

**MINUTES OF MEETING
RIVER LANDING
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT**

The Regular Meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the River Landing Community Development District was held on Tuesday, January 20, 2026 at River Club Amenity Center, 2345 Oxbow Boulevard, Wesley Chapel, Florida 33543. It began at 2:00 p.m. and was presided over by Mr. Josh Tepper, Chairperson, and James P. Ward as Secretary.

Present and constituting a quorum:

Joshua Tepper	Chairperson
Matt Sawyer	Assistant Secretary
Corrin Godlevske	Assistant Secretary

Absent:

Mike Piendel	Vice Chair
David Wilson	Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

James P. Ward	District Manager
Ashley Ligas	District Counsel
Victor Barbosa	District Engineer
Ben Steets	Grau & Associates

Audience:

Christine
Michelle
Lina Alvadallah
Sanjiv Parikh
Greg Burleson

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

Mr. Ward called the meeting to order at approximately 2:00 p.m. He conducted roll call; all Members of the Board were present, with the exception of Supervisor Piendel and Supervisor Wilson, constituting a quorum.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS

Consideration of Minutes

October 21, 2025 - Regular Meeting Minutes

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

On MOTION made by Matt Sawyer, seconded by Corrin Godlevske, and with all in favor, the October 21, 2025 Regular Meeting Minutes were approved.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS

Consideration of Audited Financial Statements

Consideration and Acceptance of the Audited Financial Statements for the Fiscal Year ended September 30, 2025

Mr. Ward introduced Ben Steets with Grau and Associates who would discuss the audited financial statements for Fiscal Year 2025 ending September 30, 2025.

Mr. Ben Steets with Grau and Associates declared the auditor's opinion was clean, which meant Grau and Associates believed the financial statements were fairly presented in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles (GAP). He indicated the Opinion Letter was on pages 1 and 2. He stated pages 3-6 were the Management's Discussion and Analysis providing a summary overview of the year's financial activity. He reported pages 7-12 were basic financial statements including government wide financial statements, fund level financial statements, the fund level balance sheet, and the fund level income statement. He stated pages 13-22 were the notes to the financial statements. He reported notes 1 through 4 were standard for government entities in Florida; note 5 was capital assets (infrastructure improvements); note 6 discussed long term liabilities (bonds and developer advances); the remaining notes were also standard. He indicated page 23 was the comparison of the general fund activity for the year to the budget; page 25 contained data elements required by the State of Florida; pages 26-27 contained the auditor's report on internal controls; page 28 was the Florida Statute dealing with investments; and pages 29-30 contained the Management Letter. He stated there were no instances of noncompliance with Florida Statutes and there were no findings. He concluded the District was in compliance and Grau issued a clean opinion.

Mr. Sawyer asked about page 25 and the unaudited elements.

Mr. Steets: These data elements are not required to be audited. It is supplementary information that the District is providing to the State of Florida. I can tell you the outstanding bond balances do agree with what's audited in the notes and in the Financial Statements, as do the assessments collected.

Mr. Ward asked if there were any additional questions; hearing none, he called for a motion.

On MOTION made by Matt Sawyer, seconded by Corrin Godlevske, and with all in favor, the Audited Financial Statements for Fiscal Year ending September 30, 2025 were accepted.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**Consideration of Proposals****Consideration of Proposals to provide Audit Services to the District for Fiscal Years 2026 to 2030**

Mr. Ward stated statute required the Board to go through a competitive proposal process in which the CDD advertised for proposals; the proposals were both qualification and price-point based. He indicated two proposals were received, one from Grau & Associates and the other from Berger, Toombs. He reported staff ranked the proposals including both mandatory elements, technical qualifications, and pricing. He stated Grau was rated 30 and Berger was rated 27 points for technical qualifications; for pricing Grau was rated 35 points and Berger was rated 31 points. He stated the overall price the five year period for Grau was \$27,000 dollars and Berger was \$35,300 dollars. He stated the Board could accept the ranking as presented or rank the proposals as the Board deemed appropriate.

On MOTION made by Matt Sawyer, seconded by Corrin Godlevske, and with all in favor, the ranking of the proposals were accepted as presented.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**Staff Reports****I. District Attorney**

No report

II. District Engineer

No report.

III. District Manager**a) Important Meeting Dates for Fiscal Year 2026**

- Tuesday, April 14, 2026 - Public Hearing: Proposed Budget for FY 2027

b) Financial Statements for period ending October 31, 2025 (unaudited)**c) Financial Statements for period ending November 30, 2025 (unaudited)****d) Financial Statements for period ending December 31, 2025 (unaudited)**

No report.

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

Mr. Ward asked if there were any supervisor's requests.

Mr. Sawyer asked when the first qualified elector election was.

Mr. Ward reported Seats 3 and 4 (Josh and David's seats) would be up for election in November 2026.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Public Comments

Mr. Ward asked if there were any public comments.

Mr. _____ asked (indecipherable).

Mr. Ward: The election is in November. The qualifying period is in July. We get the qualified elector report April 15th, but as of April 15th last year we were at like 700 qualified electors, which was over the required threshold.

Ms. Lina Alvadallah stated she felt the community was too dark, did not have enough lighting and this made it unsafe. She asked if a discussion about providing more lighting in the community could be held. She said the community was deemed a "dark night" or "dark sky" community. She noted there were a lot of children in the community, and it was unsafe to be so dark. She asked how to move forward and get more lighting.

Mr. Ward: I don't know too much about your lighting other than you have a solar lighting system out here. To the extent that any Community Development District wants to add lighting, it is a capital addition to the system which would require the District to go through the process of levying an assessment. With that additional capital, there would be a public hearing which residents could attend and provide input to the Board about whether they want to add additional lights. My assumption in saying all of this is that you could do this. Then after the public hearing we would be able to levy assessments. It probably would not be able to go into effect until October of 2028 at the earliest at this point.

Ms. Alvadallah: So, this is something that if wanted by the community the residents would have to pay for it, and does that assessment get levied against the CDD amount we are already paying?

Mr. Ward: No, it would be in addition to the existing assessment. That's why I mentioned we would go through a public hearing process with notice to all residents about the levy of an additional assessment for streetlights.

Ms. Alvadallah: How does a community get deemed a "dark night" community? Does the builder make that decision? Am I wrong in saying the CDD provided the infrastructure for the streetlights, but the HOA is maintaining it?

Mr. Ward: They are the streetlights of the CDD, and the HOA does maintain it.

Mr. Matt Sawyer: This is something that as a developer we can make a decision to do and it's all about light pollution. We were trying to be environmentally friendly, in conjunction with our partnership with the National Wildlife Federation and trying to give back to the Earth.

Ms. Alvadallah: With that being said, if we are using solar lighting aren't we already being friendly to the environment?

Mr. Sawyer: Yes, but light pollution also puts off a large array - if you go look at the dark sky communities you will see a lot of scientific evidence that a dark sky community promotes natural wildlife in the area, so it's something that we as a developer made a decision to do and we are not looking at reverting that.

Ms. Alvadallah: How can we, as residents, move forward with seeing what that type of assessment would look like? Because it's dangerous in our community. I know you and I, Matt, have spoken about it before and you've heard it discussed at meetings. It's dangerous and a little scary, so I'm wondering if the community can move forward with figuring out how much this would cost us if we wanted to provide more streetlights, especially at some of these big intersections where people are not paying attention to crosswalks.

Mr. Sawyer: I don't care about additional streetlighting, but it sounds like you want brighter ones.

Ms. Alvadallah: Additional ones, brighter ones, whatever is going to light this community up because currently what is occurring is that people are out after dark, they are walking, and you cannot see them. Sometimes you can't even see a car until it's coming around a corner because there is no lighting. I don't know if that's going to require brighter lights or additional lights. The community has expressed concern about the community being dangerous and unsafe in general. We need to figure out the proper way to address this concern. We've talked about making the lights brighter, but I don't think anything has been done in this regard.

Mr. Sawyer: Jim, you want to go out and solicit?

Mr. Ward: We can ask Atwell whether we could add additional lighting.

Mr. Sawyer: It could cost \$300,000 dollars to \$500,000 dollars.

Mr. Ward: It could, easily. I think the solar lights cost \$1,800 dollars to \$2,000 dollars each installed, so this is a big community. Those numbers will add up quickly.

Ms. Alvadallah continued to discuss specific areas in the community where the low light was dangerous. She said she did not feel this should be the residents' responsibility. She said she understood what the builder was trying to do but felt the entry alone was extremely dangerous. She asked how the lights had become the residents' responsibility.

Mr. Ward explained once facilities were developed, they became the responsibility of the CDD to own, operate, and/or improve as appropriate. He stated the lighting system was installed and permitted correctly under current county or city ordinances; therefore, it would be the CDD's responsibility to make any improvements the community deemed appropriate.

Ms. Alvadallah asked how the situation could be evaluated. She asked what the next steps would be because she felt there was a fail in the community lighting infrastructure design.

Mr. Sawyer stated the CDD would ask the engineer to meet with the vendor for pricing and options.

Ms. Alvadallah stated she wanted it to be on record that it was a concern of the community.

Mr. Sawyer respectfully disagreed that it was a fail on the community; it being a dark sky community was something Ms. Alvadallah purchased into and it was disclosed as part of the community.

Ms. Alvadallah: I definitely was never told this was a dark sky community but that's a discussion for another time. As far as where we stand today, it definitely is a fail in the community as far as there is not enough lighting at all. I don't know what the requirements are for a dark sky community or how much lighting there should be, but definitely in certain areas in our community, especially with our landscaping, you can't see anything. This is going to be a problem. It's already a problem. The only thing that hasn't occurred is something tragic at this point. We as residents are raising our hands and saying there is an issue. Let's investigate and make sure that all the proper protocols were followed and if not, what do we do to move forward from that?

Mr. Ward noted Victor Barbosa was present and heard the discussion; he would speak with Mr. Barbosa after the meeting. He asked if there were any additional questions or comments; there were none.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Adjournment

Mr. Ward adjourned the meeting at approximately 2:19 p.m.

On MOTION made by Matt Sawyer, seconded by Corrin Godlevske, and with all in favor, the meeting was adjourned.

River Landing Community Development District

James P. Ward
James P. Ward (Mar 25, 2026 07:46:37 EDT)
James P. Ward, Secretary

Josh Tepper
Josh Tepper (Mar 16, 2026 11:57:44 EDT)
Josh Tepper, Chairperson