

**MINUTES OF MEETING
FLOW WAY
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT**

The Regular Meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Flow Way Community Development District was held on Thursday, February 19, 2026 at the Esplanade Golf and Country Club, 8910 Torre Vista Lane, Naples, FL 34119. It began at 1:00 p.m. and was presided over by Mr. Zack Stamp, Chairperson, and James P. Ward as Secretary.

Present and constituting a quorum:

Zack Stamp	Chairperson
Ron Miller	Vice Chairperson
Bart Bhatla	Assistant Secretary
Tom Kleck	Assistant Secretary
Mark Scimio	Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

James P. Ward	District Manager
Jimmy Messick	District Engineer
Michael Pawelczyk	District Counsel

Audience:

John Koles
Vinnie Frey
Charlie Machac
Mary Garcia
Lisa C.
Niki O'Connor
C. Franke

All residents' names were not included with the minutes. If a resident did not identify themselves or the audio file did not pick up the name, the name was not recorded in these minutes. Portions of these minutes may be transcribed in verbatim.

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

Call to Order/Roll Call

Chairperson Stamp called the meeting to order at approximately 1:00 p.m. Roll call was conducted, and all Members of the Board were present, with the exception of Supervisor Miller, constituting a quorum. Supervisor Miller joined the meeting electronically at 1:13 p.m.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS

Consideration of Minutes

January 15, 2026 - Regular Meeting Minutes

Chairperson Stamp asked if there were any additions, corrections, or deletions to the Minutes; hearing none, he called for a motion.

On MOTION made by Bart Bhatla, seconded by Tom Kleck, and with all in favor, the January 15, 2026 Regular Meeting Minutes were approved.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS

Consideration of Resolution 2026-4

Consideration of Resolution 2026-4, a Resolution of the Board of Supervisors of the Flow Way Community Development District Approving a Proposed Budget for Fiscal Year 2027 and Setting a Public Hearing for Thursday, June 18, 2026, at 1:00 P.M. at Esplanade Golf and Country Club, 8910 Torre Vista Lane, Naples, Florida 34119

Mr. Ward stated Resolution 2026-4 was the start of the fiscal year 2027 budget process covering the period of October 1, 2026 through September 30, 2027. He indicated the public hearing was scheduled for June 18, 2026 at 1:00 p.m. He noted anything in the budget could be changed until the public hearing date, but after approval, the assessment rate could not be increased. He discussed the budget process. He asked if there were any questions; hearing none, he called for a motion.

On MOTION made by Tom Kleck, seconded by Bart Bhatla, and with all in favor, Resolution 2026-4 was adopted, and the Chair was authorized to sign.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Staff Items

I. District General Counsel - Billing, Cochran, Lyles, Mauro & Ramsey, P.A.

a. Litigation updates

Mr. Michael Pawelczyk: The appellate portion of the Colosi litigation, the special counsel filed our reply brief on or about January 23, 2026, so now they are just waiting for the court to decide on that, or direct (indecipherable), but that is about a year process, so we will let you know if anything comes up in between meetings on the appeal portion of that litigation. The newer litigation was filed as well shortly before the last meeting I believe. That's the litigation where Colosi has sued the Quarry CDD, the Flow Way CDD and the Esplanade Golf and Country Club regarding access issues and all the defendants in that litigation have filed motions to dismiss, none of which have been set for hearing. If anyone has any questions, I'm very happy to discuss this outside of the public meeting, or you can contact special counsel yourself.

Chairperson Stamp: If there is some item on the Agenda anyone would like to discuss, when we get to it, get my attention and we will give you three minutes to address it. If there is something you want to talk about that's not on the Agenda at the end of the meeting, we will give you three minutes to talk about it. I should have said that up front. Does anyone have anything we missed they want to talk about? No? Okay, moving on.

II. District Engineer - Calvin, Giordano & Associates

a. Engineer's Report

- 1) Purpose**
- 2) Current Asset Updates:**
 - 1. Landscaping**
 - 2. Entrance Maintenance**
 - 3. Lake Maintenance**
 - 4. Irrigation Pump House**
 - 5. External Preserves**
 - 6. Cane Toads**
- 3) Capital Projects**
- 4) Future Asset Maintenance Items**
- 5) Engineer's Report Complete**

Mr. Jimmy Messick stated page 20 on the Engineers report had been revised and distributed copies to the board. He discussed his report: the annuals were covered to protect them from the cold; holiday lighting has been taken down; bridge maintenance continued; new reflective signage was installed for the crosswalk; fountain maintenance continued; storm drain inspection was ongoing; and lake 7 had recurring washout and a long-term solution was being considered.

Discussion ensued regarding potential long term solutions.

Mr. Messick indicated he put together a table discussing options for lake 11 adjacent to the roundabout and fountain in the middle of the development; options 1 and 2 added littorals and added landscaping would need an additional \$25,000 dollars each for irrigation. (Indecipherable). He noted littorals could be added to the lake, but there was a problem with them potentially dying in an emergency storm event and needing irrigation in the dry season and it would cost \$25,000 dollars to facilitate irrigation.

Chairperson Stamp: What we are talking about is tapping into the existing waterlines that run down either side of the street.

Mr. Bhatla stated he felt littorals were not ideal because they died easily.

Mr. Messick agreed, littorals could die.

Discussion ensued regarding the use of more hardy littorals; filling in landscaping around lake 11; cost of landscaping; cost of littorals. Much of this discussion was (indecipherable).

Mr. Ward: With respect to Lake 11, the next option would be to add some irrigation as Jimmy mentioned, to hide some of the disaster that it really is. Irrigation for landscaping and for the littoral shelves or dying littorals in the dry season would help mitigate some of that problem. We don't know whether that will solve it. That's the \$50,000 dollar item here. We have costed that out and it is anticipated to be a little over \$40,000 dollars. My opinion is that (indecipherable) in order to try to mitigate a little more of the problems we are having and the concerns from residents on the look of Lake 11.

Chairperson Stamp: Richard was also talking about something that looked like mangroves, putting something out there that might be hardier.

Mr. Ward: (Indecipherable). It's really hard to dig into it, but to the extent that we can get bigger materials in it, things that would help that are not the most expensive are on this list. We don't have a great solution for lake 11 but these might be good to think about.

Mr. Bhatla: I thought the objective was to improve the view.

Mr. Ward: Some people have an issue from the road, some like it, some don't, some people prefer the view, etc. On the residential side, we are still getting substantial pushback on what that lake looks like because of the fact that it is (indecipherable). Jimmy's team has come up with ways to address a little bit more the visual aspects of that lake as it relates to the residential side and try to put some littorals in there using irrigation that might help solve the problem with water levels dropping so low and being able to water them during the dry portion of the year. Jimmy will go through other potential solutions, but from a cost perspective, we may be able to mitigate this somewhat with some irrigation, larger trees, littorals and see if this works on an interim basis.

Mr. Bhatla: (Indecipherable).

Chairperson Stamp: This is a discussion item and even if we decided on any of these options we would not do anything until the fall in the rainy season. We've got some time to discuss this and flesh it out, and people may have better ideas.

Mr. Ron Miller apologized for being late. He said he was strongly in favor of doing something to hide the problem area. He indicated he was concerned about the cost but was more concerned about lake 11 and felt it was a necessity to fix it. He stated it looked terrible and needed to be fixed. He said he felt the CDD should move forward with the landscaping.

Mr. Bhatla said he agreed landscaping should be done, but planting littorals seemed like a bad idea.

Mr. Messick indicated the third option was to excavate the lake and this was the most expensive option due to the large amount of limestone rock in the lake; blasting was not a possibility because of the homes nearby, so the cost could be between \$3 million dollars and \$5 million dollars.

Discussion ensued regarding the cost of excavating the lake.

Mr. Messick stated another possibility was to fill in the lake and dig a lake elsewhere where there was less rock, but the CDD did not have any undeveloped land which could accommodate a lake. He noted it wouldn't be too much to fill in the lake, but the CDD would have to dig a lake in return because the lake was a part of the stormwater system as a whole and was required. He said he did not investigate the

cost because there was no land available for a new lake. He said another option was to pump water into the lake, but he did not think it would be permissible. He explained the lake was tied into the drainage system and the CDD would need to get approval from SWFMD to pump water into the lake and he did not think SWFMD would approve it.

Discussion ensued regarding asking AI for a solution.

Chairperson Stamp asked if there were any public comments.

Mr. ____ 30:00 stated something needed to be done to improve the visuals but the thought of spending \$3 million dollars on top of the capital improvements, the golf course renovation, and whatever else was coming down the pipe was an absurdity. He said he felt the best approach would be to increase landscaping such as the red flowers which seemed to be doing well.

Ms. Lisa C. stated she bought her home on lake 11 as a lakefront property and paid a premium for lakefront property. She said she was misled; it was not lakefront property. She said she wanted a solution, so residents were not looking at a flat rock area. She said she understood the desire to cover it up for those driving, but for those living on the lake it was disgusting to look at and needed to be fixed in the right way.

Mr. Charlie Machac asked who would pay for the improvements made to lake 11. He asked about the water.

Chairperson Stamp stated the CDD would pay which meant the residents paid through the assessment. He stated the water would be recycled water, or non-potable water.

Ms. Lisa C. stated she felt the community should work together to improve lake 11. She asked if there was an option to triple down on the landscaping and littorals because she did not feel adding irrigation alone would do the trick; it needed to be fixed once and for all.

Mr. Vinnie Frey stated (indecipherable). He suggested using a jackhammer to break up the rock and use the rock in the community. He said he did not understand how it could cost over \$3 million dollars to dig out the lake. He stated an industrial jackhammer, and a rock crusher would do the job. He said digging the lake was the only real solution. He asked the CDD to get a quote for using a jackhammer to break up the rock in the lake. He noted the rock could be used for rip rap.

Mr. Mark Scimio asked, if the CDD could get a permit to dig it out, was there a possibility of taking out a bond for the Hatcher property which did not have a bond attached to it.

Chairperson Stamp stated the CDD could look into it.

Mr. Miller stated several years ago a rumor went around that the residents were given the option to cancel their contracts or get a \$50,000 dollar refund and he wondered if it were true. He asked if the residents living on the lake would be willing to put money in the pot and help pay for improvements.

Ms. Niki O'Connor said she believed a refund was offered to residents who purchased the property expecting a lake view, but to be fair, the residents who purchased lots on the lake had no idea what it would end up looking like. She said it did not look so terrible several years ago, but now it looked horrendous. She stated she would like to find out how much it would cost to use a jackhammer and rock crusher to dig out the lake.

Mr. Messick noted it was an exorbitant amount of rock which would need to be removed; the lake would have to be dug down 30 feet, not just a few feet, and the cost could be provided in a proposal in more detail. He said the cost estimate he had was simply a ballpark figure he obtained from a contractor.

Chairperson Stamp noted there was a danger to residents' foundations even using a jackhammer.

Mr. Messick agreed; vibrations could cause foundation damage.

Discussion ensued regarding the cost of option 1 and option 2; the possibility of a bond for the Hatcher community; the Hatcher property not paying any bond debt issue at this time; and how the Hatcher property ended up with no bond payment. Portions of this discussion were (indecipherable).

Ms. ____ 45:39 asked if it was possible to use funds obtained as a result of the litigation of Taylor Morrison to fix lake 11.

Chairperson Stamp explained the HOA was litigating Taylor Morrison, not the CDD. He said if the HOA wished to give the CDD money from the lawsuit the CDD would certainly use it; however, he believed the HOA had projects earmarked for those potential funds.

Mr. Ron Miller stated he felt assigning a \$3 million to \$5 million dollar bond to the Hatcher property was a bad idea; the Hatcher property only had 30 homes, and it was a large debt. He noted only 13 of the 30 Hatcher homes were on the lake, so 17 homes would likely strenuously object to the bond.

Chairperson Stamp stated this subject would be on the agenda for discussion for the next few months and residents were welcome to bring in ideas.

Ms. ____ thanked the CDD for actively working to fix this problem.

Mr. Messick continued his report: the recharge well (indecipherable); the Hatcher parcel irrigation pump station filter housing was replaced; the water level (indecipherable). He indicated the well water level was not providing enough flow;

throttling the valves improving the situation, but too much throttle could burn out the pump.

Discussion ensued regarding the amount of recharge water actual flow versus allowed flow; water pumped into the lakes versus water used for irrigation; how much water the District should be allowed to pump; contacting SWFMD to permit drilling another well; SWFMD refusing to permit a fourth well; filling in an existing well to dig a new well with potentially more water; and what would happen if the community ran out of reuse water (purchase water). Much of this discussion was (indecipherable).

Mr. Messick stated the annual external preserves maintenance program would start next month; this would be the last year of required monitored recording; the maintenance program would continue at a lesser amount in the years to come. He reviewed the coyote trapping program map showing places to trap coyotes away from public areas and the areas where coyote activity was noted. He discussed the coyote trapping plan.

Mr. Ward: The HOA has indicated it has declined being a part of the program. You have to kill the coyotes if you catch them and there was some concern with the HOA with respect to the method of disposal. We would not be able to do this entire program. It was contingent upon us being able to do the preserves and the HOA doing areas outside of the preserves. It's not worth doing the program just within the preserves.

Mr. ____: Is the HOA worried about a PEETA thing?

Mr. Ward: I don't know. I only know they had comments from residents that they don't like the disposal method. They have declined to participate. It does not make sense to only trap the coyotes within the preserves, and we can't go outside the preserves to trap these things. That's the issue.

Discussion ensued regarding capturing the coyotes on camera to determine how many coyotes there were in the community to determine whether there was a problem; the cost of coyote trapping; trapped coyotes having to be destroyed; the inability to relocate coyotes.

Mr. Messick discussed the cane toad removal; the number of toads were reduced.

Mr. Ward noted the problem with cane toads was growing exponentially in south Florida. He stated the cane toads were moving north; he was seeing cane toads all the way up in Charlotte County.

Mr. Messick: The last thing for the lakes is from capital projects. We did our report in 2022. Next year we have the last of the lakes from the first five year cyclical program. This summer the plan was to reevaluate everything pending the last three lakes and evaluate what that meant from a capital budget program standpoint. It's been requested that we look at alternatives which includes full rip-rap sections, so what I've done is provided an estimate not specific to which lakes need to be addressed

because that still needs to be evaluated. But this is including all the lakes. The reason we've updated it and brought in the numbers is because this is every shoreline. We've been asked to remove the canal shoreline and just include the lake shoreline, so the 101,000 linear feet went down to 77,000 linear feet, but the comparison between the two is still the same. I'm going to go through (indecipherable) option number 2, the Geosock and rip rap section is the preferred method from our office, and the Board can certainly chime in. We have Geotubes. The Geosock rip rap we feel will help prevent future washouts underneath the Geotubes and the Geosock allows for a sloped cross section. Of course, there is still concern about the grass dying and coming off of it and the Geosocks being exposed, but that is still going to be a part of our annual maintenance. We are just trying to limit our exposure by adding to the rip rap for stabilization. Going through the two options, option number one is a full rip rap section. There are two different sections depending on how much erosion was anticipated, and whether we do a four foot or eight-foot-deep section. That \$6 million dollars and \$12 million dollars comes from that \$80 dollars (4 foot deep) or \$160 dollars (8 foot deep) per linear foot. I've shown this to you over the seven years because if we do this it will be over the entire community. We have about 21 lakes, and we do about three lakes per year. That seems to be our sweet spot with what the vendors can do per year and not be too rushed. We've taken that overall cost and divided it by the number of units over 7 years to give you a ballpark figure of what that rip rap costs per unit. The second option is Geosock and rip rap. I would like to point out that this option would not be required over the entire lake bank. It is going to be evaluated over the summer to see if it is 50 percent of that or 75 percent of that. It's to be determined. But to do a comparison per linear foot, I do have the cost for the 6 foot tall or 10 foot tall Geosock and that costs \$131 or \$151 dollars, so you take the same unit prices and extrapolate out, and you come down to the price per unit over seven years. Again, that's just to show you the price per foot comparison. We can't really tell you what the overall capital program cost is going to be. We can tell you that we don't like the look of rip rap. It's ugly. You're going to have stains and you're going to have to pressure wash. There are other things to think about other than installation costs. It's not ideal. It's more of a commercial application. The Geosock and the rip rap blend is probably a better fit for the neighborhood. These costs are estimated for 100 percent of the lakes needing to be restored, which we know they do not. With rip rap it has to be all or nothing, but with Geosock, because you have the sod which overlays it, you could do that as needed over the next seven years. We are looking to install the 2 foot rip rap tow for stabilization and resodding, or we can go full blown in two years with this option to make sure that holds up over two years.

Discussion ensued regarding Geotubes versus Geosocks; and installing Geosock on lake 7.

Chairperson Stamp asked if rip rap would be installed where there were littoral shelves.

Mr. Ward: *The concept is we would plant littorals around the culverts. Within the context of our existing fiscal year 2026 budget, we have sufficient funds to do the Geosocks, rip rap, with some littorals in four lakes, one of which is lake 7.*

Chairperson Stamp: I mean take the linear feet of littorals out of your calculation.

Mr. Messick: We can. We do need to maintain the littorals.

Chairperson Stamp: I agree with that. We are not going to be installing rip rap over them, so we should not be including that cost.

Mr. Messick: The littorals are in the water, not on the bank. For the Geosock/rip rap section, it will only be the areas that needs it, which typically aren't littorals. I can look at the last capital program and look at percentage wise the previous lake bank restoration needed to incorporate and bank that into this cost.

Chairperson Stamp: I understand these are not going to be exact numbers, I just want a better ballpark. I'm getting people telling me they want to do all the lakes, but I think when they see the cost they may not want to do all the lakes.

Discussion continued regarding the residents wanting to rip rap the lakes; the lake water levels being low right now; and obtaining more accurate numbers to enable the Board to make an informed decision.

Mr. Miller asked if it would be possible to fill in lake 11 and make up for the volume of the lake by digging the canal deeper.

Mr. Messick: The volume of the stormwater is above the water table. The lakes go below the water table per handbook drainage requirements from South Florida, but the volume that you have to offset is above the water table, so digging deeper does not help with the volume of stored water during a rain event.

Mr. Miller noted the lake bank rip rap program could be stretched out to 10 or 15 years to make the cost more reasonable if it was felt rip rap was the better option.

Mr. Messick stated the best approach would be to determine the best solution and then move forward from there.

Mr. Mark Scimio asked if the CDD would be able to get permitting approved for excavating lake 11.

Mr. Messick responded in the affirmative. He noted the littorals would need to be offset and there would be environmental considerations, but he believed the CDD would be permitted to excavate the lake.

Discussion ensued regarding excavating lake 11, the difficulty, and the cost.

III. District Manager - JPWard & Associates, LLC

a. Discussion of Proposal for Coyote Trapping

b. Financial Report for the period ending January 31, 2026 (unaudited)

No report.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**Supervisor's Requests**

Supervisor Ron Miller request: Hatcher Landscaping / Improvement Budget. This item was discussed earlier in the meeting.

Chairperson Stamp indicated the FY 2027 budget would now be discussed; there were no longer any members of the public present. He stated the budget would be discussed over the next few months to iron out the line items, with adoption of the budget in June if the assessment rate remained below the cap level. He noted if the budget went above the cap rate then mailed notice would be required and the budget would be adopted in July. He noted the assessment rate at this point remained the same as last year. He stated this budget left the assessment rate at \$1,845 dollars, funded asset replacement for the near term, completed the success criteria for the preserves, began funding mitigation of fire hazards (a controlled burn may be needed in the future), increased the manager's compensation by \$5,000 dollars (increased for the first time in years), and began the first year of the second five year plan. He said the two things it did not include were major lake 11 improvements and long term rip rap plans; these would be budget add-ons.

Mr. Ward directed the Board to pages 8 and 9 of the budget which was a report created by Mr. Messick, an analysis of all the CDD's assets in detail, including remaining useful life and current replacement costs. He indicated the purpose of this report was to prepare for fiscal year 2027 and gauge the ability of the CDD to maintain said assets. He said he crossed out line items which did not need a reserve because the assets had an extended life, such as the concrete pipes which had a 100 year life span. He said he also took out a lot of the larger landscaping items, such as the larger palms and trees in the community. He explained if there were a storm event, the CDD would not replace landscaping at full large tree value; the landscaping would be replaced at a smaller size and value. He stated when he removed those items, the reserve allocation for fiscal year 2027 was reduced to \$85,000 dollars. He indicated it was essentially the same amount to be collected for the reserve account annually; over time the reserve account would be built up. *We basically have about \$1,096,000 dollars anticipated to be in cash going into the current fiscal year. We've added \$85,000 dollars to this. I want you to go into the long term capital funding/hurricane restoration. We had \$306,000 dollars in the budget. I want to point out this is a plug. This is a number we use to get to \$1,845 dollars. We build the budget. If I'm under \$1,845, I plug that number to get us up to \$1,845 dollars and you can see from 2026 to 2027 I have been able to increase it because two things are occurring. One is we've been able to take some money from a reduction in the amount of funding we're going to spend on the external preserves, and we are currently starting to see a flattening in the curve of increases in cost estimates for services provided. You've been able to save some money in terms of our operating expenses. It goes into that \$306,000 dollar plug, which then keeps us at \$1,845 dollars per unit.*

Mr. Scimio: (indecipherable).

Mr. Ward: *I break this into a couple of different parts. One is how much does it take to operate for the first two months. That's \$330,000 dollars. For storm events, capital operations, we are at the \$985,000 dollars number going into the end of next year. That gives you \$1.2 million dollars basically in cash. I know Ron will tell you he thinks of that as one big cash fund and you can use it for either/or, but in my mind I separate it because I need to know what we have to*

operate the District on and what we need for storm events. \$85,000 dollars is in addition to that. I think we need to have a separate line item for our reserves for our assets going forward. By the end of next year, we will go from \$1 million dollars to \$1.4 million dollars broken down as you see it in the line items with an assessment rate of \$1,845 dollars. As Chairperson Stamp has noted, you can go over \$1,845 dollars to \$2,214 dollars. You can reduce the \$300,000 dollar number but keep the \$1,845 dollars. All of these other numbers in the reserve will go down by whatever you take out of the \$300,000 dollar number to fund it. The only other thing I want to comment on is in regard to the debt service fund which is your capital financing. We are still not in a position to refinance the bonds due last November. The ones coming up this November are basically at the same rates. The market has not changed, so we now have two series of bonds that are basically at the same position. The next series of bonds which are coming up the following year are also basically at the same rates. Unless the market changes, we will still be in the same position another year out.

Chairperson Stamp: It may be the desire of the Board to say we probably ought to do something about the concrete structures and pipes, and maybe we put \$50,000 dollars a year aside for them, or for inflation adjustments knowing some day it will be an issue, but I think that's a discussion for next year or the year after that. We've adequately handled the short term risk with what we've got there and that's what we set out to do, and I think we've done it. The other thing is, we budgeted \$30,000 dollars for the emergency well and we spent about \$81,000 dollars. What's the situation there?

Mr. Ward: The original estimate was to not install the pipe from the well to the lake, and the meter to deal with that, but then we decided it would be best to install that pipe and the meter. That was an additional emergency we had to deal with, so we had division funds within the constraints of the existing budget, although the line item is over.

Discussion ensued regarding the well, pipe and meter; lake 11 landscaping; costs of lake 11 landscaping and whether some landscaping could be done within the constraints of the existing budget; whether lake 11 should be prioritized; whether the HOA should be responsible for adding landscaping to lake 11; the CDD being responsible for work on the actual lake; and the necessity of irrigation for lake 11 landscaping.

Mr. Ward stated one option was to spend \$40,000 dollars to add some additional landscaping and trees as well as irrigation to lake 11.

Chairperson Stamp: In my opinion we do the irrigation and put in the littorals that look like mangroves. We owe it to the public to give them a chance to come back and say this is what we like, what we don't like, or this is something you haven't even thought of. I don't think anybody here wants to spend \$3 million dollars or \$5 million dollars. The charge I gave Jimmy was to start with nothing and go to the Cadillac version and give us everything you can think of.

Mr. Scimio: You know the community would like to have the lake dug out but do they want to pay for it?

Chairperson Stamp: That's why it's good to have the numbers out for a while for people to think about. He suggested Mr. Messick take pictures of how rip rap looked when it became stained for the residents to see what rip rap would look like over time.

Mr. Messick discussed stained rip rap versus new rip rap. He said he would take some pictures.

Discussion ensued regarding the budget; rip rap staining; the community weighing in on the decision regarding lake 11; and rip rap installation versus Geosock installation.

Chairperson Stamp noted a couple of months ago the CDD adopted a new way of compensating the engineers. He asked if this increased or decreased engineering costs.

Mr. Ward: As of October 24th, we had a slight increase over the same period as last year of about \$6,000 dollars, but it's a little early in the year to tell. I'm monitoring this on a quarterly basis. I will keep you updated. The fall is always a little heavier period for us, and once we get into winter it slows down a little bit.

Chairperson Stamp: And we've put more demands on him with the rip rap proposals and lake 11 proposals. He's not doing those for free.

Mr. Miller endorsed the increase to Jim Ward and Associates. He stated he disagreed with Mr. Ward regarding the Hatcher property; he believed it was a CDD issue, not an HOA issue. He indicated he felt the CDD should pay for the landscaping. He discussed the budget saying it sounded as if the CDD would meet the reserve account goal and have a little extra, which was good. He noted he would like more time to think about the budget, as well as rip rap versus Geosock, and he looked forward to future discussion about such. He asked if he understood the current budget had funds to rip rap the exposed pipes in the lakes.

Mr. Messick stated lake 7 was this year, not proposed budget for next year; the CDD was covering the cost to fix lake 7. *When we look at an evaluation for future capital costs, we will incorporate the rip rap for the pipes for each section.*

Mr. Ward: We have four lakes that are going to be done this year. Let's exclude lake 7. The concept is we are going to use the Geosock or Geotube and then around these concrete pipes we were going to use littorals to cover the pipes up and a little rip rap on either side to hold it all in place. It is a little bit of rip rap around the pipes simply to hold the littorals in place, but not anything to the extent that you had mentioned earlier.

Mr. Miller: Thank you for that clarification.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Public Comments

Chairperson Stamp noted there were no members of the public present. He noted he would not be present for the March meeting. He said three Board Members had to be present for a quorum.

Mr. Miller noted he would be present.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 2:56 p.m.

**On MOTION made by Mark Scimio, seconded by Tom Kleck,
and with all in favor, the Meeting was adjourned.**

Flow Way Community Development District

Signature: James Ward

James Ward (Aug 24, 2026 17:31:15 EDT)

Email: wardj@pfm.com
James P. Ward, Secretary

Signature: Z Stamp

Z Stamp (Sep 1, 2026 06:46:44 EDT)

Email: zackstamp@gmail.com
Zack Stamp, Chairperson

FW - Minutes 02 19 2026 - PDF for Signatures

Final Audit Report

2026-09-01

Created:	2026-08-24
By:	Anastasya Beauchamps (beauchampsa@pfm.com)
Status:	Signed
Transaction ID:	CBJCHBCAABAAr9BNHfbdJ13iKDhclJ4YB2OrBrTX5JCU

"FW - Minutes 02 19 2026 - PDF for Signatures" History

-  Document created by Anastasya Beauchamps (beauchampsa@pfm.com)
2026-08-24 - 9:25:17 PM GMT
-  Document emailed to zackstamp@gmail.com for signature
2026-08-24 - 9:25:22 PM GMT
-  Document emailed to James Ward (wardj@pfm.com) for signature
2026-08-24 - 9:25:22 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by James Ward (wardj@pfm.com)
2026-08-24 - 9:30:56 PM GMT
-  Document e-signed by James Ward (wardj@pfm.com)
Signature Date: 2026-08-24 - 9:31:15 PM GMT - Time Source: server - Signature Appearance Selected: TYPE
-  Email viewed by zackstamp@gmail.com
2026-09-01 - 10:46:06 AM GMT
-  Signer zackstamp@gmail.com entered name at signing as Z Stamp
2026-09-01 - 10:46:42 AM GMT
-  Document e-signed by Z Stamp (zackstamp@gmail.com)
Signature Date: 2026-09-01 - 10:46:44 AM GMT - Time Source: server - Signature Appearance Selected: TYPE
-  Agreement completed.
2026-09-01 - 10:46:44 AM GMT