

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10

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

11 The Regular Meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Flow Way Community Development
12 District was held on Thursday, February 19, 2026 at the Esplanade Golf and Country Club,
13 8910 Torre Vista Lane, Naples, FL 34119. It began at 1:00 p.m. and was presided over by Mr.
14 Zack Stamp, Chairperson, and James P. Ward as Secretary.
15
16

17
18
19
20
21
22

Present and constituting a quorum:

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

23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

Also present were:

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

32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

Audience:

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

44 All residents' names were not included with the minutes. If a resident did not identify
45 themselves or the audio file did not pick up the name, the name was not recorded in
46 these minutes. Portions of these minutes may be transcribed in verbatim.
47
48

49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100

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.

98 **a. Engineer's Report**

99 **1) Purpose**

100 **2) Current Asset Updates:**

101 **1. Landscaping**

102 **2. Entrance Maintenance**

103 **3. Lake Maintenance**

104 **4. Irrigation Pump House**

105 **5. External Preserves**

106 **6. Cane Toads**

107 **3) Capital Projects**

108 **4) Future Asset Maintenance Items**

109 **5) Engineer's Report Complete**

110
111 Mr. Jimmy Messick stated page 20 on the Engineers report had been revised and
112 distributed copies to the board. He discussed his report: the annuals were covered
113 to protect them from the cold; holiday lighting has been taken down; bridge
114 maintenance continued; new reflective signage was installed for the crosswalk;
115 fountain maintenance continued; storm drain inspection was ongoing; and lake 7
116 had recurring washout and a long-term solution was being considered.

117
118 Discussion ensued regarding potential long term solutions.

119
120 Mr. Messick indicated he put together a table discussing options for lake 11
121 adjacent to the roundabout and fountain in the middle of the development; options
122 1 and 2 added littorals and added landscaping would need an additional \$25,000
123 dollars each for irrigation. (Indecipherable). He noted littorals could be added to the
124 lake, but there was a problem with them potentially dying in an emergency storm
125 event and needing irrigation in the dry season and it would cost \$25,000 dollars to
126 facilitate irrigation.

127
128 *Chairperson Stamp: What we are talking about is tapping into the existing waterlines*
129 *that run down either side of the street.*

130
131 Mr. Bhatla stated he felt littorals were not ideal because they died easily.

132
133 Mr. Messick agreed, littorals could die.

134
135 Discussion ensued regarding the use of more hardy littorals; filling in landscaping
136 around lake 11; cost of landscaping; cost of littorals. Much of this discussion was
137 (indecipherable).

138
139 *Mr. Ward: With respect to Lake 11, the next option would be to add some irrigation*
140 *as Jimmy mentioned, to hide some of the disaster that it really is. Irrigation for*
141 *landscaping and for the littoral shelves or dying littorals in the dry season would help*
142 *mitigate some of that problem. We don't know whether that will solve it. That's the*
143 *\$50,000 dollar item here. We have costed that out and it is anticipated to be a little*
144 *over \$40,000 dollars. My opinion is that (indecipherable) in order to try to mitigate a*
145 *little more of the problems we are having and the concerns from residents on the*
146 *look of Lake 11.*

147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195

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

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

201
202 Discussion ensued regarding asking AI for a solution.

203
204 Chairperson Stamp asked if there were any public comments.

205
206 Mr. ____30:00 stated something needed to be done to improve the visuals but the
207 thought of spending \$3 million dollars on top of the capital improvements, the golf
208 course renovation, and whatever else was coming down the pipe was an absurdity.
209 He said he felt the best approach would be to increase landscaping such as the red
210 flowers which seemed to be doing well.

211
212 Ms. Lisa C. stated she bought her home on lake 11 as a lakefront property and paid
213 a premium for lakefront property. She said she was misled; it was not lakefront
214 property. She said she wanted a solution, so residents were not looking at a flat rock
215 area. She said she understood the desire to cover it up for those driving, but for
216 those living on the lake it was disgusting to look at and needed to be fixed in the
217 right way.

218
219 Mr. Charlie Machac asked who would pay for the improvements made to lake 11. He
220 asked about the water.

221
222 Chairperson Stamp stated the CDD would pay which meant the residents paid
223 through the assessment. He stated the water would be recycled water, or non-
224 potable water.

225
226 Ms. Lisa C. stated she felt the community should work together to improve lake 11.
227 She asked if there was an option to triple down on the landscaping and littorals
228 because she did not feel adding irrigation alone would do the trick; it needed to be
229 fixed once and for all.

230
231 Mr. Vinnie Frey stated (indecipherable). He suggested using a jackhammer to break
232 up the rock and use the rock in the community. He said he did not understand how
233 it could cost over \$3 million dollars to dig out the lake. He stated an industrial
234 jackhammer, and a rock crusher would do the job. He said digging the lake was the
235 only real solution. He asked the CDD to get a quote for using a jackhammer to break
236 up the rock in the lake. He noted the rock could be used for rip rap.

237
238 Mr. Mark Scimio asked, if the CDD could get a permit to dig it out, was there a
239 possibility of taking out a bond for the Hatcher property which did not have a bond
240 attached to it.

241
242 Chairperson Stamp stated the CDD could look into it.

243

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

248
249 Ms. Niki O'Connor said she believed a refund was offered to residents who
250 purchased the property expecting a lake view, but to be fair, the residents who
251 purchased lots on the lake had no idea what it would end up looking like. She said it
252 did not look so terrible several years ago, but now it looked horrendous. She stated
253 she would like to find out how much it would cost to use a jackhammer and rock
254 crusher to dig out the lake.

255
256 Mr. Messick noted it was an exorbitant amount of rock which would need to be
257 removed; the lake would have to be dug down 30 feet, not just a few feet, and the
258 cost could be provided in a proposal in more detail. He said the cost estimate he
259 had was simply a ballpark figure he obtained from a contractor.

260
261 Chairperson Stamp noted there was a danger to residents' foundations even using a
262 jackhammer.

263
264 Mr. Messick agreed; vibrations could cause foundation damage.

265
266 Discussion ensued regarding the cost of option 1 and option 2; the possibility of a
267 bond for the Hatcher community; the Hatcher property not paying any bond debt
268 issue at this time; and how the Hatcher property ended up with no bond payment.
269 Portions of this discussion were (indecipherable).

270
271 Ms. ____45:39 asked if it was possible to use funds obtained as a result of the
272 litigation of Taylor Morrison to fix lake 11.

273
274 Chairperson Stamp explained the HOA was litigating Taylor Morrison, not the CDD.
275 He said if the HOA wished to give the CDD money from the lawsuit the CDD would
276 certainly use it; however, he believed the HOA had projects earmarked for those
277 potential funds.

278
279 Mr. Ron Miller stated he felt assigning a \$3 million to \$5 million dollar bond to the
280 Hatcher property was a bad idea; the Hatcher property only had 30 homes, and it
281 was a large debt. He noted only 13 of the 30 Hatcher homes were on the lake, so 17
282 homes would likely strenuously object to the bond.

283
284 Chairperson Stamp stated this subject would be on the agenda for discussion for
285 the next few months and residents were welcome to bring in ideas.

286
287 Ms. ____ thanked the CDD for actively working to fix this problem.

288
289 Mr. Messick continued his report: the recharge well (indecipherable); the Hatcher
290 parcel irrigation pump station filter housing was replaced; the water level
291 (indecipherable). He indicated the well water level was not providing enough flow;

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

294
295 Discussion ensued regarding the amount of recharge water actual flow versus
296 allowed flow; water pumped into the lakes versus water used for irrigation; how
297 much water the District should be allowed to pump; contacting SWFMD to permit
298 drilling another well; SWFMD refusing to permit a fourth well; filling in an existing
299 well to dig a new well with potentially more water; and what would happen if the
300 community ran out of reuse water (purchase water). Much of this discussion was
301 (indecipherable).

302
303 Mr. Messick stated the annual external preserves maintenance program would start
304 next month; this would be the last year of required monitored recording; the
305 maintenance program would continue at a lesser amount in the years to come. He
306 reviewed the coyote trapping program map showing places to trap coyotes away
307 from public areas and the areas where coyote activity was noted. He discussed the
308 coyote trapping plan.

309
310 *Mr. Ward: The HOA has indicated it has declined being a part of the program. You*
311 *have to kill the coyotes if you catch them and there was some concern with the HOA*
312 *with respect to the method of disposal. We would not be able to do this entire*
313 *program. It was contingent upon us being able to do the preserves and the HOA*
314 *doing areas outside of the preserves. It's not worth doing the program just within the*
315 *preserves.*

316
317 *Mr. ____: Is the HOA worried about a PEETA thing?*

318
319 *Mr. Ward: I don't know. I only know they had comments from residents that they don't*
320 *like the disposal method. They have declined to participate. It does not make sense*
321 *to only trap the coyotes within the preserves, and we can't go outside the preserves*
322 *to trap these things. That's the issue.*

323
324 Discussion ensued regarding capturing the coyotes on camera to determine how
325 many coyotes there were in the community to determine whether there was a
326 problem; the cost of coyote trapping; trapped coyotes having to be destroyed; the
327 inability to relocate coyotes.

328
329 Mr. Messick discussed the cane toad removal; the number of toads were reduced.

330
331 Mr. Ward noted the problem with cane toads was growing exponentially in south
332 Florida. He stated the cane toads were moving north; he was seeing cane toads all
333 the way up in Charlotte County.

334
335 *Mr. Messick: The last thing for the lakes is from capital projects. We did our report in*
336 *2022. Next year we have the last of the lakes from the first five year cyclical program.*
337 *This summer the plan was to reevaluate everything pending the last three lakes and*
338 *evaluate what that meant from a capital budget program standpoint. It's been*
339 *requested that we look at alternatives which includes full rip-rap sections, so what I've*
340 *done is provided an estimate not specific to which lakes need to be addressed*

341 because that still needs to be evaluated. But this is including all the lakes. The reason
342 we've updated it and brought in the numbers is because this is every shoreline.
343 We've been asked to remove the canal shoreline and just include the lake shoreline,
344 so the 101,000 linear feet went down to 77,000 linear feet, but the comparison
345 between the two is still the same. I'm going to go through (indecipherable) option
346 number 2, the Geosock and rip rap section is the preferred method from our office,
347 and the Board can certainly chime in. We have Geotubes. The Geosock rip rap we
348 feel will help prevent future washouts underneath the Geotubes and the Geosock
349 allows for a sloped cross section. Of course, there is still concern about the grass
350 dying and coming off of it and the Geosocks being exposed, but that is still going to
351 be a part of our annual maintenance. We are just trying to limit our exposure by
352 adding to the rip rap for stabilization. Going through the two options, option number
353 one is a full rip rap section. There are two different sections depending on how much
354 erosion was anticipated, and whether we do a four foot or eight-foot-deep section.
355 That \$6 million dollars and \$12 million dollars comes from that \$80 dollars (4 foot
356 deep) or \$160 dollars (8 foot deep) per linear foot. I've shown this to you over the
357 seven years because if we do this it will be over the entire community. We have about
358 21 lakes, and we do about three lakes per year. That seems to be our sweet spot with
359 what the vendors can do per year and not be too rushed. We've taken that overall
360 cost and divided it by the number of units over 7 years to give you a ballpark figure of
361 what that rip rap costs per unit. The second option is Geosock and rip rap. I would
362 like to point out that this option would not be required over the entire lake bank. It is
363 going to be evaluated over the summer to see if it is 50 percent of that or 75 percent
364 of that. It's to be determined. But to do a comparison per linear foot, I do have the
365 cost for the 6 foot tall or 10 foot tall Geosock and that costs \$131 or \$151 dollars, so
366 you take the same unit prices and extrapolate out, and you come down to the price
367 per unit over seven years. Again, that's just to show you the price per foot
368 comparison. We can't really tell you what the overall capital program cost is going to
369 be. We can tell you that we don't like the look of rip rap. It's ugly. You're going to
370 have stains and you're going to have to pressure wash. There are other things to
371 think about other than installation costs. It's not ideal. It's more of a commercial
372 application. The Geosock and the rip rap blend is probably a better fit for the
373 neighborhood. These costs are estimated for 100 percent of the lakes needing to be
374 restored, which we know they do not. With rip rap it has to be all or nothing, but with
375 Geosock, because you have the sod which overlays it, you could do that as needed
376 over the next seven years. We are looking to install the 2 foot rip rap tow for
377 stabilization and resodding, or we can go full blown in two years with this option to
378 make sure that holds up over two years.

379
380 Discussion ensued regarding Geotubes versus Geosocks; and installing Geosock on
381 lake 7.

382
383 Chairperson Stamp asked if rip rap would be installed where there were littoral
384 shelves.

385
386 Mr. Ward: The concept is we would plant littorals around the culverts. Within the
387 context of our existing fiscal year 2026 budget, we have sufficient funds to do the
388 Geosocks, rip rap, with some littorals in four lakes, one of which is lake 7.

389

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

391

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

393

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

396

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

401

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

405

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

409

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

412

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

417

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

420

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

423

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

426

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

430

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

432

433 **III. District Manager - JPWard & Associates, LLC**

434 **a. Discussion of Proposal for Coyote Trapping**

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

436

437 No report.

438

439

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

441

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

444

445 Chairperson Stamp indicated the FY 2027 budget would now be discussed; there were no
446 longer any members of the public present. He stated the budget would be discussed over
447 the next few months to iron out the line items, with adoption of the budget in June if the
448 assessment rate remained below the cap level. He noted if the budget went above the cap
449 rate then mailed notice would be required and the budget would be adopted in July. He
450 noted the assessment rate at this point remained the same as last year. He stated this budget
451 left the assessment rate at \$1,845 dollars, funded asset replacement for the near term,
452 completed the success criteria for the preserves, began funding mitigation of fire hazards (a
453 controlled burn may be needed in the future), increased the manager's compensation by
454 \$5,000 dollars (increased for the first time in years), and began the first year of the second
455 five year plan. He said the two things it did not include were major lake 11 improvements and
456 long term rip rap plans; these would be budget add-ons.

457

458 Mr. Ward directed the Board to pages 8 and 9 of the budget which was a report created by
459 Mr. Messick, an analysis of all the CDD's assets in detail, including remaining useful life and
460 current replacement costs. He indicated the purpose of this report was to prepare for fiscal
461 year 2027 and gauge the ability of the CDD to maintain said assets. He said he crossed out
462 line items which did not need a reserve because the assets had an extended life, such as the
463 concrete pipes which had a 100 year life span. He said he also took out a lot of the larger
464 landscaping items, such as the larger palms and trees in the community. He explained if there
465 were a storm event, the CDD would not replace landscaping at full large tree value; the
466 landscaping would be replaced at a smaller size and value. He stated when he removed
467 those items, the reserve allocation for fiscal year 2027 was reduced to \$85,000 dollars. He
468 indicated it was essentially the same amount to be collected for the reserve account annually;
469 over time the reserve account would be built up. *We basically have about \$1,096,000 dollars*
470 *anticipated to be in cash going into the current fiscal year. We've added \$85,000 dollars to*
471 *this. I want you to go into the long term capital funding/hurricane restoration. We had*
472 *\$306,000 dollars in the budget. I want to point out this is a plug. This is a number we use to*
473 *get to \$1,845 dollars. We build the budget. If I'm under \$1,845, I plug that number to get us*
474 *up to \$1,845 dollars and you can see from 2026 to 2027 I have been able to increase it*
475 *because two things are occurring. One is we've been able to take some money from a*
476 *reduction in the amount of funding we're going to spend on the external preserves, and we*
477 *are currently starting to see a flattening in the curve of increases in cost estimates for services*
478 *provided. You've been able to save some money in terms of our operating expenses. It goes*
479 *into that \$306,000 dollar plug, which then keeps us at \$1,845 dollars per unit.*

480

481 *Mr. Scimio: (indecipherable).*

482

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

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

501
502 Chairperson Stamp: It may be the desire of the Board to say we probably ought to do
503 something about the concrete structures and pipes, and maybe we put \$50,000 dollars a year
504 aside for them, or for inflation adjustments knowing some day it will be an issue, but I think
505 that's a discussion for next year or the year after that. We've adequately handled the short term
506 risk with what we've got there and that's what we set out to do, and I think we've done it. The
507 other thing is, we budgeted \$30,000 dollars for the emergency well and we spent about
508 \$81,000 dollars. What's the situation there?

509
510 Mr. Ward: The original estimate was to not install the pipe from the well to the lake, and the
511 meter to deal with that, but then we decided it would be best to install that pipe and the
512 meter. That was an additional emergency we had to deal with, so we had division funds within
513 the constraints of the existing budget, although the line item is over.

514
515 Discussion ensued regarding the well, pipe and meter; lake 11 landscaping; costs of lake 11
516 landscaping and whether some landscaping could be done within the constraints of the
517 existing budget; whether lake 11 should be prioritized; whether the HOA should be
518 responsible for adding landscaping to lake 11; the CDD being responsible for work on the
519 actual lake; and the necessity of irrigation for lake 11 landscaping.

520
521 Mr. Ward stated one option was to spend \$40,000 dollars to add some additional
522 landscaping and trees as well as irrigation to lake 11.

523
524 Chairperson Stamp: In my opinion we do the irrigation and put in the littorals that look like
525 mangroves. We owe it to the public to give them a chance to come back and say this is what
526 we like, what we don't like, or this is something you haven't even thought of. I don't think
527 anybody here wants to spend \$3 million dollars or \$5 million dollars. The charge I gave Jimmy
528 was to start with nothing and go to the Cadillac version and give us everything you can think
529 of.

530
531 Mr. Scimio: You know the community would like to have the lake dug out but do they want to
532 pay for it?

533
534 Chairperson Stamp: That's why it's good to have the numbers out for a while for people to
535 think about. He suggested Mr. Messick take pictures of how rip rap looked when it became
536 stained for the residents to see what rip rap would look like over time.

537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585

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.

586 **SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS** **Adjournment**

587
588 The meeting was adjourned at approximately 2:56 p.m.
589

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

592
593
594 Flow Way Community Development District

595
596
597
598
599 _____
600 James P. Ward, Secretary

Zack Stamp, Chairperson

