

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

The Regular Meeting of the Board of Directors of the Flow Way Community Development District was held on Thursday, August 20, 2020 at 1:00 p.m. via telecommunication.

**Present and constituting a quorum:**

Andrew Miller	Chairperson
John Wollard	Vice Chairperson
Ronald Miller	Assistant Secretary
Tom Kleck	Assistant Secretary

**Also present were:**

James P. Ward	District Manager
Greg Urbancic	District Counsel
Jeremy Fireline	District Engineer

**Audience:**

Ed Staley  
Zack Stamp

All resident's 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 THIS MEETING WERE TRANSCRIBED VERBATIM. ALL VERBATIM PORTIONS WERE TRANSCRIBED IN *ITALICS*.**

**FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Call to Order/Roll Call**

District Manager James P. Ward called the meeting to order at approximately 1:02 p.m. He reported with the State of Emergency in Florida, and pursuant to Executive Orders 20-52, 20-69, 20-112, 20-123, 20-139, 20-150, 20-179, and 20-193 issued by Governor DeSantis on March 9, 2020, March 20, 2020, April 29, 2020, May 8, 2020, June 23, 2020, July 29, 2020, and August 7, 2020 respectively, and pursuant to Section 120.54(5)9b)2., Florida, Statutes, this meeting was held utilizing communication media technology due to the current COVID-19 public health emergency. He explained all Members of the Board and Staff were present via videoconference or telephone; no persons were present in the on-site meeting room location. He asked all speakers to state their names for the record prior to speaking. He conducted roll call; all Members of the Board were present constituting a quorum.

**SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Public Comments**

- I. The Public comment period is for items NOT listed on the Agenda, and individuals are limited to three (3) minutes per person, assignment of speaking time is not permitted, however the Presiding**

**Officer may extend or reduce the time for the public comment period consistent with Section 286.0114, Florida Statutes.**

**II. Individuals are permitted to speak on items on the Agenda in accordance with the procedure in I. above.**

Mr. Ward indicated public comments would be taken during Agenda Items and at the end of the Meeting.

**THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Consideration of Minutes**

**July 16, 2020 Regular Meeting Minutes**

Mr. Ward asked if there were any additions, corrections, or deletions for the July 16, 2020 Regular Meeting Minutes. Hearing none, he called for a motion.

**On MOTION made by Mr. Tom Kleck, seconded by Mr. Ronald Miller, and with all in favor, the July 16, 2020 Regular Meeting Minutes were approved.**

**FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Staff Reports**

**Staff Reports**

**I. District Attorney**

Mr. Greg Urbancic noted the next meeting would likely be held via telecommunication; otherwise, he had nothing to report.

**II. District Engineer/Environmental Consultant**

Mr. Jeremy Fireline had nothing to report.

**III. District Manager**

**a) Financial Statements ending July 31, 2020 (Unaudited)**

Mr. Ward had nothing to report.

**SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Supervisor's Requests and Audience Comments**

Mr. Ward asked if there were any audience comments or questions; there were none.

**I. Supervisor Ron Miller:**

**a) Update on Preserve E-mail (to Chair) – July 16, 2020 Meeting**

*Mr. Ward: There was an open item from the last Board Meeting that Mr. Miller had asked about specifically regarding the email sent out by the homeowner's association with respect to the preserves. If you all recall that was the email that I included in the Agenda that was sent out by the homeowner's association to all residents and the CDD regarding access to the preserves, etc., with other ancillary information. I think the question was primarily, how did that get disseminated to the community without it at least going through the CDD.*

*Mr. Ron Miller: I agree with everything you said, but was also hoping to get, not only how it got disseminated without involving the CDD, but the accuracy of it seemed to be way out of line. I'm drawing a conclusion on that, but it just seemed to be. We were hoping that Drew would visit with – I think he agreed to visit with other people and give us a report back for clarity or something.*

*Mr. Drew Miller: I don't think it's out of line. I'm following now. This is regarding the access. The permit allows for – I think Jim, if you need additional clarification it needs to come from Tim Hall. They can have access to, providing they don't destroy vegetation. I believe there were some questions about restricting some of the use. I think the association is moving forward with some landscaping, some additional signage, as well as Jim and I think we'd put some additional signage out there through the CDD for offsite areas. The CDD has the ability to restrict access. I just don't know that we'd want to or not. I don't particularly think we need to.*

*Mr. Ward: It's up to the Board what you all want to do. I'll tell you during the interim Drew, and for the balance of the Board, prior to even seeing this email, I was clearly having No Trespassing signs put up on the external preserves such that they would have no trespassing and even some recent locations that I've learned about in the last week or so. On the internal of the preserves, my thought was at least until the CDD Board comes up with a firm position on how it wants to provide access to the internal preserves, the CDD should put up signage at some interval in this location to at least notify residents of these wildlife animals in here, and their danger, and probably not go into those preserves for the moment until we come up with some way to at least identify for residents what's in these preserves, etc. I have asked Tim to come up with some signage for that, that I know he is working on for me during this interim period until the Board comes up with a firm position on this matter. I don't know the answer to this matter. And I think the bigger issue is I don't even know the extent of the kinds of animals that are in that preserve as they relate to the permit. So, whether the email is correct or – I don't see anything wrong with the email in terms of my discussions with Tim Hall, but I also don't know the extent of animals that are in that preserve at this point.*

*Mr. Drew Miller: Greg, how much liability does the CDD have if its residents and members of the CDD access the preserve.*

*Mr. Greg Urbancic: I got into this at the last meeting. It is a bit of an unsettled area of the law when you go into what might be a natural habitat of a particular wild animal do you have responsibility. I think some of the commentary and some of the case law that started to come up after the incident at Disney World with the alligator seem to suggest, at least in terms of discussions about an HOA type of contact, which I would deem somewhat applicable, provides that there should at least be some sort of warning. You have to take some steps. The question is one of negligence. Would someone ever say we had a duty to protect them, and that we breached that duty, and the breach of that duty was the proximate cause of them being injured. We could debate the theory of that. I think discussions we had on a Staff level is, well, it wouldn't hurt to put up warning signs at a*

*minimum because then we at least could say, maybe we had a duty, but we also tried to mitigate that duty by warning people what the situation was. It's a bit of a theoretical debate as to whether or not there would be any sort of liability. There other aspect I want to say is just by our very nature of being a governmental entity we have potential sovereign immunity. There is a limited waiver under the Florida Statutes, but certainly it provides quite a bit more protection than if we were just some private entity that had an interest there. There is that benefit for us that we do have a cap in the event of some sort of tort claim.*

*Mr. Ron Miller: I was hoping to get some additional clarification on the threshold point. I'm one of the first residents in the place and there has always been signs for the external preserves No Trespassing, Keep Out, No Entrance, or whatever that say. I was always under the layman's view that nobody can enter those preserves whatsoever. Then the Nathan Stiff (ph) email blast comes out saying oh, it's a happy thing, we can all go have happy times in there or whatever. I'm trying to understand just the basics of can the CDD allow the utilization of the preserves or are those preserves put away in an easement which prevents their utilization.*

*Mr. Drew Miller: Yes, they can be utilized as passive. The permit allows for passive recreation in there. So, biking and things like that are allowed.*

*Mr. Urbancic: I would have to pull the permit, but my understanding, my recollection, it's been a while, but I think there is language in the permit, in the conservation easement, that allows for passive recreation. I guess the next question Ron would be whether or not, given that the CDD's obligations or interests out there, whether or not we could initiate some sort of rule making to dictate what we are going to permit out there. It is one thing to have it permitted to be allowed; it's another thing of whether or not we are going to ultimately allow it.*

*Mr. Ron Miller: Thank you. You read my mind. I'm not against preventing activity out there. If we can use it for some good things that's fine, but Greg you hit the nail on the head what is it that the CDD, not Nathan Stiff, but what would the CDD like to allow to happen out there? As I'm sitting here right now, I don't have a list of things that I would want to say are "do's and don'ts" but isn't that something the Board and the CDD should develop?*

*Mr. Urbancic: Yes, I think that's a good idea. I would recommend we go through the rule making process in order to determine this is what we're going to allow to be done in the preserves. That would require a public hearing. I think that would be a good idea if we went down that road. Then we could figure it out and determine based on what may be permissible, what we are actually going to allow.*

*Mr. Tom Kleck: There are a lot of CDD organizations throughout the State of Florida. I would think there would be some kind of guidelines or established do's and don'ts already. Are not all CDDs the same Greg?*

*Mr. Urbancic: Not all of them are the same. Every once in a while we establish rules in various districts as to what you can do on certain properties, but I can do a little research, but all the Districts I represent I don't think it's been an issue for other Districts. Other Districts have onsite preserves, maybe not as vast, but they have certain preserves. We've not had to go in there and dictate what can be done and what can't be done. Not all of them are designated as passive recreation. I think if you look at some other communities they may not have the same ability to use the preserves for*

*certain things or they may be limited to things like boardwalks and the like which have never been built, and therefore it's not really an issue. I don't know that there is an actual template. Somebody may have a draft somewhere that they did for another community we might be able to piggyback off of and not start from scratch, but I haven't done it myself personally.*

*Mr. Ron Miller: In the meantime, for discussion purposes, would it be wise to prohibit the utilization because we don't know what we want to do?*

*Mr. Drew Miller: I'm willing to go with whatever you want to. I think we are overanalyzing some of this. I'm not too concerned personally, but I would go with whatever you want to do. I think everybody in the community signs liability waivers, so I don't know how that applies to this but –*

*Mr. Urbancic: I think it's a policy matter and I think you can make the decision as to whether or not you want to do that, and then go through the process of evaluating what you are going to do, or you can keep the status quo and do that evaluation. I would just say it might take a little bit of time to get the signage up there to let the public know exactly what is transpiring.*

*Mr. John Wollard: I would recommend on this particular topic maybe get a Florida Native Habitat sign up in the entrance points and maybe that will suffice for the liability concern while we work out the rules over the course of the next 30 or 60 days.*

*Mr. Urbancic: I think Jim was coming up with some kind of sign that warned of the particularly potentially dangerous species that might be out there: bears and snakes and things like that. Maybe that would meet what Supervisor Wollard had just said.*

*Mr. Ward: Before the email went out, I was on the side of nobody is going in it anyways so let's not worry about it. But the email kind of suggests that people should go out there. So, there are two kinds of signs: one that just says these animals are in here, no trespassing, or please don't enter and another sign that says these are the potential animals that are in here, they are dangerous, beware or stay on a path or something. My gut reaction, until the Board develops a firm set of policies on access, is there is too much potential for hurting a human being, which I tend to be more cautious about, so putting up a Do Not Enter or No Trespassing until you can develop a full set of rules or procedures. The email that went out was extraordinarily broad. I'm not going to question the voracity of the email, if it's correct, it's correct; but I do think we need some kind of signage. My leaning is towards more of a no trespassing, or do not enter sign than anything else.*

*Mr. Tom Kleck: I feel that a lot of this is common sense, and if we are going to forbid our neighbors from trespassing in this area, how are we going to keep the bears from trespassing on our areas? We've got more bears coming into our neighborhoods than I think are in the preserves.*

*Mr. Wollard: We do live in Florida. All of our lakes in the communities tend to have alligators. I just question how far you take the signage. In theory we could say no swimming, and alligators in every lake. Again, I'm with Drew, if we feel like we need to put no trespassing signs there and lock it out we can. I don't necessarily feel like it's the right thing to do, but we will go with your gut on it.*

*Mr. Drew Miller: If we are going to spin our wheels for 30 days or 60 days putting no trespassing signs up, and then come up with rules – the rules in my mind are going to be simple. It's going to be straightforward. If we focus on putting some kind of warning sign up that says enter at your own*

*risk, this is native habitat for these animals, it's going to take us just as long. I don't want to restrict the community from access due to a far chance of them suing us and us being responsible for their actions that they probably already know anyway because it's common sense. If you go out in the woods, you're in nature.*

Mr. Ward asked for the consensus of the Board.

*Mr. Drew Miller: I would like the sign to say Beware, Enter at Your Own Risk and I think Tim should be the one to help us create it. When you go to a State Park, they don't have any scary signs out front. Let's maybe take notes from a State Park. I think Tim is probably qualified and has seen this and done this at a State Park. It's not much different from a State Park in my opinion.*

The Board agreed.

*Mr. Ron Miller: Should we commission a study to be more specific in the future or just leave it at this and we are done?*

*Mr. Ward: Well, we need to develop rules, but let's go to step one and put up beware signs. I've already gotten with Tim, so I have some ideas of what to do. Then we can deal with that as we move forward.*

*Mr. Drew Miller: In creating rules I think you should let Tim start it from the permit, then if we feel like there is something else that needs to be added we can.*

*Mr. Ron Miller: So, Tim Hall is going to come up with some guidelines for us to consider?*

*Mr. Ward: I will be glad to ask him to do that if you'd like and will do the signs in advance of that.*

The Board agreed.

*Mr. Ward: Tim did develop a sign that I saw. It says "Caution: Wildlife. Do not feed the animals. Keep pets on a leash. Keep children close by." It has our name on the bottom of it. It is a rectangular sign we can put toward the entrances. I will forward this email to you so you can see it. He asked if there were any additional Board comments.*

*Mr. Kleck: I noticed there were emails and correspondence regarding Taylor Morrison proceeding with the development of the Hatcher property. How are they able to do that when in fact the preserve in that area has not been approved or accepted by the CDD yet?*

*Mr. Drew Miller: I don't understand.*

*Mr. Kleck: We had a vote on whether we would accept the Hatcher property into the preserve area.*

*Mr. Drew Miller: It wasn't the preserve area; it was into the CDD boundaries. We voted not to keep it in the CDD. It's still going to get developed and brought into the community. It will be part of the HOA; they just won't pay the dues or be part of the CDD or have any CDD obligations.*

*Mr. Ron Miller: I agree with what Drew just said. The Hatcher property has been approved by Collier County and if Taylor Morrison wants to proceed on developing it outside of the CDD they have that privilege.*

*Mr. Drew Miller: We would still be more than willing to bring it into the CDD if you would like to, but it got voted down, which I advised against at the time because they won't have any CDD debt and won't pay any CDD dues, but they are still going to have most of the privileges of the CDD with the exception of potentially being kept out of the preserves.*

*Mr. Ron Miller: I think I would rather defer that until the Board is freshened up in November so there are other voices from the resident's side on that.*

*Mr. Drew Miller: It won't be a deferment. Either we act now, or it won't happen. Once we start development there is not going to be any benefit. We are up against a time clock. At some point you will be getting their permission as well. If you wanted to bring them into the CDD at a later date you would have to get all of the homeowners in that area to agreed.*

*Mr. Urbancic: That's correct. The legal basis is statute. In order to be subjected to the CDD the owner has to consent. Once they transfer a unit to a private owner then that situation is probably lost unless the owner decides they want to be part of the CDD. That's the reason for some of the timing.*

*Mr. Kleck: Drew, do you know how many acres are in that Hatcher property, that are potentially CDD preserves?*

*Mr. Drew Miller: I don't think there are any preserves. There might be a little bit of a grassy area. It's really not about the preserve as much as it is about the homes at the time. They would obviously be paying for their portion of the overall preserves. I think there are 30 some odd units in there, that would be added to the CDD, and obviously the budget would be split up by that many more units.*

*Mr. Ward: There are 36 homes in there.*

*Mr. Kleck: Are you telling me they would not be paying into the CDD fund as everybody else is now?*

*Mr. Drew Miller: Currently. Correct.*

*Mr. Kleck: I don't think that's fair to the existing homeowners.*

*Mr. Drew Miller: I agree. Taylor Morrison at the time would like to have put it in and I feel certain they still would. I will have to confirm we haven't passed our deadlines.*

*Mr. Ron Miller: Bringing Hatcher into the CDD boundaries does not benefit the CDD or any of the current residents in the CDD. That would be brought in as a different separate phase and all of the infrastructure done would be paid for just by those 36 homes. There is no crossover of us paying for some of theirs or them paying for some of ours. With respect to the HOA, irrespective of whether that's in the CDD boundaries or not, the same HOA fees are going to apply for their use of the common amenities of Esplanade. I don't think this has any bearing on the benefits or detriments to the current residents.*

*Mr. Kleck: There is a fee for every homeowner in here, a CDD fee, which is at the bottom of your tax bill. I just got ours in the mail, the preview of what's to come, and it was about \$2300 dollars a year on top of our regular real estate taxes, payable to the CDD. These 36 homes will not be charged with the CDD fee, or will they?*

*Mr. Urbancic: They won't have the debt assessment or the O&M. The large part of that assessment is probably the debt assessment, but they would not have either item, basically because they are not subject to the CDD.*

*Mr. Ron Miller: Yes, those things are on all of our tax bills, and the current residents pay for those, but those are done by the individual phases. The CDD assessment you pay for your phase is different than my phase. If that were to come into the boundaries, they would pay the assessments just for their phase. The bigger picture is it's not a freeloading situation. If it comes into the CDD there will be infrastructure bonds issued and those CDD people will have to pay for those, not other CDD members like us. Without that infrastructure development, that simply raises the cost for Taylor Morrison and Taylor Morrison then either prices that into the properties, or doesn't price it in. That's purely up to Taylor Morrison as to how they want to price their properties. In theoretical mode, if you figured out the cost of that infrastructure that now would be paid for by Taylor Morrison and not by the CDD, if that number is \$25,000 per lot (I'm just making up numbers here), Taylor Morrison can up the lots by \$25,000 dollars and those people pay that in the cost of their house. Or Taylor Morrison can make a \$25,000 dollar less profit margin. It doesn't really impact the rest of us. It's all about the cost of the development and the pricing of the property.*

*Mr. Drew Miller: The O&M and the ongoing things are what would be an additional cost split between and additional 36 people. The debt assessment you are correct on. The CDD did sell bond debt already in anticipation of that. It's sitting in the account. That was intended when Hatcher was closed on; it would be annexed into the CDD and the debt would then go back. As currently planned, it's going to go back to the bond holders and pay off that obligation, and then these 36 residents or so would not pay O&M. Any future plans, anything owned by the CDD, any structure that needs to be repaired or rebuilt in the future, these 36 homes would not be obligated to do so.*

*Mr. Kleck: I see no real advantage to not bringing those folks into the CDD, especially when the funds they are going to be paying are included in our maintenance fund for the long term.*

*Mr. Urbancic: Yeah, they will pay their share of operation and maintenance, so basically your denominator gets bigger by 36 units if they are in the CDD.*

*Mr. Kleck: Can I make a new motion?*

*Mr. Urbancic: If we are going to do it, what we would typically do in these situations would be to authorize the boundary expansion and authorize Staff to do it, and probably as a condition, you area going to want to have Taylor Morrison pay the fees for the expansion so they don't have to get saddled with my costs or Jim's costs or the Engineer's costs.*

*Mr. Drew Miller: I don't know if we have a Taylor Morrison representative on that's working in the community, but that portion is going to be fine. The question for Taylor Morrison is going to be whether we still have time to do this and recognize the bond proceeds.*



*Mr. Urbancic: Taylor Morrison has to know, I don't know where you are in your sales process, you've got to have disclosures in your sales documents.*

*Mr. Drew Miller: I guess the question is, if we do it now, how would we caveat it, or do we need to set it up for 30 days from now?*

*Mr. Urbancic: You could authorize it. I don't see any reason you couldn't authorize it. Jim, is there any reason we couldn't authorize it if that's what the Board decides to do?*

*Mr. Ward: No.*

*Mr. Drew Miller: I just texted Taylor Morrison and they say they still want Hatcher in the CDD. So, Taylor Morrison would still like to have Hatcher in the CDD. It's still available.*

Mr. Ward read Resolution 2020-7: Consideration of Resolution 2020-7 of the board of supervisors of Flow Way Community Development District authorizing the filing of a petition with the Board of County Commissioners of Collier County for a modification of the District's boundaries and the jurisdiction of the District through expansion; providing for certain requirements implementing Section 190.046(1) in agreement with Taylor Morrison Esplanade, LLC to fund the expansion (commonly known as the Hatcher expansion) which authorized Collier County to modify the District's boundaries and bring the Hatcher property under the jurisdiction of the CDD. He recommended Resolution 2020-7 be approved with an amendment requiring understanding from Taylor Morrison that Taylor Morrison would pay the District Counsel and District Engineer service costs in bringing Hatcher into the CDD.

*Mr. Ron Miller: We rejected this because there really isn't any benefit per se for the other residents, and we've got this much broader issue out there with respect to the preserves, the premature transfer, the funding. We've got all this going on, so I continue to be totally opposed to it, unless Taylor Morrison was wanting to settle this entire thing rather than adding this on top of everything. I don't think it's a good idea to reverse that resolution which was agreed upon and I don't see any issue with the CDD going forward without that property being in the CDD. Taylor Morrison simply has the privilege of developing that land and they can price it, pay for development of that land, and they can price it to their customers. I don't see this as an issue for us to be involved in any further.*

*Mr. Kleck: I personally don't see that we are going to add any leverage for ourselves onto Taylor Morrison by withholding this information. They are going ahead with their development anyway and it's no skin off of their back. As you say, they will raise the prices of their properties to get what they want, and my only problem is, with the future bills that are going to be coming to maintain these preserves, I suggest we have 36 more homes to help fund it.*

*Mr. Drew Miller: Jim, is there a specific motion? How do I say it?*

*Mr. Ward: This was done in resolution format. It is simple a motion to adopt Resolution 2020-7 as I had read into the record with addition to require Taylor Morrison to pay the cost of the expansion of the District's boundaries. He asked if there were any public questions or comments regarding Hatcher property.*

*Mr. Zack Stamp: Under the Florida Sunshine Law, can you take final action on something that didn't appear on the Agenda? There has been no public notice that this would be considered.*

*Mr. Urbancic: It isn't necessarily a Sunshine Law issue. The District is able to take up items that don't appear on the original Agenda. The Agenda doesn't bind you to just those specific items. The District is one that meets on a periodic basis and it has to address the business that comes forth, and things can be added that are deemed time sensitive, or whatever the case may be. The Board has some discretion to take action.*

Mr. Ward asked if any other members of the public had questions; there were none.

**On MOTION made by Mr. Drew Miller, seconded by Mr. Tom Kleck, and with three in favor and one opposed, Resolution 2020-7 was approved as amended and the Chair was authorized to sign.**

Mr. Ward asked if there were any other questions or comments.

*Mr. Ron Miller: As we probably all know, some information came in, and I'm going to paraphrase it as best I can. What Jim sent out to all of us seemed to be Tim Hall's responses to a few questions which came to him from South Florida Water Management District about what seems to be a request to amend the permits with respect to the mitigation and maintenance and the funding of the preserves. That's what I think it's about, but since we don't have that information and cannot be sure, but the information we did receive used the words "co-applicants" and that would lead me down the road that if it's a co-applicant perhaps the CDD was one of the applicant in the co-applicant wording. The Board did approve for Drew, a year ago at this time, to work with Taylor Morrison or Tim Hall or other people to get permit modifications, so there is no issue in Drew doing that because he was authorized by the Board, but where I'm going with this – when I asked Drew have you been working on something – have you been working on something with South Florida Water Management District?*

*Mr. Drew Miller: Yes. Mostly Tim has been doing the leg work, but yes, we are still working to amend the language that was ambiguous or had discussions of the fund to make sure it is clear the CDD – if you remember, this was in context of your concern that somebody could come later and claim the property and ask for money. We don't believe that's the case but agreed at the time to move forward with cleaning up the language and that is what we are moving forward with.*

*Mr. Ron Miller: So, you have been representing the CDD in that endeavor?*

*Mr. Drew Miller: Correct.*

*Mr. Ron Miller: Are you going to provide the CDD Board and administrator with all of those documents, so we can read them?*

*Mr. Drew Miller: Yes. We can get with Tim and have him send the documents which were submitted.*

*Mr. Ron Miller: Have you been working with Jim Ward or Greg Urbancic on this or have you just been working directly with Taylor Morrison and Tim Hall as their representative?*

*Mr. Drew Miller: For the most part yes, that's correct. They do have an attorney helping with the permitting as well.*

*Mr. Ron Miller: I would like to make an off the Agenda motion not because you cannot do what you're doing because you've been authorized to do so, but because the rest of the Board has no knowledge and we don't have any information I would like to make a motion the CDD withdraw your authority to represent it in this matter until such time as we have all the information and have had time to review it.*

Mr. Ward asked if there was a second to Mr. Ron Miller's motion; there was none; the motion died for lack of a second.

Mr. Drew Miller indicated he would have Mr. Hall send over the requested information to the Board.

*Mr. Ron Miller: I would like to move to withdraw the application pending further review because the Board has not had an opportunity to review it.*

Mr. Ward asked if there were any public comments or questions; there were none.

**On MOTION made by Mr. Ron Miller, seconded by Mr. Tom Kleck, and with one in favor and three opposed, the motion to withdraw the application pending further review failed.**

**EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**


**Adjournment**

Mr. Ward adjourned the meeting at approximately 1:57 p.m.

**On MOTION made by Mr. Ron Miller, seconded by Mr. Drew Miller, and with all in favor, the Meeting was adjourned.**

**Attest:**

**Flow Way Community Development District**

  
James P. Ward, Secretary

  
Drew Miller, Chairperson