

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

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

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

The Regular Meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Flow Way Community Development District was held on Thursday, May 21, 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 Zack Stamp, Chairperson, and James P. Ward as Secretary.

35
36
37
38
39

Present and constituting a quorum:

Zack Stamp	Chairperson
Manmohan "Bart" Bhatla	Assistant Secretary
Tom Kleck	Assistant Secretary
Mark Scimio	Assistant Secretary

40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

Absent:

Ron Miller	Vice Chairperson
------------	------------------

Also present were:

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

Audience:

Frits Riep
Charlie Berkowitz
Daniel Kaufman
Steve Baker
Charlie Machac
Karen Vetrano
Suzanne Sanders
Joe Stigliano (ph)

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.

Chairperson Stamp reviewed public comment protocols.

49 SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS Consideration of Minutes

50

51 April 16, 2026 - Regular Meeting Minutes

52

53 Chairperson Stamp asked if there were any additions, corrections, or deletions to the
54 Minutes. He made one name correction. There were no other corrections.

55

**56 On MOTION made by Bart Bhatla, seconded by Tom Kleck,
57 and with all in favor, the April 16, 2026 Regular Meeting
58 Minutes were approved as amended.**

59

60

61 THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS Discussion

62

63 Discussion of Lake Bank Analysis

64

65 Mr. Jimmy Messick made a PowerPoint presentation. He noted Mr. Stamp made this
66 presentation at the Master HOA Meeting. He stated the first slide outlined the investigations
67 needed to be done to understand the system which included reviewing inventory of the full
68 drainage system, analysis of all assets, developing replacement cost reports, erosion reports
69 and then developing the capital improvement program. He said the next slide showed the
70 permit research which was done. He displayed and discussed maps of the District including a
71 Lakes Map, Irrigation Map, Preserves Map and Overall Ownership Map. He noted the reports
72 done were last performed in 2022 for the capital improvement program developed for 2023
73 through 2027. He stated this summer was the next cyclical year for investigations to identify
74 which lake banks needed to be restored. He stated this report would be used to prepare a
75 capital improvement report for budgeting in the fiscal year 2028 budget. He discussed the
76 2022 Stormwater Report which identified each lake bank, the condition of each bank, and
77 proposed recommended improvements. He stated primarily erosion was due to wind
78 generated wave action, seasonal water level fluctuations, storms, and rainwater leader
79 discharge points. He displayed the previous Capital Improvement Program (CIP) which
80 outlined all the lakes, which lakes had priority, and which year of the program each lake
81 would be addressed. He noted total shoreline was just under 100,000 linear feet and the
82 method used to improve the lake banks were Geotubes or Geosox, rip rap rock, or fill and
83 regrade/reslope banks. He noted the report also included the cost associated with each type
84 of improvement. He explained the different methods were used to bring the lakes back into
85 permit compliance; permits required a certain amount of lake bank slope and protection
86 from erosion. He stated each proposed lake bank restoration method came at a cost and
87 expected lifespan. He noted the cost listed was to install each specific method over the entire
88 100,000 linear feet; this was why the cost listed was in the millions for each. He indicated
89 there were pros and cons for each method. He stated strategic recommendations indicated
90 not all shoreline required repair, to prioritize high-erosion and high-visibility areas and
91 implement repairs in phases over multiple fiscal years. He stated the initial focus area in Flow
92 Way Channel included the lake bank visible from Montelanico Loop and Rapallo Street he
93 noted recommendations were to prioritize only the areas with visible erosion or stabilization
94 concerns and consider limiting improvements to the side adjacent to residential homes
95 where visibility is greatest as this approach may reduce overall project scope while still
96 addressing the most noticeable and impactful areas. He discussed the phasing approach

97 which had three phases, phase 1 - critical erosion and safety concerns, phase 2 - moderate
98 stabilization areas, and phase 3 - long-term and low-risk areas. He reported next year was the
99 last of the current five-year plan before moving on to the next capital improvement program
100 cycle. He displayed a slide reviewing what was done so far in the current capital improvement
101 plan. He noted the comparable 15-year cost analysis indicated the more substantial costs
102 may help in the long run. He indicated the next four slides outlined each lake, each linear foot
103 for each lake, and what the cost would be if a full complete restoration was done. He
104 displayed a slide which outlined littoral planting goals. He noted in the past the CDD simply
105 met the permit standards for littoral planting but would increase the littoral planting above
106 permit standards in the upcoming capital improvement plan to better protect the shoreline
107 from wave motion erosion. He stated he was working with a consultant at this time to develop
108 two to three concepts for improving Lake 11 which would hopefully be presented at the June
109 meeting. He stated in conclusion: the estimated project exposure ranged from \$2.3M to
110 \$9.5M depending on selected repair method, prioritization, and phasing. He stated the
111 District was developing a new five-year shoreline stabilization plan for Fiscal Years 2028
112 through 2032; and ongoing inspections would continue throughout the summer. He noted a
113 \$1,000 special assessment across 1,184 units/doors would generate approximately
114 \$1,184,000 dollars in revenue. He stated this was for information purposes only; he was not
115 proposing a special assessment. He stated if riprap was the preferred restoration method
116 around all lakes, it was important to remember during peak drought season, exposed
117 sediment and mud may still be visible at the lowest points of the lakes and Flow Way
118 Channel.

119
120 Discussion ensued regarding the cost of installing riprap around all the lakes; and how much
121 it would cost the residents to install riprap around the lakes.

122
123 Mr. Mark Scimio asked what was driving these improvements, permit standards, or
124 beautification.

125
126 Chairperson Stamp responded the driver was two-fold, the CDD wanted to meet permit
127 standards and beautify the lakes as well. He said he felt the study was necessary to
128 understand how these goals were divided and how to meet each.

129
130 Mr. Messick agreed.

131
132 Mr. Steve Baker [19:45] asked if the 2022 study would be the baseline for (indecipherable); it
133 was a lot of money

134
135 Mr. Messick explained the numbers were based on the assumption that all the lakes, all the
136 banks, all linear feet would need to be repaired. He explained the numbers were simply cost
137 examples. He stated when the study was performed it would consider the portions of the
138 lakes which needed improvement and which portions of which lakes needed improvement.

139
140 Mr. Charlie Machac asked if the CDD was currently in compliance with the permits.

141
142 Mr. Messick responded in the affirmative.

143
144 Mr. Machac asked if Taylor Morrison built the lakes to permit standards.

145
146 Mr. Messick responded Taylor Morrison constructed the lakes to permit standards.
147
148 Mr. Machac asked if the five-year plan was updated annually.
149
150 Mr. Messick responded the CDD revisited the five year plan annually and adjusted it as
151 appropriate.
152
153 Mr. Ward agreed.
154
155 Chairperson Stamp agreed noting the CDD was not locked into the five year plan.
156
157 Mr. Charlie Berkowitz asked about the upcoming Flow Way channel project.
158
159 Mr. Messick stated he did not know the specifics off the top of his head, but he believed it
160 was in the residential area that the work would be done.
161
162 Mr. Joe Stigliano asked about the Flow Way Canal along the golf course.
163
164 Mr. Messick stated he would evaluate the Flow Way Canal this summer and see if there were
165 other areas which were not included in the CIP for year number five. He stated there was a
166 CIP project for restoring the overflow weir which was damaged from the storm events.
167
168 Discussion continued regarding the Flow Way Canal.
169
170 Ms. Karen Vetrano discussed where sod was planted along a lake bank in her previous
171 neighborhood and the sod was still in place after ten years. She noted her previous irrigation
172 system was connected to the recharge well. She explained the builder obtained the permit
173 for the recharge well but never dug the well; after the Board was turned over to the residents,
174 the residents dug the recharge well. She said this might be a possibility for Flow Way. She
175 noted there were also shut off valves which allowed the community to send water to different
176 areas where irrigation was needed. She stated also a programable, computerized irrigation
177 system was installed for single family homes, so the homes could change the schedule of
178 irrigation. She stated since her previous community was able to monitor its gallons more
179 accurately SFWMD did not watch the community as closely and allowed the community to
180 water more in some seasons and less in others. She stated she lived on the 9th fairway and the
181 lake had Geosox and there was erosion. She stated where the sod came to the top of the lake
182 and met the Geosox there was a big swath of sod which died and looked bad. She stated the
183 drain by her house which extended into the lake was collapsing, so her bank was falling in.
184 She noted the single family homes had not been well irrigated over the last month. She asked
185 what could be done to fix the problem. She asked if the irrigation system was correctly
186 designed by Taylor Morrison.
187
188 Mr. Messick explained the method Taylor Morrison used to design the irrigation system for
189 the community was the same as was used today; it was based on acreage and land use. He
190 stated as the acreage and the land use were the same, the community would not be
191 permitted to increase the amount of water withdrawn and used. He stated as such he did not

192 know if there were any additional permitting which could be done to increase the water use
193 in the community.

194

195 Ms. Vetrano asked if there were a way to preserve water use during the wetter season for use
196 during the dry season. She asked if there were a way to better retain stormwater for irrigation
197 use. She asked if there were lakes which held more stormwater that could be drawn from.

198

199 Mr. Messick explained the lakes were all interconnected, so any water drawn from one lake
200 was being drawn from all the lakes. He said the CDD drew from the larger lakes as opposed
201 to the smaller lakes, so when irrigation was being drawn from the main lake, an effort was
202 made to balance out the water so it should not create any unpermitted condition. He stated
203 the interconnected lake system should be working as it was designed.

204

205 Mr. Charlie Machac noted the past two years the operating budget did not increase, so the
206 increase in fiscal year 2027's budget was the first increase in three years. He asked if there
207 was any room left before the assessment rate reached its cap.

208

209 Chairperson Stamp responded there was roughly \$400 dollars before the assessment rate
210 reached its CAP.

211

212 Mr. Machac asked about increasing the assessment rate by \$400 dollars and how this would
213 be billed.

214

215 Chairperson Stamp explained the CDD could add \$400 dollars to the assessment rate, and if
216 so, Collier County would put it in the tax bill, collect the money and remit the money to the
217 CDD.

218

219 Mr. Machac asked if the CDD did not increase the assessment rate, when could the
220 assessment rate be increased.

221

222 Chairperson Stamp responded if it did not increase the assessment rate this year, then it
223 could be considered for the next budget cycle a year from now. He said the fiscal year
224 budget began October 1 and ended September 30 annually, but the tax money was not
225 collected until December, so there was a lag in funding which the CDD had to cover with
226 existing funds.

227

228 Mr. Machac asked why the CDD would not increase the assessment rate to the cap rate right
229 now.

230

231 Chairperson Stamp stated he would discuss this during the next item, which was the budget
232 discussion.

233

234

235

236 FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Discussion

237

238 Continuation of Fiscal Year 2027 Budget Discussion

239

240 *Mr. Ward: We are now in month three of review of this budget. The assessment rate stays the*
241 *same at \$1,845 dollars per unit per year for fiscal year 2027. It includes all the operating*
242 *requirements we have had over the past few years with respect to the services required*
243 *including \$86,000 dollars for lake bank repairs in fiscal year 2027 identified for three lakes in*
244 *the system for this year.*

245

246 *Chairperson Stamp: I think there are three options we could consider in June. One is, Ron*
247 *Miller wants to go up to the cap rate, as Charlie indicated, or some number very close to that*
248 *to have those funds available. Second option will be if we have good proposal regarding lake*
249 *11 and we think we need funds, we can put that number in, or we can put in a plug number to*
250 *do lake 11 and if we use it, we use it, and if we don't, we don't. The third option which Jim and*
251 *I have been working on, and we are not ready to put on the table today, we think we might be*
252 *able to stretch and squeeze the existing budget and come up with enough money to do*
253 *something, depending on what the proposal is for Lake 11. That doesn't take care of the lake*
254 *bank beautification, but it should take care of the lake bank erosion. In my personal opinion,*
255 *until we have a plan, I don't like just throwing money out there. We can break the cap rate. All*
256 *it takes is a special hearing, so mechanically it's not that difficult. If we come back and*
257 *everybody wants to spend \$1 million dollars we can bust the cap rate and do it. But without*
258 *having some type of plan I don't think it's responsible to start increasing the assessment. That's*
259 *what I think we will end up talking about in June. Any other comments?*

260

261 *Mr. Mark Scimio: What have we heard from our consultant about delivering the proposals for*
262 *lake 11 at the June meeting?*

263

264 *Mr. Ward: We are diligently working on getting the proposals out. We are hopefully on track*
265 *to get the proposal to you by the June meeting, but I'm going to tell you it's either going to be*
266 *June or July. I'm not going to promise we will get this done by June. This is a complicated*
267 *process, and we just started it 30 days ago.*

268

269 *Mr. Scimio: So, the budget has to be finalized by the July meeting?*

270

271 *Chairperson Stamp: We could do it in July. Right?*

272

273 *Mr. Ward: Yes, but it would be tough.*

274

275 *Mr. Scimio: So, if we raise to the cap, we would bring in approximately \$500,000 dollars. I*
276 *would assume the three proposals we are looking at are not going to come up to \$500,000*
277 *dollars.*

278

279 *Chairperson Stamp: I don't think there are any votes up here for a \$500,000 dollar project.*

280

281 *Mr. Scimio: So, I guess the scenario would be if we didn't have the plans, and we wanted to*
282 *approve the budget in June, we just would go to the cap and go on with it? Or pick a dollar*
283 *amount out of the air.*

284

285 *Chairperson Stamp: Yes. Or, Jim and I have been working on trying to figure out, out of*
286 *contingencies and stuff we are not going to spend this fiscal year, do we have enough room to*
287 *have a reasonable amount available at the current rate, or maybe a combination of these*
288 *things.*

289

290 *Mr. Bhatla: It seems to me that we need to calm down until we have the proposals. We are*
291 *talking about financing before we know the alternatives. I don't see that this is an emergency.*
292 *It's on the urgent track, but it's not an emergency.*

293

294 *Chairperson Stamp: It wouldn't be urgent if we could work on the budget up until the end of*
295 *our fiscal year. All these solutions are possible solutions. Also, we are not going to do the work*
296 *when the water is high anyway. We would do the work when the water went back down.*

297

298 Mr. Ward concurred.

299

300 Chairperson Stamp asked if there were any audience comments.

301

302 Mr. Charlie Berkowitz stated it was important not to use up all contingency monies to make
303 lake 11 improvements just in case there was an emergency situation.

304

305 Mr. Ward explained to the extent that there was an emergency which the CDD did not
306 foresee, it automatically had sufficient funds to handle the emergency.

307

308 Chairperson Stamp explained every category included a contingency amount.

309

310 Mr. Charlie Machac stated the CDD should increase the assessment to the cap rate because
311 he believed it was inevitable the CDD would need funds to improve the lakes and the lake
312 banks, so it might as well move forward with increasing the assessment rate to cover the
313 costs. He noted if any funds were not used for lake 11, they could be used for future lake
314 bank projects which in the long term would prevent a future assessment rate increase. He
315 noted improvement of lake 11 and the lake banks in general would only increase home
316 values.

317

318

319 **FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

Consideration of Resolution 2026-6

320

321 **Consideration of Resolution 2026-6, a Resolution of the Board of Supervisors**
322 **Approving the agreements with PFM Management Services LLC, and PFM Financial**
323 **Advisors LLC; Authorizing the Chairperson to execute the agreements; providing**
324 **general authorization; and addressing conflicts, severability, and an effective date**

325

326 Mr. Ward stated he sold his firm to PFM Management Services LLC and PFM Financial
327 Advisors LLC. He noted he would remain with PFM for a year or so before he transitioned out.
328 He explained Resolution 2026-6 transferred the JPWard and Associates LLC agreements over
329 to PFM. He indicated the scope of services and fee structures remained the same. He asked if
330 there were any questions.

331

332 Mr. Tom Kleck asked how much more these new contracts would cost the CDD.

333

334 Mr. Ward responded it would not cost the CDD anything more; the fee structures were
335 exactly the same.

336

337 Mr. Kleck noted corporate headquarters were in Orlando. He asked if the insurance fees
338 would be more or less than current fees.

339

340 Mr. Ward responded insurance was included in the fee structure.

341

342 Mr. Kleck asked if Mr. Ward had a contract with PFM.

343

344 Mr. Ward responded in the affirmative; he had a binding one year contract with PFM.

345

346 Chairperson Stamp discussed the history behind Mr. Ward's decision to sell. He indicated he
347 asked Mr. Ward who would take over if anything happened to Mr. Ward. He stated this
348 prompted Mr. Ward to look into options to ensure his company had a fallback option.

349

350 Mr. Michael Pawelczyk stated his office worked with PFM on many other Districts; PFM was
351 well qualified as a CDD Management Firm and had plenty of other Managers on staff and an
352 excellent accounting staff. He noted these agreements were terminable by either party for
353 convenience, so once Mr. Ward stepped down, if the Board did not like PFM it could exercise
354 its termination rights.

355

356 Mr. Bhatla asked for Mr. Pawelczyk's recommendation regarding whether or not to approve
357 the agreement.

358

359 Mr. Pawelczyk explained the CDD was approving an agreement that had the same or similar
360 terms to what it had with JPWard & Associates. He said if the CDD wished to continue to have
361 management services he recommended approving the agreement. He indicated there was
362 no change to the cost, and there was a financial advisory component PFM offered if the CDD
363 wished to issue bonds or refinance bonds. He said he had no objections to the CDD entering
364 into the agreements. He noted the legal form of the documents were acceptable pursuant to
365 the changes he recommended which would be in the final form of the agreements.

366

367 Mr. Kleck asked what other companies PFM managed which were similar to Flow Way CDD.

368

369 Mr. Ward responded PFM currently managed somewhere around 70 to 80 Community
370 Development Districts across Florida and also managed stewardship districts which were
371 larger districts which spanned 5,000 acres to 7,000 acres with 10,000 to 15,000 units. He
372 stated PFM had a wealth of knowledge and background which JPWard & Associates could
373 not bring to the table for the CDD.

374

375 Chairperson Stamp called for a motion.

376

377

**On MOTION made by Bart Bhatla, seconded by Tom Kleck,
and with all in favor, the Resolution 2026-6 was adopted,
and the Chair was authorized to sign.**

378

379

380 SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Staff Items

381

382 I. District General Counsel - Billing, Cochran, Lyles, Mauro & Ramsey, P.A.**383 a. Litigation updates**

384

385 *Mr. Michael Pawelczyk: For the pending Colosi litigation regarding access through our*
386 *conservation areas, there was a motion to dismiss filed by both this CDD, the Quarry*
387 *CDD and Esplanade, your association. All three of those motions were heard on the 18th*
388 *of May. The Judge entered an order shortly thereafter denying the motion to dismiss,*
389 *which is not unusual, and ordering the District, Esplanade and the Quarry CDD to file a*
390 *responsive pleading within 10 days of the order. So, your special counsel will file that.*
391 *The other part of the order which was made clear at the hearing is that in Colosi's*
392 *complaint there is a reference to certain damages and that has now been withdrawn, so*
393 *basically the complaint is about access through land owned by the three entities. There*
394 *is no damage component to this litigation. Once special counsel files the responsive*
395 *pleading we will circulate that amongst the Board because it is a public record.*

396

397 II. District Engineer - Calvin, Giordano & Associates**398 a. Engineer's Report****399 1) Purpose****400 2) Current Asset Updates:****401 1. Landscape Maintenance****402 2. Entrance Maintenance****403 3. Lake Maintenance****404 4. Irrigation Pump House****405 5. External Preserves****406 6. Cane Toads****407 3) Capital Projects****408 4) Future Asset Maintenance Items****409 5) Engineer's Report Complete****410 b. Water Quality Report - February 2026****411 c. Lake 11 Improvement Plan Timeline**

412

413 Mr. Jimmy Messick reported regarding the landscaping: a lot of palm trimming was
414 being done; mulch was done. He said regarding lake maintenance: landscape debris
415 was removed from lake 11 and he was working to remove some of the rocks; all internal
416 preserve wetlands were treated for exotics and nuisance species; lake bank restoration
417 for lake 7 and lake 14 were completed; and this summer a lake bank restoration
418 assessment would be done. He discussed the cane toad program: slight increase
419 throughout April; monitoring and removal would continue. He stated the irrigation
420 pumphouse monthly usage table was updated and the CDD was within permit
421 requirements. He stated the external preserves were nearing the end of the required
422 monitoring and reporting for this year. He stated the vendor completed preserve area 2
423 and was at the end of area 1. He stated he continued to work with Collier County to pull
424 a fence permit, along with the Quarry CDD.

425 He indicated the initial submittal was to move the fence to the south. He noted the
426 Quarry CDD offered to help with the cost, but the cost was quite large. He stated he
427 would have solid information next month for the Board to consider.

428
429 *Chairperson Stamp: There is a lot of fly dumping down that road when you come in at*
430 *the back entrance, and you turn and you see that dirt path. Richard (the asset manager)*
431 *and I walked down there the other day and there was all kinds of fly dumping. They've*
432 *got all kinds of people going back in there and doing stuff. Including people just walking*
433 *back there. They also have a lot of panthers and that's where the bear was. I don't know*
434 *why people go back there, but it's a problem and we need to get that closed off.*

435
436 *Mr. Messick: The initial proposal was shot down, trying to propose a fence through,*
437 *across from one CDD to the other, because of Collier Blvd right-of-way, and you're not*
438 *allowed to disturb the preserves with a fence. We can put a fence adjacent to the*
439 *preserves, so we have a solution, but it's a very costly solution.*

440
441 *Chairperson Stamp: We've had a request from a resident to keep the holiday lights on*
442 *year-round. I just wonder what the Board's thoughts are.*

443
444 *Mr. Kleck: I've gotten several requests, probably from the same person. We are looking*
445 *at just the palm trees. The front entrance of our neighborhood is spectacular at*
446 *Christmas time and the holidays, and this request came from a gentleman who was a*
447 *part time snowbird who asked if we could leave the palm tree lights on year round. The*
448 *cost that I see, \$3,500 dollars, is that additional electric? Per year?*

449
450 *Mr. Ward: Yes. It's electric, it's the maintenance, and it's the cost of renting them. Yes,*
451 *per year.*

452
453 *Mr. Kleck: That's \$2.94 cents per home.*

454
455 Discussion ensued regarding potentially leaving the lights on the palm trees on all year
456 round and the cost of holiday lighting versus the cost of palm tree lighting.

457
458 Mr. Scimio indicated he was not opposed to leaving up palm tree lighting year-round.

459
460 Mr. Kleck agreed.

461
462 Mr. Bhatla indicated he was in favor of keeping the palm tree lighting on year-round.

463
464 Chairperson Stamp stated the Board was in favor of leaving the palm tree lighting up
465 year-round; a vote was not needed; it would be done.

466
467 **III. District Manager - JPWard & Associates, LLC**

468 **a. Supervisor of Elections Qualified Elector Report dated April 15, 2026**

469 **b. Important Meeting Dates for the Remainder of Fiscal Year 2026:**

470 **i. Next Meeting: Thursday, June 18, 2026, Public Hearing FY 2027 Budget**

471 **ii. Candidate Qualifying Period: June 8, 2026 - June 12, 2026 (Seats 1, 2, & 4)**

472 **c. Financial Report for the period ending April 30, 2026 (unaudited)**

473 Mr. Ward stated the Supervisor of Elections reported the District had 1,357 qualified
474 electors as of April 15, 2026. He noted the Board was already transitioned to a qualified
475 elector board; no action was required. He reminded the Board that the public hearing
476 would be on June 18, 2026 for budget adoption. He stated the Board could continue
477 the public hearing until July at the June meeting. He asked Mr. Michael Pawelczyk if the
478 Board would be able to go over the \$1,845 rate.

479
480 Mr. Michael Pawelczyk responded the Board would not be able to go above \$1,845
481 dollars without approving another proposed budget.

482
483 *Mr. Ward: You would have to approve a new proposed budget in June with a higher*
484 *rate.*

485
486 *Mr. Pawelczyk: And then 60 days from then, you would have your public hearing.*

487
488 *Mr. Ward: Right. We are not talking about breaking the cap.*

489
490 *Chairperson Stamp: The next meeting is June 18th. If anyone is interested in running for*
491 *the CDD, the candidate qualification period is June 8, 2026 through June 12, 2026.*
492 *There are three seats up. The information is on our website. The seats up for election are*
493 *Ron Miller, Bart Bhatla, and Tom Kleck.*

494
495
496 **SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS** **Supervisor’s Requests**

497
498 Chairperson Stamp asked if there were any Supervisor’s requests; there were none.

499
500
501 **EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS** **Public Comments**

502
503 Chairperson Stamp asked if there were any public comments; there were none.

504
505
506 **NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS** **Adjournment**

507
508 The meeting was adjourned at approximately 2:09 p.m.

509
510 **On MOTION made by Tom Kleck, seconded by Bart Bhatla,**
511 **and with all in favor, the Meeting was adjourned.**

512
513
514 Flow Way Community Development District

515
516 **Signature:** James Ward
517 James Ward (Jul 7, 2026 07:36:12 EDT)

518 **Email:** wardj@pfm.com

519 James P. Ward, Secretary

516 **Signature:** Z Stamp
517 z stamp (Jul 6, 2026 16:39:53 EDT)

518 **Email:** zackstamp@gmail.com

519 Zack Stamp, Chairperson










FW - Minutes 05 21 2026 - PDF for Sigs

Final Audit Report

2026-07-07

Created:	2026-07-06
By:	Anastasya Beauchamps (beauchampsa@pfm.com)
Status:	Signed
Transaction ID:	CBJCHBCAABAAMaiVLMwMJ0ABvLw1KrFv2d2HVzEHMEDN

"FW - Minutes 05 21 2026 - PDF for Sigs" History

-  Document created by Anastasya Beauchamps (beauchampsa@pfm.com)
2026-07-06 - 8:18:32 PM GMT
-  Document emailed to zackstamp@gmail.com for signature
2026-07-06 - 8:18:37 PM GMT
-  Document emailed to James Ward (wardj@pfm.com) for signature
2026-07-06 - 8:18:37 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by James Ward (wardj@pfm.com)
2026-07-06 - 8:18:41 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by zackstamp@gmail.com
2026-07-06 - 8:39:15 PM GMT
-  Signer zackstamp@gmail.com entered name at signing as z stamp
2026-07-06 - 8:39:51 PM GMT
-  Document e-signed by z stamp (zackstamp@gmail.com)
Signature Date: 2026-07-06 - 8:39:53 PM GMT - Time Source: server - Signature Appearance Selected: TYPE
-  Document e-signed by James Ward (wardj@pfm.com)
Signature Date: 2026-07-07 - 11:36:12 AM GMT - Time Source: server - Signature Appearance Selected: TYPE
-  Agreement completed.
2026-07-07 - 11:36:12 AM GMT