Dredging Project

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

[Report Suspicious](#)

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Everyone.

Thank you for your work representing the city of Sanibel.

While dredging the bayou is a good idea, it seems to me this is the job of an HOA. When an HOA is not available the neighbors can get together and arrange it. This would be more fair and better for the home owners.

Not clear from your letter is whether a bidding process was performed. Also not clear is whether a way to minimize the effort has been considered.

An HOA would serve me better and it would help me control more closely this for ever fund.

Thanks again.

John Alam
5850 San Cap.

From: Heidi Wegryn Gross <grosstacular@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, June 2, 2025 3:09 PM

To: Sarah Lopez <throughthelens528@gmail.com>; Marcel Ventura <marcelventura@prodigy.net>; Alex Herrey <awhq@generalmail.net>; Alan Antley <anb1040@gmail.com>; William & Muriel Primm <cmwy10a@msn.com>; Janis Gregg <sanibeljanis@gmail.com>; Judy Bellistri <judy.bellistri@gmail.com>; Joan and Steve Szynal <szynals@hotmail.com>; Rig Baldwin Sr. <RBaldwinSr@baldwin-seraina.com>; Babs Maughan <barbara@maughan.com>; Vicki L. Smith <vicki.smith@mysanibel.com>; Melissa Lehman <malehman@icloud.com>; Steven Triantafyllou <STriantafyllou@comcast.net>; Jeff D Harvey <jdharvey11@gmail.com>

Subject: Fwd: Dredging of Dinkins bayou etc.

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

[Report Suspicious](#)

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Heidi Gross

first amendment to submission

Please be advised that I am not opposed to dredging of dinkins bayou and blind pass. But I do not feel that adequate notice has not been given to the residents who are affected pursuant to our existing statutes considering the gravitas of this monumental endeavor. At this time of the year, many of our residents rely on mail forwarding and may have had no notice at the time of the hearing nonetheless, they will be affected by your decisions.

Further you are not just removing silting caused by your connecting clam bayou to dinkins bayou but creating new pathways that never existed. Thus creating additional

You relied on inaccurate information from the private engineering firm that has caused not only significant silting by opening clam bayou into Dinkins Bayou but profound erosion of private property. The residents have not been informed if other solutions have not been pursued.

To my knowledge, you have not asked Captiva or Lee County, both of who benefit from this project to participate in the economic impact.

Further the assessment on homeowners is a taxation. As a taxation residents have not been given adequate information regarding the proposal by publication in the local newspapers and by letter within the time frames as required bylaw. This meeting should not go forward until those requirements have been met.

Please refer to Ord. No. 18-002, § 2, 4-3- 2018 sec 94-37 forward to the requirements. Including SEC 58 and section 82-4 22 regarding schedule and notice.

We need more information and we need time to understand the consequences of these decisions before we do more irreparable damage and incur more expenses in trying to maintain navigable waterways.

Respectfully submitted.

Heidi Wegryn Gross, retired Esq. Fl. & N.J.

From: Jennifer McSorley <jenmcsorley@embarqmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 2, 2025 1:48 PM
To: Vicki L. Smith <vicki.smith@mysanibel.com>
Cc: Mike Miller <Mike.Miller@mysanibel.com>; John Henshaw <John.Henshaw@mysanibel.com>; Holly Smith <Holly.Smith@mysanibel.com>; Richard Johnson <richard.johnson@mysanibel.com>; Laura J. DeBruce <laura.debruce@mysanibel.com>
Subject: Dredging Project

This Message Is From an External Sender

[Report Suspicious](#)

This message came from outside your organization.

Vicki Smith and City Council Members,

Thank you for the work that has been done to address the concerns that you have received regarding the need to dredge in the Blind Pass and Dinkins Bayou areas.

I am not a boater but do live in the proposed Assessment District. I did not receive a letter explaining the project but fortunately one of my neighbors sent a copy of it to me.

I am not questioning that there is a need for dredging. I understand that crossing Blind Pass from Roosevelt Channel into Dinkins Bayou is quite shallow and difficult to navigate. I experienced this personally when coming to the island by boat after Ian.

However, I do have a few concerns with the proposal.

1. What is the scope of the project and what are the full benefits of it?

Will the engineering report and the proposal for the work to be completed be shared with residents before this is approved so that residents can make a more informed decision regarding this project? A cost-benefit analysis seems like it would be important for a project of this magnitude and expense. For example, is the proposed dredging area in line with the area(s) of concern and are there additional benefits such as water quality and storm resilience?

2. The proposed Assessment District seems too limited.

Are there benefits to water quality and /or storm resilience as a result of this project? If this is the case, it seems that the Assessment District should be expanded to include the largest landholders along the Bayous: Lee County, US Fish and Wildlife as well as property owners on Clam Bayou.

Further, there are two communities with community boat ramps that access Dinkins Bayou. It does not appear that these properties are included in the Assessment District, which makes the number of properties in the District smaller than it should be and therefore the cost higher per property owner.

Beyond this, this is not a closed waterway. It is enjoyed by boaters and fishermen from all areas and adds to the appeal of Lee County which makes it a tourism issue as well. It seems that more needs to be done to expand the group of contributors to this project so that the cost is shared more fairly.

3. Is this proposal the most cost effective way to address navigation concerns? Could there be federal funding available to assist?

I understand that an engineering firm prepared a study and that a contractor provided a cost proposal. Is this the most cost effective way to achieve the desired result? Would there be any federal funding available particularly if much of the need to dredge is a result of recent storms?

4. Proposed tax increase.

I understand that this current proposed project is expected to be effective for the next ten years. The proposed tax increase asks that current property owners pay for a project that benefits owners from 2025- 2035 AND property owners that own property from 2035- 2045. IF dredging is necessary in 2035, the people that own property in 2035 should pay for that project at that time.

Any number of environmental issues/ events may occur between now and 2035 that may affect whether dredging will be necessary or how extensive any dredging project must be at that time. It does not seem reasonable for current owners to fund an additional future project that is not known in scope or necessity at this time. Many current owners will not even own property on these waterways during 2035-2045.

Additionally, an added tax bill may negatively affect property values for owners in the Assessment District. Some buyers may consider homes without this expense since many homeowners in this area are not boaters but simply prefer the west end location.

Thank you for all the work that you are doing to address the concerns about the west end waterways and for all you do to make Sanibel such a wonderful place to live.

Thank you,

Jen McSorley
5776 Sanibel Captiva Road
Sanibel, FL 33957
239-560-2355

From: Matt Funchion <mfuncion@pennbeer.com>
Sent: Monday, June 2, 2025 1:23 PM
To: Vicki L. Smith <vicki.smith@mysanibel.com>
Cc: Christopher M. Kelly <ckelly@jonesday.com>; 'Diana Funchion' (<dianafunchion@gmail.com>) <dianafunchion@gmail.com>
Subject: Wulfert/Sunset BAY dredging

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

[Report Suspicious](#)

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Hello Vicki, My name is Matt Funchion, and I own a home at 2494 Blind Pass Court in Sanibel. My wife Diana, our children and 8 grandchildren are avid boaters and fishermen. We keep our boat in the back of our house at 2494. We all wholeheartedly support the City of Sanibel plan to begin and complete the dredging project in Wulfert Channel. Completion of this project will enhance boater safety, navigational ease, full enjoyment of our beautiful waterways, protection of our investment in Sanibel and tourism attraction. This plan and funding strategy makes great sense, and we fully endorse beginning the project as soon as possible.

I am planning to be in Sanibel for July 15th meeting, and please let me know if you need any other information from me prior to that meeting. As a very committed member of the community, I am very appreciative of your work and support in getting this very important project completed. Thank you very much. Matt Funchion.

From: NAnCy KRAHMER <krahmer6@verizon.net>
Sent: Monday, June 2, 2025 12:39 PM
To: Dana A. Souza <Dana.Souza@mysanibel.com>
Cc: Chad Krahmer <ckrahmer@baystatefinancial.com>
Subject: Sanibel dredging questions

This Message Is From an External Sender

[Report Suspicious](#)

This message came from outside your organization.

Chad and nancy krahmer reach as directed with our questions and concerns regarding the Santiva dredging project.

Funding Sources

- **Why was this dredging project not funded under Hurricane Ian recovery efforts? Were other island sand displacement projects covered under Ian recovery funds? If so, which ones?**
- **Why weren't Helene or Milton emergency funds utilized for this project? We are still within the two year window to apply for funding. What is being done?**
- **How was the Clam Bayou breach and berm rebuild funded? Was this project managed differently, and if so, how?**
- **What grants or state/federal aid were applied for before costs were passed on to homeowners? Please provide specific information on applications and outcomes.**

Bidding and Cost Transparency

- **Was the dredging project subjected to a competitive bidding process?**
- **How many bids were received, and what was the cost range per cubic yard of dredging?**
- **The current cost appears inconsistent with similar projects —what explains this discrepancy?**
- **Who is financially responsible if the project goes over budget?**
- **If an accident occurs in the Bayou, and homeowners are considered contributors to its upkeep, who holds legal liability?**

Access and Fairness

- **Henderson is a public launch accessible to all Florida residents. Will there be a launch fee in the future to help offset the annual maintenance costs?**
 - **Is Blind Pass Channel included in the dredging scope?**
- This is a significant concern for the boating community.**
- **On the East End, marinas share in dredging costs. Will Castaways Marina contribute its proportionate share (reportedly over 30%)?**

- **Will Castaways residential properties also contribute as homeowners?**

Equity Among Residents

- **Why are all residents being charged equally, when the majority of the dredging seems concentrated in specific areas?**
- **Will residents of Captiva, particularly those across from the Coconut District, be contributing to the project as well?**

**Thank you for your review
Nancy and Chad krahmer
2444 Harbour Lane**

From: Nicholas Weyers <captnick@mostexcellenthfishing.com>

Sent: Monday, June 2, 2025 12:12 PM

To: Mike Miller <Mike.Miller@mysanibel.com>; Holly Smith <Holly.Smith@mysanibel.com>; Laura J. DeBruce <laura.debruce@mysanibel.com>; John Henshaw <John.Henshaw@mysanibel.com>; Richard Johnson <richard.johnson@mysanibel.com>; Vicki L. Smith <vicki.smith@mysanibel.com>; citymanager <citymanager@mysanibel.com>; Dan Hinckley <dbh@suiattle.org>

Subject: Dinkins Bayou dredging project concerns

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

[Report Suspicious](#)

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Hello,

I hope you're all well this Monday afternoon. My name is Nick Weyers and I live full time with my wife and 2 kids at 2540 Coconut Drive down by Blind Pass. I own a marine construction business (Santiva Marine Recovery) and run offshore fishing charters full time. To say that I'm familiar with Dinkins Bayou and that entire area, would be an understatement. I have physically walked most of Dinkins and Blind Pass in waders. My company was responsible for the waterway cleanup from Cayo Costa all the way down to the lighthouse. If you saw the barge and accompanying landing craft picking through the mangroves, that was us. I am in support of fixing the problem but, what is being presented is not a solution. I would love to help in any capacity that I can.

My concerns with this dredging project are many so I guess I'll just start listing them off while trying not to take up too much of your time.

1. The area surveyed for the project does not include any areas that are preventing gulf access for Del Saga and half of the Sanctuary. The issue is much farther back in Dinkins bayou which would only affect residents on Pine Tree, not our neighborhood. The spot that blocks everyone in, isn't even on the survey map. It's in Blind pass.
2. Many residents, while thinking they need dredging, just need their boat slips blown out. Dinkins Bayou is navigable for any size boat that anyone has back there. I've driven massive boats back there with out any issue. Most of Dinkins has a depth of 4' or more. The Sand just moved with the past 2 storms and people don't know the route. I'd be happy show them or place markers to assist.
3. The real problem is in Blind Pass, not Dinkins Bayou. Where you come into Blind pass, the channel markers will force you to run aground. I have found another route that provides plenty of water until you get to the actual problem area. The area is about 20'x40' and is only restrictive

during low tide. That is the area that I brought up at a council meeting, nothing in Dinkins.

4. As you know, the beach renourishment project at Blind Pass is never-ending. As more material is brought in to renourish that beach without there being anything to hold the sand there, or course it ends up in the channels and pass. One tropical storm and that sand is gone and piling up in the backbay where it has caused the channel to be unnavigable. In order to fix this problem, there is only one solution that makes sense to me and that is to mirror Captiva and build a jetty on our side to stop the sand from washing through the pass. It would allow the pass to open up more naturally and improve water quality dramatically for our end of the island and Captiva.
5. The environmental concerns for dredging Dinkins bayou is massive due to all the life that accumulates back there. There are oyster beds everywhere throughout Dinkins. There's an amazing amount of stone crabs and healthy fish populations that come back there. Dredging it would effectively turn it into a mudhole and kill any natural filtration we have.
6. The area that needs to be dredge in the pass has no seagrass or oysterbeds within it. It is truly just beach sand that piled up. This is not a \$3,000,000 fix. This is a job that one crew and an excavator can perform in about 4 days. The navigation markers should be moved to reflect the actual path through.
7. Correct me if I'm wrong but Dinkins and the pass are both naturally formed which would make them state waters and DEP territory. The city assessing us to fix a problem that is possibly out of it's jurisdiction seems problematic to me. I understand that Sanibel owns all the man-made canals but the natural formations connected to the sound seem like state territory to me. But, if you're willing to help, we'll take it.
8. An assessment coming at this time of year when most of the residents down here are gone, has rubbed some people in a certain way. I can only speak for myself and friends in my neighborhood but we do not have an HOA and we like it that way. The idea that we can be assessed for a problem that was caused by a project that wasn't completed in the correct manor by the city is problematic. As section 4 points out, this was 100% caused by the beach renourishment and anyone that lives down here full time, saw it happen in real time. While we appreciate your attention to maintaining our beach, I view it as a massive waste of time and funds until there is a jetty at the bridge. And to shift 66% of the cost to the neighborhood doesn't feel right considering the cause of the problem. As many who came before us, there's no sense in doing a job if it's not going to be done right. \$3,000,000 for a one-time permanent solution, we're all open to that. \$3,000,000 for a band-aid that will fall off in a year

doesn't seem like a good idea and opens up a whole can of worms down the road.

In closing I just wanted to offer my experience and assistance with anything moving forward. Whether that be having my crew dig it out or donating my time to show the necessary people where the issues lie, I'm at your disposal. I intend to attend the meeting tomorrow to voice my concerns both to you and the public in person. I look forward to finding a real solution to this issue and working together to make sure our island stays special. Feel free to call at any time with questions.

Regards,

Capt. Nick Weyers
Santiva Marine Recovery
Most Excellent Fishing
(239) 699-7023
www.mostexcellentfishing.com
nick@santivamarine.com
captnick@mostexcellentfishing.com

From: MERRAY HARRIS <merrayharris@hotmail.com>

Sent: Monday, June 2, 2025 8:17 AM

To: Vicki L. Smith <vicki.smith@mysanibel.com>

Cc: joanne Harris <mucmuc1@comcast.net>; Laura J. DeBruce <laura.debruce@mysanibel.com>; Holly Smith <Holly.Smith@mysanibel.com>; Mike Miller <Mike.Miller@mysanibel.com>; Richard Johnson <richard.johnson@mysanibel.com>; Dana A. Souza <Dana.Souza@mysanibel.com>

Subject: \$10,000 Tax assessment plus \$1200 a year tax increase

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

[Report Suspicious](#)

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Joanne and I are 24/7/365 Sanibel Residents and vote every election

We have been hit hard by Milton, Helene and Ian

We are appalled at receiving a snail mail letter and short notice on this tax increase.

Bullet points

1. We see no value in the dredging to our Family.
2. Housing market is Del Segal has collapsed. A tax increase will not help
3. 300,000CY of silt trucked to a landfill via Henderson Rd????
4. We are paying \$17,000 in taxes for a 1300SF home.
5. We NEED walkable restaurants and a convenience store.
6. I have not found any support among my Neighbors for the dredging
7. We are organizing to fight this TAX INCREASE

Merthyn and Joanne Harris (Merray and Jo)
2464 Blind Pass Ct
Sanibel FL 33957
215-872-1797

From: Arielle Cohen <arielle@cohensalesllc.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 1, 2025 10:05 PM
To: Vicki L. Smith <vicki.smith@mysanibel.com>
Subject: Support for Wulfert/Dinkins Dredging

This Message Is From an External Sender

[Report Suspicious](#)

This message came from outside your organization.

Hi Vicky,

I am writing in support of the proposition to dredge Wulfert Channel and Dinkins Bayou.
This action is necessary for safe waterway navigation in these areas.

Thank you,

Arielle Cohen
5847 Pine Tree Dr.
Sanibel, FL
33957

From: megvborn@icloud.com <megvborn@icloud.com>

Sent: Sunday, June 1, 2025 6:10 PM

To: citymanager <citymanager@mysanibel.com>; Holly Smith <Holly.Smith@mysanibel.com>; Laura J. DeBruce <laura.debruce@mysanibel.com>; mikeimiller@me.com; John Henshaw <John.Henshaw@mysanibel.com>; sancouncil <sancouncil@mysanibel.com>

Subject: The Wulfert and Dinkins Bayou Dredging Project and Special Assessment District

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Vote NO

The Sanibel City Council
800 Dunlop Road
Sanibel, Florida 33957

Sunday, June 1, 2025

RE: The Wulfert and Dinkins Bayou Dredging Project and Special Assessment District

Dear Council Members,

A quick review of Coconut Drive residents shows we never received your mailing regarding the dredging project and assessment. Did you miss a street? Or are you intentionally providing us with too short a time to respond to this proposal? Was it mailed so we would receive it after the meeting? Are you trying to push this through illegally without proper notice? Is there an under-the-table reason for your urgency, similar to what South Seas attempted? Are you behaving like Lee County in this rushed project?

It is rumored that this project is at the special request of only a few of our residents who have deep-water boats; again, comparisons can be drawn between the South Seas and Lee County situation.

The general feeling is that the Sanibel City Council and the City of Sanibel do not have the interests of the West End at heart and that you show favoritism toward the East End. For instance, the City's payment for the Periwinkle bridge is a prime example. That bridge is unnecessary, as the East End can be accessed via Lindgren and East Gulf Drive. It should not be paid for by the City of Sanibel. You are demonstrating favoritism. Comments were made on the bridge favoritism before learning of the dredging project.

A large portion of the boaters using Wulfert Channel are not residents of our neighborhood. In fact, we must keep a watch to ensure these boaters do not come ashore and steal from us. My neighbors and I must lock up everything to prevent theft. Nothing is safe. Therefore, we do not want to dredge the channel to aid and abet thieves.

I recall the rational and reasonable concerns of larger boat owners regarding the ability of any boats to exit and make a right turn towards the Bay into the blind pass strait from Dinkins. Now, I believe the cost to address that area, which absolutely needs to be dredged for anything larger than a canoe to use, is \$50,000. However, it seems that the only area not scheduled for dredging is that very location. The only other "terrible" areas, in my opinion, are the far end of Pine Tree and Sunset Bay (although Sunset needs to be reopened at the Bridge, as it was until Charlie, to allow for proper flushing). Previously, that dredging was part of a city/county/Federal project intended to dredge Blind Pass in 2026 without assessments. I'm attaching the plans below, but it may be a jurisdictional issue, and the County must dredge the affected area necessary to escape Dinkins Bayou while the City thinks it's helping.

While the navigation issue may be real, we do not feel this SAD is the appropriate solution.

We are writing to oppose the Special Assessment District as currently proposed.

- The notice period for this meeting agenda on June 3rd was way too short. Many affected residents did not receive this notice in time to prepare to comment in an informed manner.
- If you perform an approximate count of the affected abutters (i.e., those with boats large enough to encounter problems navigating the Dinkins Bayou entrance or Wulfert Channel), we believe that it will represent a small percentage of the affected abutters. Let's say it might be 40 users, yet another 160 abutters are being asked to pay to resolve this issue. We have frequently navigated all the canals off Dinkins Bayou, and while we have never counted the number of large-draft boats, it is not considerable. One resident abutting Dinkins Bayou asserts that he has had no issues using a 28 ft. Dauntless in the waters.
- We have not received a copy of the legal reasoning by which Sanibel determines that this is its problem.
- Wulfert Channel and Dinkins Bayou are navigable waters as defined by the act, and are therefore the responsibility of the USACE (US Army Corps of Engineers); please see the attached sections of the US CFR.
- Abutters are being asked or told to pay for work that will not benefit most of them. However, this dredging project will benefit many non-Sanibel residents, who will not be required to cover any of this work. This project should, at a minimum, be funded by Lee County and the State, not by local residents of Sanibel.
- If a future claim is made by a boater alleging that the dredging was done improperly, will the abutters in the SAD be liable?
- Sanibel has experienced three hurricanes in three years. The waters of the Caribbean and the Gulf of Mexico are warming so rapidly that hurricanes now develop independently in those seas, without originating off the west coast of Africa. Two of those storms (Ian and Milton) had significant effects on the profiles of the Wulfert and Dinkins Bayou channels. The proposed 10-year planning horizon is meaningless when we consider that more such hurricanes are likely to occur within that period. What happens then? Will dredging be done before 2035? Who will pay for it?
- The last dredging of Blind Pass and part of the Wulfert Channel occurred in 2017. Following that, there was a comprehensive and very public process to review the dredging template for future work. Those of us who participated provided input to the planning firm regarding the historic pattern of flows through Sunset Bay. When the firm ran their model with that modification, they discovered that expanding the dredging template to include Sunset Bay would significantly improve flows through Blind Pass.
- For those interested in the dredging history of Blind Pass, please visit [this page](#).

- The last dredging was done for environmental reasons, not to improve navigation.
- The 2019 management plan in which many of us participated, is reported here. If you scroll down to page 10 of that report, you will see the final preferred option, Figure 5. That option would resolve any issues that boaters may feel they currently face.
- The current proposed dredging and funding efforts are short-sighted, lacking any apparent strategies to address a recurrence within a period shorter than the 10-year planning horizon. Meanwhile, property owners are expected to pay an annual tax that will not be sufficient to respond to recurring storm changes. When this navigation problem arises again in 5 years, will the SAD feel obliged or be permitted to make additional assessments?

We urge the Council to, at a minimum, table this project until the answers to these points are researched more thoroughly. Fundamentally, this dredging should not be undertaken by the City of Sanibel, especially when it clearly benefits many users from other communities and so few of the abutters.

If the Council decides to proceed with this effort, then at the very least the affected abutters should have the opportunity to vote on this proposal; to do otherwise amounts to taxation without representation.

US CFR:

<https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-33/chapter-II/part-329>

<https://www.nap.usace.army.mil/Portals/39/docs/regulatory/regs/33cfr329.pdf>

§ 329.4 General definition.

Navigable waters of the United States are those waters that are subject to the ebb and flow of the tide and/or are presently used, or have been used in the past, or may be susceptible for use to transport interstate or foreign commerce. A determination of navigability, once made, applies laterally over the entire surface of the waterbody, and is not extinguished by later actions or events which impede or destroy navigable capacity.

§ 329.7 Intrastate or interstate nature of waterway.

A waterbody may be entirely within a state, yet still be capable of carrying interstate commerce. This is especially clear when it physically connects with a generally acknowledged avenue of interstate commerce, such as the ocean or one of the Great Lakes, and is yet wholly within one state. Nor is it necessary that there be a physically navigable connection across a state boundary. Where a waterbody extends through one or more states, but substantial portions, which are capable of bearing interstate commerce, are located in only one of the states, the entirety of the waterway up to the head (upper limit) of navigation is subject to Federal jurisdiction.

329.12 Geographic and jurisdictional limits of oceanic and tidal waters.

(a) ***Ocean and coastal waters.*** The navigable waters of the United States over which Corps of Engineers regulatory jurisdiction extends include all ocean and coastal waters within a zone three geographic (nautical) miles seaward from the baseline (The Territorial Seas). Wider zones are recognized for special regulatory powers exercised over the outer continental shelf. (See [33 CFR 322.3\(b\)](#)).

Sincerely,

Meg Born
2628 Coconut Dr.
Sanibel, Florida 33957

From: Cooley, Thomas <cooley.1@osu.edu>
Sent: Saturday, May 31, 2025 7:51 PM
To: sancouncil <sancouncil@mysanibel.com>
Subject: proposed assessment for dredging Wulfert Channel

This Message Is From an External Sender

This message came from outside your organization.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Dear Council Members:

Received your letter outlining the proposal. As an avid non-boat owner, I live on Dinkins Bayou for the beautiful scenery and the wildlife, neither of which, I believe, is likely to benefit from dredging the channel. Please consider abandoning the proposal. Thank you.

Thomas Cooley
2720 Coconut Dr.
Sanibel, FL 33957

From: August Borschke <ajborschke@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 31, 2025 4:15 PM
To: Vicki L. Smith <vicki.smith@mysanibel.com>
Cc: Susan Borschke <suebsfo@gmail.com>
Subject: 6494 San Cap

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Hi Vicki. This is a rather poor quality picture of a large wall photo that we have. We know the photo was taken before the mid-1990s, because that is when we acquired the picture. You can see the shape of Sunset Bay at that time. Also, you can see the two rather large channels out of the bay. Gus Borschke. 6494 San-Cap

Sent from my iPhone



From: Stafford, Arthur <artstaf@staffordmfg.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 31, 2025 8:09 AM
To: Vicki L. Smith <vicki.smith@mysanibel.com>
Cc: dianestafford2020@gmail.com
Subject: Assessment District

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

[Report Suspicious](#)

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Hello Vicki,

As regards the proposed dredging, how was it funded when last done in 2014? Was there a \$10,000 assessment then or is this a new twist?

We agree that the dredging necessary, to maintain the property values on the affected parcels, but those property values already pay additional taxes based upon the assumption that they have access to navigable water. Should this change, there would be a cry for tax decreases --- so, in effect we're being asked to pay twice.

Also, the annual add-on to our Lee-County tax of \$1200 to prepay for a cost that may or may not be necessary and may or may not cost the estimated amount again seems like the wrong approach. We strongly object to this.

Arthur and Diane Stafford
2423 Blue Crab Court
Sanibel, FL

From: rsbcsb <rsbcsb@aol.com>
Sent: Friday, May 30, 2025 8:31 PM
To: Vicki L. Smith <vicki.smith@mysanibel.com>
Subject: Dredging assessment

Dear Ms. Smith/ City manager Souza: I have received your 21 May 2025 dredging assessment notice. I find it unfathomable that a project of this scope and cost to all property owners was initiated by "requests from residents", rather than a survey
ZjQcmQRYFpfptBannerStart

This Message Is From an External Sender

[Report Suspicious](#)

This message came from outside your organization.

ZjQcmQRYFpfptBannerEnd

Dear Ms. Smith/ City manager Souza:

I have received your 21 May 2025 dredging assessment notice. I find it unfathomable that a project of this scope and cost to all property owners was initiated by "requests from residents", rather than a survey of all residents. So, some residents have started a process that will impose a large and continuing cost to all residents without any say from all of us. Talk about lack of due process. After major damage from 3 hurricanes, I am fairly certain that few of us have that kind of funding to spare, especially for a project that will not benefit any who do not have a boat. I do not support this assessment and if able to vote, vote no.

A few questions:

Can the state or federal government provide support in any capacity.

Why are private citizens funding repair of areas owned by the state.

If citizens fund repairs are they then liable should an injury occur from those repairs (I assume the city and/or county are liable now).

The costs of recovery from 3 major storms have affected all involved and driven some away. This added cost will surely do more of the same, last straw type of mentality. I am not sure why private homeowners are asked to fund a project involving property not owned by them, especially since the benefits of said repairs will benefit more than the 202 property owners.

The cost should be born by the municipalities involved not the property owners who do not own the waterways.

Again, I vote no.

Robert Berger

2470 Harbour lane

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From: Kelly, Christopher M. <ckelly@jonesday.com>
Sent: Friday, May 30, 2025 5:01 PM
To: Vicki L. Smith <vicki.smith@mysanibel.com>
Subject: Support of Dredging Plan

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

[Report Suspicious](#)

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Dear Vicki and Members of City Council:

I currently reside at 6012 White Heron Lane and am writing to you to strongly support the proposed dredging plan for Wulfert Channel and related tax assessment zone. As you may know, I have been one of the residents who has worked with the City Manager and City Staff to develop this plan and I truly believe it represents the best solution for the serious navigation issues we are facing as well as improve water flow and related environmental conditions in the bayou. I won't belabor the points for supporting, others in the community I know have it far better than I could have in emails to you.

From where I sit-based on numerous emails, phone calls and meetings-the communities surrounding Dinkins strongly support the the dredging and assessment zone plans. There are, however, some that do not. Their objections include:

1. My boat can currently get through the problem so I don't want to pay;
2. These waterways are the responsibility of the Federal, State and County governments so we shouldn't be taxed by the City for this;
3. Homeowners on Captiva that have to use Wulfert Channel to get out should have to contribute;
4. We shouldn't have our taxes raised by the City;
5. The dredging plan does not cover the problem areas, and the the problem areas are smaller than the plan calls for; if the channel markers are correctly placed the area in question is much smaller.
6. The dredging plan is too expansive in the bayou and not needed.
7. The problem is caused by the beach renourishment projects on Captiva and Sanibel, and the lack of a jetty on the Sanibel side. This does nothing to fix that.

Some of these objections obviously don't deserve a response (and some of those have been made by people with other agendas-they are trying to sell their houses right now and don't want an assessment). With respect to other objections, we have tried our best to educate the communities that it is, unfortunately, the City's responsibility to deal with these waterways. As you might expect, some don't want to hear that. However, we all would like to see the City push the County for some reimbursement for the Captiva

residents' "share", or work with the county to establish a wider tax assessment zone that includes those residents. We recognize that this is part of a longer term solution and should not affect the approval before you.

The dredging plan is comprehensive; if minor adjustments need to be made before the actual dredge because of shifting bottoms that should not be an issue. However, we residents feel strongly that the size of the area in Wulfert to be dredged is appropriate. We hit bottom all over that area right now when it is lower than mean tide and this plan solves that issue. I'm sure an expert guide who is on the water everyday can navigate through the eye of a needle but for the vast majority of us that is not the case.

The objectors are right, this plan doesn't solve what many many residents over the last couple of decades believe, that beach renourishment and lack of a jetty are the causes of all of this. But we need to fix the current problem and tackle that problem at the same time.

I am sorry I cannot be at the Meeting Tuesday, I will be travelling to Ireland for a work matter. Thank you for your strong leadership on this issue, this solution helps everyone and makes for a better Sanibel.

Chris Kelly

This e-mail (including any attachments) may contain information that is private, confidential, or protected by attorney-client or other privilege. If you received this e-mail in error, please delete it from your system without copying it and notify sender by reply e-mail, so that our records can be corrected.

From: Robert Pascotto <rpascotto88@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, May 30, 2025 3:51 PM

To: Kelly, Christopher M. <ckelly@jonesday.com>

Subject: Re: Fw: Wulfert Channel/Dinkins Bayou Dredging Plan

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

If you are concerned about the message's content, highlight the email in your inbox and click "Report Suspicious" in the Outlook ribbon -or- contact 6Help.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Hello Chris thank you so much for including me in this email chain. Please feel free to forward it to all interested parties. As I type this, we are idling out Wulfert Channel and as the new homeowner of a house on White Heron Lane I am 100% supportive of dredging the channel and the discussed surrounding waterways.

Thank you so much. I hope to talk to you soon.

Robert Pascotto

This e-mail (including any attachments) may contain information that is private, confidential, or protected by attorney-client or other privilege. If you received this e-mail in error, please delete it from your system without copying it and notify sender by reply e-mail, so that our records can be corrected.

From: Donna <don.db5151@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, May 30, 2025 1:04 PM
To: Vicki L. Smith <vicki.smith@mysanibel.com>
Subject: Dinkins dredging

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

[Report Suspicious](#)

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Vicki

I support the dredging project. I would like to have seen more transparency with regard to the bidding process. We should have been given that information at the time we were told to pay our \$11,000! Hopefully it was competitive and based on more than just one bid.

Thank you,

Donald Bishop

2443 Blue crab ct.