Storey Park Community
Development District

Agenda

December 1, 2026

AGENDA

Storey Park
Community Development District

219 E. Livingston Street, Orlando, Florida 32801
Phone: 407-841-5524 – Fax: 407-839-1526

November 24, 2026

Board of Supervisors
Storey Park Community
Development District

Dear Board Members:

The meeting of the Board of Supervisors of **Storey Park Community Development District** will be held **Tuesday, December 1, 2026 at 4:00 PM at the Offices of GMS-CF, 219 E. Livingston Street, Orlando, Florida. F**ollowing is the advance agenda for the meeting:

1. Roll Call
2. Public Comment Period
3. Organizational Matters
    A. Appointment of Individuals to Fulfill Vacancies in Seats #4 and #5
    B. Administration of Oaths of Office to Newly Appointed Board Members
    C. Election of Officers
    D. Consideration of Resolution 2027-02 Electing Officers
4. Approval of Minutes of the September 1, 2026 and November 3, 2026 Meetings
5. Staff Reports
    A. Attorney
    B. Engineer
    C. District Manager's Report
        i. Approval of Check Register
        ii. Balance Sheet and Income Statement
        iii. Presentation of Arbitrage Rebate Calculation Report for the Series 2015 Bonds
    D. Field Manager's Report
6. Public Comment Period
7. Supervisor's Requests
8. Other Business
9. Next Meeting Date – January 5, 2027
10. Adjournment

The balance of the agenda will be discussed at the meeting. In the meantime, if you should have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Jason M. Showe
District Manager

CC: Jan Carpenter, District Counsel
Christina Baxter, District Engineer

Enclosures

SECTION III

SECTION D

RESOLUTION 2027-02

A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE STOREY PARK COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT ELECTING THE OFFICERS OF THE DISTRICT AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE

WHEREAS, the Storey Park Community Development District (the "District") is a local unit of special purpose government created and existing pursuant to Chapter 190, Florida Statutes; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors of the District ("Board") desires to elect the Officers of the District.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE STOREY PARK COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT:

Section 1. _____ is elected Chairperson.

Section 2. _____ is elected Vice-Chairperson.

Section 3. _____ is elected Secretary.

Section 4. _____ is elected Assistant Secretary.
_____ is elected Assistant Secretary.
_____ is elected Assistant Secretary.
_____ is elected Assistant Secretary.

Section 5. _____ is elected Treasurer.

Section 6. _____ is elected Assistant Treasurer.
_____ is elected Assistant Treasurer.

Section 7. This Resolution shall become effective immediately upon its adoption.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 1st day of December, 2026.

ATTEST:

STOREY PARK COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

_____
Secretary/Assistant Secretary

_____
Chairperson/Vice-Chairperson

MINUTES

MINUTES OF MEETING
STOREY PARK
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

The regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Storey Park Community Development District was held on Tuesday, September 1, 2026 at 4:00 p.m. at the Offices of GMS-CF, 219 E. Livingston Street, Orlando, Florida.

Present and constituting a quorum were:

Willem Boermans	Chairman
Matthew Antolovich	Vice Chairman
Travis Smith	Assistant Secretary
David Grimm	Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

Jason Showe	District Manager
Jan Carpenter	District Counsel
Cameron Roberts	District Engineer
Alan Scheerer	Field Manager

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS **Roll Call**

Mr. Showe called the meeting to order and called the roll. A quorum was present.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS **Public Comment Period**

Mr. Showe: We only have members of the Board and staff present. So, there's no public comment period.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS **Approval of Minutes of the August 4, 2026 Meeting**

Mr. Showe: We can go to the approval of minutes of the August 4, 2026 meeting. Those minutes were included as part of your agenda package. We can take any corrections or changes at this time or a motion to approve.

On MOTION by Mr. Antolovich seconded by Mr. Boermans with all in favor the Minutes of the August 4, 2026 Meeting were approved, as presented.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS **Consideration of Proposal from Pape-Dawson for Theme Alley & Prologue Avenue**

This item was discussed later in the meeting.

Mr. Showe: We have a proposal for some survey work. So, we'll turn that over to Cameron.

Mr. Roberts: We sent you guys the proposal for the survey, between the Pond K-1 trail and wetland. I know that the Board approved a not-to-exceed at the last meeting. So, I did bug the guy and asked him if it could be penciled down a little bit tighter. He said it is what it is. He's estimating about two days' worth of work in the field and about a half days' worth of work internally in the office.

Mr. Showe: Does that relate to the map that you handed out or is that separate?

Mr. Roberts: That's separate.

Mr. Showe: Okay.

Mr. Scheerer: That's the asphalt trail by the wetland and the K1 pond.

Mr. Showe: Okay.

Mr. Smith: It was determined what we wanted to do with it, right?

Mr. Roberts: Correct.

Ms. Carpenter: Once you get the survey, what will it provide? Will it give enough information?

Mr. Grimm: The point of that, was to determine if there was some grading to alleviate liability.

Mr. Antolovich: Also, to figure out if it was just a fix that was just going to be new grading or whatnot.

Mr. Smith: Yeah, because I think when we had the discussion last time, it was designed a certain way. It was built, but there was never, I think, what I recall, not a verification of what it was built to. This was to verify the grading, to see if it matched what was permitted and what we expected.

Ms. Carpenter: Well, I thought that they said they weren't any permits. That's why I was asking.

Mr. Showe: Yeah.

Ms. Carpenter: That's why I was asking whether it was a permitted design.

Mr. Smith: I think the permitting was wrong.

Ms. Carpenter: Were there plans?

Mr. Showe: I think it was designed.

Ms. Carpenter: Were there design plans?

Mr. Smith: There were design plans. Whether it was built to design was, I think, one of the things that we wanted to establish. Then I think the other was, if we were to do a fix, are there simpler fixes that could be implemented that were less costly, than the two main options, I think we had to consider.

Ms. Carpenter: Yeah, I was just asking to make sure that the design plans are available, so you don't get a survey and don't have something to compare it to.

Mr. Grimm: That would have to be something that the Chairman would have to approve.

Mr. Roberts: We have design plans.

Ms. Carpenter: Okay. Perfect.

Mr. Boermans: The most important part is the big fix, the most expensive fix, is over six figures.

Mr. Showe: Yeah.

Mr. Boermans: Our job is to be financially responsible. So, that's why we have to find the best solution. What do you all think about this and the price?

Mr. Showe: Yeah. Just for reference. the not-to-exceed proposed at the last meeting, was $2,500. Obviously, it was over that.

Mr. Grimm: That was based upon?

Mr. Showe: I think it was based on Christie's opinion. She threw out a number.

Mr. Smith: It was just a guess.

Mr. Showe: Yeah.

Mr. Roberts: I think it's the intricacies. I'm not defending any other way. Just FYI, we think we need about 5-foot increments and we're measuring sod levels directly next to trail levels. Then the edge of the trail and then the sod. We're creating a pretty substantial grid to really inform. Hence why it's two days' worth of work for only 500 linear feet.

Mr. Grimm: Well, let me ask this question. You say that the original design plans are available. I guess my fear is that we pay for the survey and all we'll look at whether the survey

matches the plan, without knowing what the plan is. Because up until the last meeting it was always it's working as designed.

Mr. Roberts: The interaction between the wetland overflow into the pond, is working as designed. The trail is graded negatively towards the wetland in certain areas, which is obviously making it worse. I think what we're trying to communicate is, even if we did raise the trail and actually graded positively towards the wetland and we fix those sod areas, that overflow is still going to occur, because there's not enough head and pressure difference.

Mr. Grimm: Because it's coming through the lakeside and not the hillside.

Mr. Roberts: Yes.

Mr. Grimm: In theory. It's overflowing from the lake up until the path, because the lake is too full.

Mr. Roberts: It's going from the wetland to the pond.

Mr. Antolovich: To the lake.

Mr. Grimm: We've been told that it's kind of acting as designed, because the water is coming out of the wetlands, down the slope, across the path and into the pond. But obviously during the wet season, the pond is higher, so then it's just creeping up. There is a portion of the path, where it actually is away from the south end of the path. Every time I drive by it, I can look to the right and there is just standing water on the path itself.

Mr. Roberts: At the edge of the house, that first lot. I know the spot you're talking about.

Mr. Grimm: It is kind of close to the street. Do you know what I'm talking about? Because you can see it from the road when you drive by. My understanding was the issue was always because the water was overflowing in the lake, which creeped up to the path. The wetland drainage was working as designed into the lake, but the lake was creeping this way, which was causing the flooding on the path itself. Am I wrong when I say that?

Mr. Roberts: It's more in the wet season, the water level in the wetland raises above existing ground and flows over the trail into the pond.

Mr. Grimm: Which is how it's supposed to work.

Mr. Roberts: Which is how it's supposed to work. So, the elevation of the wetland is 84. The elevation of the trail is 84. The elevation of the water in the lake, the pond is 76.

Mr. Grimm: I guess it depends on what part, because you said that some parts are level with the retention of the wetland.

Ms. Carpenter: We are going totally out of line here.

Mr. Roberts: Approximately, but yes. Some areas are a little bit lower. It slopes down towards the wetland.

Mr. Grimm: Which brings another question. Hypothetically we picked one of the options of fixing the issue. At what point where do we fix it? Because water is not just pulling in one spot. It's pulling in from way up here, all the way down and then actually it's pulling there, no matter what happens with the water, Obviously, Alan can contest that concrete breaks apart like crazy there, causing asphalt potholes.

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah, potholes in the asphalt, because of the water ponding.

Mr. Grimm: Right.

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah.

Ms. Carpenter: Again, this is not legal. This just sort of crossed my mind from the conversations, because of the price this time. There were thoughts that maybe the sod had grown up high along the path, that it was holding water rather than letting it drip down.

Mr. Showe: Drain through.

Mr. Grimm: I heard that insulation facade might be the reason. Grass is lower than…

Ms. Carpenter: Is there any inspection? I know when you look at a yard, sometimes the roots grow up and suddenly you've got this much.

Mr. Scheerer: It's like any yard. Over time, you are going to mow it at a certain height, and that grass is going to grow to that certain height and it's going to stay at that certain height.

Ms. Carpenter: Rather than spending $6,000.

Mr. Grimm: I think the survey was brought up, because how do you know if there's a landscaper issue that threw the sod after it was ready to be sodded? How do we know if it was a grading issue? We're being told it's not a design issue, because that's what Lennar asked for. Apparently, based upon the comments from Christine, they told Lennar that it was a bad idea and Lennar still said to do it as is.

Ms. Carpenter: They said it was going to flood. Is there anything, inspection-wise, that you can see if you look at and say, *"Hey, yeah, it will flood in these four areas?"*

Mr. Scheerer: Well, we know that we have one big area and that's the flooding coming over from the wetland, but then also coming between the two houses off of Imaginary Way, there's a big dip that comes down like this. So, not only are we getting ponding issues right there,

but it's also coming from irrigation from the yards and downspouts facing that way from the gutters.

Mr. Boermans: Yeah, it’s absolutely horrible there, at the entrance.

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah.

Mr. Boermans: It’s all eroded.

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah. Unfortunately, Dan never fixed what Dan said he was going to do. I got a price to re-asphalt it. At the time, it was about $21,000 to do it.

Ms. Carpenter: Oh, wow.

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah. It's not a simple pothole.

Ms. Carpenter: I was just wondering, is there any sort of landscaping inspection or something to see, if we trim the grass down?

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah, we do.

Ms. Carpenter: Would it make sense to spend a few hundred dollars doing that?

Mr. Scheerer: We edge the trails from time to time as they grow over. But as far as mowing, there's not a whole lot that we can do for mowing. When I mow my yard, if I'm mowing it at 3 inches, it's going to stay at 3 inches.

Ms. Carpenter: Yeah, but you get that clump of roots and stuff that suddenly is above the path.

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah.

Mr. Boermans: I'm sorry if I interrupted you.

Ms. Carpenter: Oh, that's fine.

Mr. Boermans: The easiest way, what I would think to fix it, is to build a trench and then in some spots, have a pipe underneath, so the water can go underneath the road.

Ms. Carpenter: That would require permit modifications.

Mr. Boermans: Oh, for sure.

Ms. Carpenter: Is the pond discharging properly? Do we know if there's anything flooding the pond?

Mr. Roberts: There is nothing wrong.

Mr. Boermans: There’s nothing wrong with it. I’ve never seen anything wrong with it.

Mr. Roberts: Besides the structures.

Mr. Showe: Yeah.

Mr. Scheerer: Yes, that's a whole other story.

Mr. Roberts: That's another thing.

Mr. Roberts: We looked at putting in a pipe. We put an actual structure in the northern corner of the wetlands.

Mr. Showe: Yeah.

Mr. Roberts: You have to raise the trail a little bit in that area, to get the sufficient cover, the depth to the pipe. By the time we actually started looking at permit modifications and applying to the city, there were our fees, environmental fees and geotechnical fees. If you remember from a couple months ago, we sent three options. That was the second option.

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah.

Mr. Roberts: After we actually did a cost breakdown, we said that's just not even an option.

Mr. Boermans: Oh yeah.

Mr. Roberts: That was just not even realistic. I think the purpose of the survey, is to figure out the minimum that we could be achieved, to alleviate to a certain amount. We can't guarantee that it's going to fix it, but in this area, the whole thing has to be re-graded. So, instead of saying all 500 feet raised up to a certain elevation, we would say 100 feet re-graded positively towards the wetland. These 50 feet trimmed down the sod on the western side and these 50 feet trimmed down the sod on the eastern side. That was the idea of getting this detailed grid survey.

Mr. Smith: But if I look at the survey scope, it says that it would provide a comparison to the engineering drawings, horizontal and vertical data, referenced to State planning coordinates. Is that section the reference back to the design?

Mr. Roberts: That's a more standardized coordinate system that surveyors work to in Florida.

Mr. Smith: Okay, but what part? I'm just looking at the scope of what the $6,500 covers. I don't read anywhere where it says directly it's going to compare back to the engineering drawings or the plan.

Mr. Roberts: The survey scope would not state that. They're just picking up elevations and giving us a topographical map.

Mr. Showe: After the survey, that would then go on to the engineering staff, the engineering staff would have to evaluate that survey and compare it.

Mr. Smith: But I'm just trying to see the total cost of it. Because here, it says that it is $6,000 for that, but then there's a cost to do the evaluation. So, I was wondering what the all in cost would be. I only see part of the cost here. I'm not seeing the next step.

Mr. Grimm: It’s confusing, because it's the same company.

Mr. Smith: Yeah. The scope is missing.

Ms. Carpenter: Yes.

Mr. Grimm: This isn't the full scope of the job. Right?

Ms. Carpenter: Yeah. This is solely for the survey. They usually have separate departments.

Mr. Roberts: Yeah, we can prepare a proposal.

Mr. Grimm: It's not going to make anything clearer. It's going to let us know the total amount. Based upon previous information that we've had with other services, I would say that it's going to cost at least $1,000. Because if you recall, when we did the parking and there were some other things, when you look at the hourly rates, etc., I'm sure it's not one person doing it. It's probably multiple people doing it. Each level of job title is more expensive. But my question is, would we be able to get the original stuff before this takes place?

Mr. Roberts: Yes.

Ms. Carpenter: You want to just send a copy to Jason, so he has it in the record.

Mr. Grimm: I still don't even really know. I kind of understand Cameron's point. Like, what is it really going to do? You can't stop gravity.

Mr. Showe: Well, he's trying to be clear when he says it.

Mr. Grimm: You have the big hill that comes off of those homes. Do the wetlands, connect or relate to each other at all, if the wetlands come over?

Mr. Roberts: When I went to the site, that sloped down from the homes, where the asphalt sprouted out, I think those are two separate problems. That's a grading issue off of the back of the lots. The wetland is not flooding in. We're just getting a lot of velocity of stormwater coming down that hill. That hole can just be filled today and should go away. The wetland issue would not be related to that.

Mr. Grimm: I don't know, other than call my friend who's running for State House and say, *“listen.”*

Mr. Showe: If I'm hearing correctly, what we can do, is we can get them to send me the original plans. We can distribute that to the Board and maybe they can come up with just what their cost would be after they get the survey, so that you guys can see the total cost.

Mr. Grimm: We don't want a ballpark.

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah. We missed that one, didn't we?

Mr. Showe: Yeah. If that's kind of what I'm hearing.

Mr. Smith: Yeah, I think we need that before we can make a decision.

Mr. Showe: Okay.

Mr. Boermans: I agree. Now that almost rainy season is almost getting to the end and before we do anything, whenever we are doing this, we should be one month further.

Mr. Showe: Yeah.

Ms. Carpenter: Well, you can see how bad it is. This is the worst that it should be, for the next four or five weeks.

Mr. Showe: Correct.

Mr. Roberts: How is it now?

Mr. Boermans: Do you want to do that or should we approve the survey now? Because now there is so much rain.

Mr. Grimm: They are not going to care about that.

Mr. Roberts: It shouldn’t matter, to be honest.

Mr. Grimm: They're like, *“Oh, there's a lot of water here.”*

Mr. Antolovich: So, there are two plans. One proposal was $75,000 and the other was $180,000 for the boardwalk. What was the cheaper option? Do you guys remember?

Mr. Roberts: We would raise the elevation of the trail.

Mr. Showe: Yeah.

Mr. Roberts: About a foot and regrade the trail.

Mr. Antolovich: Is a survey needed for that?

Mr. Roberts: For?

Mr. Antolovich: Well, I'm trying to figure that out.

Mr. Roberts: Not for us to direct a contractor.

Mr. Antolovich: Yeah.

Mr. Roberts: I think we would want them to get us an actual survey by the time that they finish.

Mr. Antolovich: Yeah.

Mr. Grimm: You're talking out of what they're going to cost?

Mr. Antolovich: Well, I'm wondering, is this survey going to happen no matter what?

Mr. Showe: Or you need a second survey, if you do the first survey.

Mr. Smith: But we may not need the same fine detail of the survey. If we're just going to raise it, we might pay half. I'm not an expert in this, but we probably won't need that finer grid, because it would raise it again in bulk.

Ms. Carpenter: Is this in the capital project for this year?

Mr. Showe: There's been no money, no funding allocated, but any expenses would come out of the capital project account.

Mr. Antolovich: This fiscal year does start next year, though. I mean, next month.

Mr. Scheerer: It does start next year. Very good, sir. Next year and next month.

Mr. Showe: Yeah.

Mr. Grimm: But you said that we're in good shape. Do we have some discretionary money?

Mr. Showe: You have $423,000 in capital reserves.

Mr. Smith: Yeah, we have $420,000.

Mr. Scheerer: You have outfall problems.

Ms. Carpenter: If you have a hurricane.

Mr. Boermans: We had to fix one of our weirs and it was $180,000.

Mr. Smith: Yeah, but we have another one that might come up, too.

Ms. Carpenter: FEMA is not reimbursing very well anymore.

Mr. Scheerer: Pick your poison.

Mr. Antolovich: My thoughts on it, we've had a lot of complaints. People want to get it fixed. It's going to cost money to fix it. Finding out whether it was installed properly or not, if there does get to be a blame put on somebody else, I guess my first question is, is there any actual resource that we have at this point in time? If not, then it's pointless to figure out who is to blame, if there's anyone to blame.

Ms. Carpenter: I guess that's pointed at me. I'm winging it here, with the little bit that I know about it. But if it was not built to plans, you may be able to go after a contractor to say, *"These were the plans. You did not build it appropriately."* If the way it was designed was not something that had to be permitted, it would probably be difficult to go after anybody for the design and the setup that was required by the City as part of the permitting. So, the fact was they built it as something that the City made Lennar build as a part of planning, could go against a claim. Again, not knowing anything about Lennar and the Engineer and design, but if no permit had to be complied with, it would be hard to find a standard with which to comply.

Mr. Antolovich: Yeah and that's what Ms. Baxter was saying, too. There was not a requirement.

Ms. Carpenter: I have a number of CDDs that are looking at developer claim issues and you have to hire another engineering firm as a consultant. Those reports tend to be in the $10,000, $20,000 or $30,000 range. So, to litigate, you could end up spending $50,000 or $100,000 minimum, to try to pursue a claim. Whether you get someone to settle, it really depends on the facts that you can find. But most of the cases are where there's permitting or there's an actual contract with specs that said, *"Okay, this did not happen."* Again, I don't know the facts here. I haven't seen the plans or permits.

Mr. Grimm: But I mean, I can't imagine they just said, *"Put in a water thing."*

Ms. Carpenter: Yeah, they had to build the pond.

Mr. Grimm: The wetland.

Mr. Showe: Yeah.

Ms. Carpenter: They have to make the stormwater system work with the wetland in the pond.

Mr. Grimm: I mean, gosh, it's likely that they have bigger issues than Storey Park CDD, if all they have to say is, *"We're going to put it right there and then just do that and we're good to go."*

Ms. Carpenter: You have to look at all of the other plans to see if there was a better place to put it or was this the only place? I mean again there's a lot of facts.

Mr. Grimm: Would this be county or city?

Ms. Carpenter: The city.

Mr. Grimm: What kind of department would that be? Do you know?

Mr. Roberts: Public Works.

Mr. Scheerer: Public Works or Stormwater Department.

Mr. Showe: Planning Department, if there was an approval process.

Mr. Roberts: As part of the Plan Development (PD), there was a trail required around there, I believe. The location of that was discussed throughout. In the planning, they only care that there's a trail there, that's 6 feet wide. That's the only thing that they will care about. The city would look at the connectivity of how it flows and code requirements of maintaining our stormwater for pre and post discharge. That would usually be the Public Works Department or if the City of Orlando has their own Stormwater Department. I'm not sure. But either way Public Works would be the ones for you to call.

Mr. Grimm: They would be the ones that said we need to have a pond that meets the specific parameters of this plan.

Mr. Roberts: It's more that we tell the city that we would like to put a pond here, this big, to cater for this much, to meet your overall final development stormwater criteria.

Mr. Grimm: Would the Public Works Department be the people that drafted that criteria at some point in time?

Mr. Roberts: Yes.

Mr. Grimm: Then of course the commissioners approved that particular situation.

Mr. Roberts: Yes.

Mr. Antolovich: Correct me if I'm wrong. A lot of times it's more just almost like a point system. It not necessarily always has to be these exact dimensions of this or whatever. It's the minimum standards and whatever way the developer comes up with that, as long as it checks the boxes.

Mr. Grimm: I asked this question, because I'll just reach out to people and say, *"This is what the situation is"* and I'm curious to know what their response is going to be. We have very strict parameters.

Ms. Carpenter: We have to be really cautious, if you talk with other government officials.

Mr. Grimm: I'll do my own research on it.

Ms. Carpenter: But if you're doing it as a Board representative, the Board needs to approve you doing it.

Mr. Grimm: To do my own research?

Ms. Carpenter: If you're contacting government officials.

Mr. Grimm: I'm not contacting anybody.

Ms. Carpenter: Okay.

Mr. Grimm: Yeah.

Mr. Boermans: Yeah. It's so difficult, because I think whenever you would look at a main road with a sidewalk and there are structural issues with it, it's easier than the trail, because the trail is like an amenity. So, it's so much more difficult.

Ms. Carpenter: Yeah. It doesn't have specifics. Like a sidewalk has to be a certain width. You can't have certain depth. It has to be level. A trail is much more flexible.

Mr. Grimm: I understand.

Ms. Carpenter. Okay, thanks.

Mr. Antolovich: If we were to just do the re-grading, what would we need beforehand? Surveys or no?

Mr. Roberts: The $95,000?

Mr. Antolovich: Yeah.

Mr. Roberts: I want to say no, at least not to the extent that, that survey is.

Mr. Smith: Cut it in half.

Mr. Roberts: Because really, it's just to get the contractor out there.

Mr. Antolovich: Yeah.

Mr. Roberts: Get his own survey done before, if he needed one.

Mr. Smith: But if we raise it, how will we verify that by fixing it?

Mr. Roberts: We would request as-builts, as well as do inspections.

Mr. Boermans: Would it be a good idea to get proposals from contractors?

Mr. Antolovich: Yeah, I guess we're running down two avenues. One, whose fault is it and can we get someone else to pay for it? And two, we still need to get it done, whether it's us paying for it or not.

Mr. Smith: But I don't know. From what I've heard, it has to be a very high bar, for someone pay for it, unless the cause of action is...

Mr. Grimm: Unless there is a plan and after the survey the plan says this was not done.

Mr. Smith: Yeah.

Mr. Grimm: Now who do you go after? Do you go after Lennar as the developer or the subcontractor that Lennar hired?

Mr. Smith: And what's the statute of limitations?

Mr. Grimm: I'm sure that the statute of limitations hasn't expired. I'll ask the attorney.

Mr. Boermans: It's within five years.

Ms. Carpenter: When was the flooding discovered?

Mr. Antolovich: Last year.

Mr. Boermans: The year before.

Mr. Grimm: When I first moved there, I've been there for just over three years.

Ms. Carpenter: I can confirm it for you.

Mr. Smith: But if my understanding is correct, right now the survey is $6,500. If we need to survey anyway, maybe it's not going to be this fine, but it still would be something for a few thousand plus dollars.

Mr. Antolovich: Potentially.

Mr. Smith: Maybe it's $3,000 to $4,000 to have that option to proceed with someone else and is that worth it? The way that I think through it, we're going to probably have to have a survey at some point anyway. It may not be the fine detail here, but it will be several thousand dollars that we have to cover. It may not be the 5 feet or 10 feet.

Mr. Grimm: It's a $100,000 job, plus or minus.

Ms. Carpenter: Yeah. What would it take for you to draft a scope of work to put out to bid?

Mr. Roberts: A couple grand.

Mr. Antolovich: If it's going to cost $100,000 to fix it.

Mr. Grimm: Does it cost us money to solicit business?

Mr. Showe: Well, they have to develop a scope. They need to develop a solid scope that we can send apples-to-apples.

Ms. Carpenter: Yeah, just to develop the scope.

Mr. Scheerer: Right.

Mr. Antolovich: So, we would need that anyways. Right? I mean, if we can prove something that they did wrong and we want them to fix it and they go, *"Okay, how do we fix it?"*

We can tell them how we want it fixed, right? Or try to sue them for an amount of money to pay for it. So, no matter what…

Mr. Boermans: We need to survey it.

Mr. Antolovich: No, we need to get proposals.

Mr. Smith: The way I'm thinking of it, is it's going to cost us roundly $100,000, no matter what options we go with. We are potentially paying $3,000 or $4,000 more, to explore the option that they may not fall back to us. So, that's what I think the option to me is. It's $3,000 for that option, if it wasn't built to plans or to the engineering design, to try to hold something. I think that's at least certainly how I think the decision should be made.

Ms. Carpenter: Do we have a contract for that work or know who even did it? Do we know who did the construction?

Mr. Scheerer: We can find out. I know Lennar had a contractor out there and we have a Lennar employee that works for us now. So, she might get some information for us. Who is it?

Mr. Smith: Elevate.

Mr. Scheerer: I'm not sure. I thought just the main contractor did all of the pond digging and stuff over in K-1.

Ms. Carpenter: It's something to find out, if you want to pursue looking at somebody.

Mr. Roberts: It was the same contractor?

Mr. Scheerer: Yes.

Mr. Roberts: Do you know who that was?

Mr. Showe: I don't know off hand if we do.

Mr. Scheerer: Well, we probably have requisitions somewhere that were paid through bonds for whatever work.

Mr. Grimm: I'll just put it out there. I’m a Real Estate Agent.

Mr. Antolovich: Is there any overlap between potentially going down this detailed survey route and getting proposals?

Mr. Showe: I think they are two separate issues.

Mr. Antolovich: If you go to the proposal route, are you going have to get some survey work done that this would cover?

Mr. Roberts: Me creating the scope for the Option 1 $95,000 fix, could that also be used for Option 2 for the minimum works scope? Yes, I think so. Because regardless, we would be reconstructing trails and grading appropriately using the same cross sections. So, yes.

Mr. Boermans: I'm just worried with the $95,000 proposal, that it is really $95,000 and it would not exceed more, because initially we were thinking that it would cost $110,000 to $150,000 and then it ended up being $180,000.

Mr. Antolovich: These are rough estimates.

Mr. Roberts: We compare it to schedules that we receive from contractors. But it's for 300 or 400 lots, right? I think we've learned now, that we need to upscale that nearly 100% to their unit rates. So, that $95,000 is higher than what it would be if it was just our normal jobs. But they are going to tell you the most. You don't get three quotes.

Mr. Boermans: Yeah. Of course,

Mr. Grimm: While I have an opinion on this, I don't have opinion on what direction you go in, so I'll defer to the other two gentlemen.

Mr. Showe: Yeah. I'm kind of hearing a lot of different directions.

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah.

Ms. Carpenter: That was why I had questions. Just because I've seen too many CDD's spend money.

Mr. Antolovich: I would like to know what it costs to replace it. I doubt that we're going to find somebody who is at fault and then litigate and then get money back and not drag it on forever. Even if we did get some money back, how long is that going to take and how much are we actually going to save?

Mr. Boermans: Yeah, I agree on that.

Mr. Grimm: I assume repairs can't be made and then you try to litigate at that point.

Ms. Carpenter: Only if it's an emergency or a health and safety issue.

Mr. Showe: Yeah. It has to be a health and safety issue.

Ms. Carpenter: Can you give galoshes to all of the runners?

Mr. Antolovich: Being quoted at $250,000, is a lot different, if it actually comes back quoted at $50,000.

Mr. Showe: I agree.

Mr. Smith: I don't know how long it would take to get the quote and prepare the spec.

Mr. Antolovich: Yeah and get some bids.

Mr. Smith: For us to consider, because I'd like to know if we're saying…

Mr. Antolovich: What are we trying to achieve?

Mr. Smith: Yeah, just weigh it against it.

Mr. Antolovich: Are we trying to save $30,000 or are we trying to save $200,000? So, I would like to get quotes and bids for the re-grading. What do you guys think?

Mr. Smith: I agree.

Mr. Showe: So, what I'm hearing is that we would need a motion to authorize the Engineer to go ahead and put a scope together and get bids.

Ms. Carpenter: With a not-to-exceed. We need some number.

Mr. Showe: Well, would you have a not-to-exceed for your work?

Ms. Carpenter: What do you need?

Mr. Scheerer: $2,000.

Mr. Grimm: Can you sign something that says $2,000?

Mr. Scheerer: We'll have them on record.

Mr. Grimm: I'm just kidding.

Mr. Roberts: I'm just doing math in my head real quick.

Mr. Antolovich: No pressure.

Mr. Roberts: $2,500 is probably fair.

> Mr. Antolovich MOVED to authorize the District Engineer to prepare a scope and obtain bids to re-grade between the Pond K-1 trail and wetland in a not-to-exceed amount of $2,500 and Mr. Boermans seconded the motion.

Mr. Smith: I would approve $3,500 with Chair approval, if it comes to that.

Mr. Showe: So, then why don't we just do a not-to-exceed of $3,500?

Mr. Roberts: Okay.

Ms. Carpenter: Let the Chair approve it.

Mr. Antolovich: Yeah.

Mr. Showe: We'll still give the Chair approval once we get the proposal.

On VOICE VOTE with all in favor authorization for the District Engineer to prepare a scope and obtain bids to re-grade between the Pond K-1 trail and wetland in a not-to-exceed amount of $3,500, with the Chair's approval was approved.

Mr. Showe: Keep working the issue.

Mr. Boermans: It is a pain in the butt.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS **Consideration of Addendum #1 to Landscape Maintenance Agreement with OmegaScapes, Inc. - Added**

Ms. Carpenter: We sent a demand letter to OmegaScapes last month, laying out the issues that we saw in the performance of their work and requested not the $20,000 contribution, but 50% and they came back and agreed. So, we drafted an agreement and they've been cooperative and did not contest it.

Mr. Showe: They've executed the agreement. It also includes the one-year warranty that the Board requested and also the language.

Ms. Carpenter: Language stating that this isn't precedent for something else.

Mr. Showe: Correct.

Mr. Showe: So, we believe it represents what the Board approved. We just wanted to have a motion to go ahead and have that approved. OmegaScapes has already signed it. I think they're ready to start on Monday.

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah. If it gets approved today, they're going to have somebody out to spray all of the grass on Monday. The grass is going to end up brown and dead. So, you may want to let your neighbors know.

Mr. Showe: We can send something out too.

Mr. Smith: Yeah, we can just send a communication out, because I see a lot of people take their pets to Hammock Park.

Mr. Antolovich: Yeah, we'll send it to John.

On MOTION by Mr. Grimm seconded by Mr. Boermans with all in favor Addendum #1 to Landscape Maintenance Agreement with OmegaScapes, Inc. was approved.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS **Consideration of Non-Ad Valorem Assessment Administration Agreement**

with Orange County Property Appraiser - Added

Mr. Showe: Behind that, is more of just a housekeeping item. This is for next year's Property Appraiser Agreement. It's required for us to use the on-roll assessment. There's really no change in the agreement, so we would just look for a motion to approve.

> On MOTION by Mr. Grimm seconded by Mr. Antolovich with all in favor the Non-Ad Valorem Assessment Administration Agreement with Orange County Property Appraiser was approved.

Ms. Carpenter: You left out the most exciting thing. The Orange County Tax Collector isn't going to hold the money any longer, because people pay early.

Mr. Grimm: Does the Controller hold it?

Ms. Carpenter: No, the Tax Collector.

Mr. Showe: Well, this agreement is with the Property Appraiser.

Ms. Carpenter: Oh, okay. Bummer.

Mr. Showe: These are different folks. We've had some issues with the Orange County Tax Collector, but Jan has been helpful in getting that resolved.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Staff Reports

A. Attorney

Mr. Showe: With that, we'll turn it over to the attorney.

Ms. Carpenter: Sorry. I had something good and it took a long time. No, we don't have anything else. I don't mean to be negative on the potential claims. My litigators would love to jump in, but from what we're seeing in our Districts, a lot of money is going out the door without really remedying the problem. If there was something that was clear negligence or clearly something wasn't done properly, then I say go for it.

Mr. Grimm: What would you encourage residents who have some issues with developers after the fact, using our neighborhood as an example? Contact legislators?

Ms. Carpenter: Contact legislators and then go after your seller, if you get large groups of people all bringing up the same issues.

Mr. Grimm: The seller is the developer.

Ms. Carpenter: Then the developer will respond, if they get enough people pushing back on the same issues. Because the homeowners have the private rights, if their yard is flooding or if

somebody's yard is not graded properly. They have much more clear construction claim 558 rights. It's much harder when a government is getting something that's been permitted or isn't required to prove something different.

Mr. Grimm: Being only less than a year on the Board, do we have the ability to figure out these types of things that have come up since 2015? In 11 years, not just Parcel K, but the whole community, how many issues have come up that are CDD related, that could potentially be pointed to the developer? I'm not trying to get you to make something up. I'm just curious. Just being here, there have been multiple issues.

Mr. Boermans: We had the weir damage.

Mr. Showe: Yeah.

Mr. Boermans: You can go look at engineering, but a hurricane came through at that time. So, there was a lot more water than normally came through. That's how it started to erode and it just collapsed completely. At that moment, I think the developer can say, *"Well, there was a hurricane."* It's so hard to fight that one, especially when you look for a major developer, well, a major developer that have a big law firm behind them. To start that fight from our side, from the CDD side, will cost so much money. Is it really worth it?

Mr. Grimm: That's why I asked for a ballpark number in the last 11 years. Is it multi million dollars? Is it $500,000? Is it $5 million? I don't know.

Mr. Showe: Just since I've been involved, the weir is the only real issue and then the trail and the other weir.

Mr. Scheerer: The other weir.

Mr. Grimm: The grass issues.

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah, the sod issue.

Mr. Antolovich: But that's really more of an HOA issue.

Mr. Scheerer: No.

Mr. Antolovich: Do we have a bunch of it?

Mr. Scheerer: Well, Parcel K.

Mr. Grimm: You should see the dog park.

Mr. Scheerer: The dog park and the areas.

Mr. Grimm: There is not even grass anymore.

Ms. Carpenter: But we've got that in one CDD. But then you're looking at whether it was due to the landscaper or the maintenance people or the irrigation.

Mr. Showe: If that's on the plan to install, then we've got a hard case to make.

Mr. Scheerer: They just put in the wrong sod in Parcel K, in our opinion.

Mr. Showe: Yeah.

Mr. Scheerer: That ProVista sod has roots that grow laterally. They don't sink. So, you end up with surface turf that doesn't always perform well.

Ms. Carpenter: But then the other side that we see and I don't know in Storey Park, are the things that the developer did in addition, after the fact, to restore problems. Because most of the developers in the early years, find a bunch of things and do more than they had to.

Mr. Antolovich: Yeah, they do.

Mr. Grimm: I'm just curious to know if there was something worth exploring.

Ms. Carpenter: Yeah.

Mr. Grimm: You mentioned a full community of people.

Mr. Boermans: It's a difficult situation and it's frustrating.

Ms. Carpenter: It is. CDDs are a relatively new invention, so there's no direct case law. There isn't a body of law to be able to say this should happen. Just treat it as any other governmental entity.

Mr. Boermans: So, now my next question. I just passed by on…

Mr. Smith: Story Time Drive?

Mr. Boermans: No, no, no. Conway Gardens Drive. In that area, they have retention ponds and they put solar panels in there. Would that ever be an option for us to save money?

Ms. Carpenter: Are the solar panels for OUC?

Mr. Boermans: They were OUC's. Correct.

Mr. Grimm: There's also one at the main toll booth, in the Curry Ford area. There's a pond in there. It's starting to become something maybe more.

Mr. Scheerer: Interesting.

Ms. Carpenter: We don't have a utility, so I don't know what we would be using the power for.

Mr. Antolovich: I actually did this with the city. I went through a little program on it. What they're doing, is they are slowly putting more and more solar panels out on unused water

areas, whether they're retention ponds or parts of lakes or whatnot. Then they basically pay whoever owns that waterway, to put it there. It just goes back to the grid.

Mr. Boermans: But I think with this CDD, we can do it towards the management fee.

Mr. Grimm: To lower the fee?

Mr. Boermans: Yeah.

Mr. Antolovich: It would come in as some sort of income stream. But the biggest issue to address your point though, is they are very slowly rolling that out. If CDD wanted to try to get into that program, there's apparently a mini multi-year wait list.

Mr. Grimm: I'll call Tom. No, I won't.

Ms. Carpenter: You also have a lot of homeowners that might not want them in their neighborhood. I can just see that as being a problem with residents saying, *"I can see it from my house. I bought a lake view. I didn't buy a solar panel."*

Mr. Grimm: There are plenty of ponds that are hidden, wouldn't you say?

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah, we got a few in the back.

Ms. Carpenter: Do you want to get the information to them to see if there's a list to get on?

Mr. Grimm: Yeah.

Ms. Carpenter: Sure, that makes sense.

Mr. Smith: I see where you're going, because on Story Time Drive, there's a path between Dowden Road and Moss Park Road. I don't know if that's ours or not.

Mr. Scheerer: It is city property.

Mr. Smith: Okay. Because they dug it up and they were repaving.

Mr. Scheerer: There was a lot of work that was going on there. I actually saw All Terrain Tractor doing some underground work in that area. It looks like somebody came in and repaved all of the areas that they were doing work on.

Mr. Smith: Yeah.

Mr. Scheerer: But that's not CDD property. That road is owned by the city.

Mr. Smith: Okay.

Mr. Scheerer: Story Time Drive is owned by the city. Moss Park Road is owned by the city and Dowden Road is owned by the city. I know Brandon sent us a truncated dome that was dislodged.

Mr. Grimm: Why do we have county utility for water?

Mr. Showe: I think they just provide the water.

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah. City, County, City, County, City, County.

Mr. Showe: Wherever the line is.

Mr. Scheerer: It all looks like the City of Orlando to me.

Mr. Antolovich: It wasn't owned by the City until it was built out.

Mr. Grimm: The City is cheaper.

Mr. Scheerer: Is it?

Mr. Grimm: I've always found that it is.

Ms. Carpenter: Yeah.

Mr. Scheerer: I wouldn't know. I have a well.

Mr. Grimm: They're cheaper for power too. I don't understand why we have Duke. I know who owns everything.

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah. It just depends on your area. That big smokestack that you see over there.

Mr. Boermans: Now we're talking about these roads. I think for eight years, we had lights on Story Time Drive and Dowden Road and there are always jumper cables in between. Nothing is underground.

Mr. Grimm: They plug them in. That's how they do it.

Mr. Boermans: No, they're all above ground, because the underground is broken.

Mr. Grimm: Are you talking about the holiday lights?

Mr. Boermans: No.

Mr. Antolovich: No, the lights themselves.

Mr. Scheerer: I believe that's all been corrected. There was one power pole, when I was out there probably four years ago or so, that we were fighting with Lennar on. They actually had to run power from one side to the other.

Mr. Antolovich: Yeah, I think that was there this year.

Mr. Boermans: The one on Dowden Road is still there.

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah. Well, as far as I know. We can check with them and see if it can be removed, but I know they do jumpers. I thought like Travis was saying, they were hanging the Christmas lights and the holiday lights on them.

Mr. Boermans: We don't have Christmas lights, right?

Mr. Antolovich: No, we don't.

Mr. Grimm: Not until Christmastime.

Mr. Scheerer: You get big snowflakes.

Mr. Antolovich: They don’t light up where I live.

Mr. Grimm: I like the Christmas trees.

Ms. Carpenter: Holiday trees.

Mr. Scheerer: Christmas trees.

Mr. Antolovich: Okay.

Ms. Carpenter: I have nothing else to report.

Mr. Boermans: Thank you.

Mr. Scheerer: Wow! That was quick.

B. Engineer

Mr. Showe: We can go to the Engineer’s Report. Are there any updates on your end?

Mr. Roberts: One question. Not to bring up the trail again, but am I going to include in this scope, the regrading of the hill portion?

Mr. Grimm: Yeah.

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah.

Mr. Boermans: Do we need to make a motion?

Mr. Showe: No. I think he just wanted clarification. The Board already made the motion.

Mr. Smith: But just for clarity, again, I know it was just a rough estimate. Did that $95,000 include that scope, that estimate?

Mr. Scheerer: I don’t think so.

Ms. Carpenter: We'll just have them billed separately.

Mr. Smith: Okay.

Ms. Carpenter: Ask them to break out their proposal to include that, versus not including it.

Mr. Scheerer: I think the original scope was just for the wetland area.

Mr. Smith: I'm not saying that we shouldn't do that. I just want to have a comparison.

Mr. Roberts: That will all be included in my scope.

Ms. Carpenter: A separate cost so they can see the difference.

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah, pricewise.

Mr. Roberts: I'll include that to be separate.

Ms. Carpenter: Perfect. Thank you.

Mr. Roberts: In front of you are the Prologue Avenue and Theme Alley intersection plans.

Mr. Smith: What's happening there? What's the change?

Mr. Roberts: There's the low point at the northwest corner, where the manhole is.

Mr. Smith: Okay. Yeah.

Mr. Roberts: That's ponding.

Mr. Antolovich: Where is this?

Mr. Showe: It's at the intersection of Prologue Avenue and Theme Alley.

Mr. Scheerer: At the intersection of Theme Alley and Prologue Avenue, there's a manhole that's underwater.

Mr. Grimm: It's not too far from Imaginary Way.

Mr. Roberts: There are potentially two causes. The pipe at the manhole is degrading the dirt around it. It's gotten loose somehow. That's probably more unlikely. More likely is that water just seeps through over time and the road is just slowly degrading with water infiltration.

Mr. Smith: When I lived on that side, at least the first couple years, there were some sewer issues in that area when we first moved in, that were persistent. I don't live right on that street or that area, but I saw various kind of professionals out there doing work in that area. I don't know if that contributed to it.

Mr. Roberts: Repetitive tracking over the same area, will degrade the road more significantly over time. The roads are only designed for a certain amount of load that the cars or trucks are on and the number of times that they're driven over.

Mr. Grimm: Can you explain why developers can build the road, then start building homes and big old dump trucks come through and then they never fix them after that? Why is that?

Mr. Roberts: Not to be combative, but I guess how else do you do it?

Mr. Grimm: You would resurface after the fact. But I know resurfacing doesn't necessarily prevent or fix any kind of indentions and things like that. I mean, obviously you have to have roads in there to develop it.

Mr. Roberts: You're 100% correct. But the city or agency will say that the road needs to be finished before you can lot it and plat it. We need to provide access. So, the only way that we can provide access, is if you have your finished road to our standards.

Ms. Carpenter: It's one of those that you can't win.

Mr. Grimm: Well, it's just a crazy situation, because the roads are destroyed by that.

Mr. Roberts: I'm shocked that in Florida, they allowed us to build sidewalks. Because the sidewalks are always destroyed. Always. And 90% of the time, the builders come by and rebuild it again. But now, a lot of the agencies, don't require us to build the sidewalks as part of the master infrastructure. I kind of consider that a win.

Ms. Carpenter: It is a win. I just drafted an agreement for that.

Mr. Scheerer: In Wellness Ridge, they don't even require them to put the second lift asphalt on first.

Ms. Carpenter: Which is nice.

Mr. Scheerer: The best thing to do, is put the base in, put the sub asphalt in and leave it until all of the construction is done. Then you come in, fix all your curbs, redo all of your asphalt and you have a fresh lift. They should do that everywhere, in my opinion.

Ms. Carpenter: Orlando and Orange county don't do that. You have to have fully permitted roads to drive on.

Mr. Antolovich: So, where this manhole is being relocated, it's a big area of the road. When you open that manhole up, is that just a giant area underneath that whole road? I thought manholes usually just went to a little claustrophobic service area.

Mr. Roberts: I think that one's about 3-foot diameter, maybe 4-foot diameter.

Mr. Antolovich: Yeah.

Mr. Scheerer: It connects to other manholes.

Mr. Antolovich: Oh, do they?

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah.

Mr. Showe: Yeah.

Mr. Scheerer: That's a stormwater manhole.

Mr. Antolovich: Okay.

Mr. Boermans: Do we have to pay for it?

Mr. Scheerer: Pay for what? The stormwater, yes.

Mr. Showe: Yes, the stormwater.

Mr. Scheerer: If it's sanitary sewer, then it goes to the municipality. But I'm pretty sure that's stormwater. Right?

Mr. Roberts: There's an inlet over here. You can barely see it.

Mr. Antolovich: Yeah.

Mr. Roberts: I believe that manhole connects to that inlet.

Mr. Antolovich: Got it. Okay.

Mr. Scheerer: It drains into the inlet and into the manhole.

Mr. Roberts: So, what this proposes, is to again, minimize the amount of work required, utilize the now existing levels and grades and elevations that are there now, because it's all been funneled to the manhole or at least around the manhole. It proposes that we lower the manhole lid and replace the top with a slotted grate. So, that way stormwater can go into the top. The manhole lid now becomes the new low point and everything grades towards the manhole.

Mr. Smith: Are any other road improvements needed?

Mr. Roberts: We would recommend the asphalt remediation. You have to fix the road or else it's going to keep degrading over time.

Mr. Smith: Yeah, but the question is, just in this one area, do you need to go out further?

Mr. Roberts: We have it going to the edge of the travel lane on the other side, just before the parking and as well as pretty much up to an inlet that is here in the alley.

Mr. Antolovich: How much does this cost?

Mr. Scheerer: $20.

Mr. Grimm: $1 million.

Mr. Roberts: We've done an estimate.

Mr. Smith: I say $25,000.

Mr. Roberts: We've done an estimate with our one-time markups. It was $46,000.

Mr. Smith: $46,000.

Mr. Scheerer: Is that all?

Mr. Showe: Yeah.

Mr. Roberts: But it's a one-time cost. They have to get multiple crews out here to do one small amount of work.

Mr. Antolovich: Do we have other areas, with similar situations that we need to get fixed or is this the main one?

Mr. Roberts: This is a significant one where the road is actively failing.

Mr. Showe: Yeah. This is one where we have received a lot of resident input.

Mr. Scheerer: Especially from the guy on the corner.

Ms. Carpenter: Maybe they could asphalt the trail, if it's dangerous and people are complaining and its degrading and you don't want the rest of the road to fail.

Mr. Smith: We still need to go out for bids. So today, are we just making it aware and then we get a markup?

Mr. Roberts: This is what would be sent to the contractor.

Mr. Antolovich: Not for bid?

Mr. Roberts: Yes.

Mr. Antolovich: Yeah.

Mr. Showe: Would the same type of vendor do this as would do the trail work? I mean could we maybe go out for bid and do two separate scopes to the same vendor, so we can see if maybe there are some cost savings and mobilization by using the same vendor? But then if we can have each one of them bid separate, you also pick different ones for different pieces.

Ms. Carpenter: Yeah. How quickly can you do a better scope?

Mr. Roberts: It would not take long.

Mr. Showe: Okay.

Mr. Antolovich: Yeah, that sounds good. Do we need a motion for that or is this more informational?

Mr. Showe: I think he's already done the work. So, as long as there's no opposition, then we can have him proceed with getting proposals for this project.

Mr. Antolovich: Yeah.

Mr. Smith: I guess the only question is timing. How long has it been at this level or is there a timeline for acting at this point?

Mr. Antolovich: Is the road going to collapse in the next three months?

Mr. Grimm: It’s not going to collapse. The concern is that it expands.

Mr. Antolovich: Yeah. Okay.

Mr. Scheerer: We have plywood.

Ms. Carpenter: Is there anything dangerous out there?

Mr. Scheerer: No.

Mr. Showe: It's just standing water.

Mr. Scheerer: It's just standing water. There is a depression in and around the manhole at the entrance to the alley.

Mr. Antolovich: But we're not going to get a sinkhole that will swallow somebody?

Mr. Scheerer: Let's hope not.

Ms. Carpenter: You never know in Florida.

Mr. Scheerer: Let's hope not. Think positive and happy thoughts, sir.

Mr. Smith: Okay. So, then for the next meeting would we have the bid package?

Mr. Showe: We would hope so.

Mr. Smith: Is this part of the capital budget?

Mr. Showe: That is where it would come from.

Mr. Roberts: That's all I have.

C. District Manager's Report

i. Approval of Check Register

Mr. Showe: Then we can go to the approval of the Check Register. In your General Fund, we have Checks #1722 through #1734.

Mr. Smith: I just had one question. If you can remind me, we replaced damaged sod. Was that the treatment or was that something else?

Mr. Scheerer: Is this on the Check Register?

Mr. Smith: Yeah.

Mr. Boermans: $5,600.

Mr. Scheerer: It's all good. I got you. If you recall, we had a lot of damage sod around the rights-of-way at Epic Park, between the sidewalk and the curb. So, we had those all replaced. That was discussed over several meetings, I believe. Then as you know, annually we close the dog parks down.

Mr. Smith: Yeah.

Mr. Scheerer: So, we closed the one on Charades Street.

Mr. Smith: Okay. So, it's dog park sod.

Mr. Scheerer: Well, the dog park is included in that. You're looking at Bahia versus Bermuda around Epic Park. So, it's a different turf, but that comprises that replacement. That wasn't anything that I tried to slide in.

Mr. Showe: No.

Mr. Scheerer: I got you. I already had it written down. I knew you guys were going to ask about it.

Mr. Grimm: I figured it was old.

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah, it's old stuff.

Mr. Showe: Then certainly there are some debt service transfers starting in August. Those are just transfers from your General Fund to the Debt Service Fund, as those assessments come in.

On MOTION by Mr. Grimm seconded by Mr. Boermans with all in favor the July 29, 2026 through August 25, 2026 Check Register in the amount of $104,367.26 was approved.

ii. Balance Sheet and Income Statement

Mr. Showe: Behind that, is your Balance Sheet and Income Statement. No action is required by the Board. We are performing about $70,000 better than budget to actuals for the year. So, we're in great shape there. With that last bit of assessment revenue that we received in late August, we are at up to 102% collected on our assessments. So, we're in great shape there.

Mr. Antolovich: How do we collect more?

Mr. Showe: This is fundamentally how the CDD works. So, for us to collect $100, we have to assess $106. People that pay their Tax Bill in November, can take a 4% discount and then we pay the Tax Collector 2%. So, again, for us to get $100, we have to bill $106. So, if there are people that pay their Tax Bill in January, we receive 1% or 2% extra.

Mr. Antolovich: Got it.

Mr. Showe: So, we almost always get over 100%, slightly.

Mr. Scheerer: It is like bonus money.

D. Field Manager's Report

Mr. Showe: We'll roll on to Alan for his report.

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah. I don't have a lot on the field stuff. I am working on all of the proposals for next month's meeting. I know that the Board had requested information on the pros and cons of fountains and ponds. Unfortunately, about 15 minutes ago, my contractor sent that to me and I don't feel comfortable sending it to anybody right now, until I have a chance to read it. I also have documents on how a stormwater pond functions and the different positive and negative plants that can go in there. Should you not choose to do a fountain, you may want to look at maybe some littoral plantings around the perimeter, which will help with your insect and algae control and stuff like that. So, next month we'll have a little more information. I'll get the stormwater stuff to Jason. If he feels that we need to send it out in advance, we can certainly do that.

Mr. Grimm: I'm so sorry to interrupt. Can you see if there's a solar option that's viable?

Mr. Scheerer: For fountains?

Mr. Grimm: Yeah.

Mr. Scheerer: Of course. Like I said, I know for a fact, the power ones are very expensive.

Mr. Grimm: We have a lot of ponds.

Mr. Scheerer: Again, I think somebody brought up that that apartment complex has a fountain in the pond out front. You have a beautiful view as you're going down Dowden Road, but most of the CDDs that we deal with, find fountains that are beneficial going into ponds that are beneficial for everybody that travels through the neighborhood.

Mr. Showe: Right.

Mr. Grimm: Someone complained today about a nice, new paved path. I'm just saying.

Mr. Scheerer: I understand, sir. But anyway.

Ms. Carpenter: Fountains are difficult.

Mr. Boermans: Yeah, it's very difficult, because a lot of our ponds are behind people's homes. There is one on History Avenue. Not everybody can actually enjoy it.

Ms. Carpenter: Exactly.

Mr. Scheerer: The thing about that, is you have to have a power source. The nearest power source could be in Mr. Grimm's front yard and we have to trench all the way back to put in the rack. For a seven and a half horsepower fountain, on average running from 8:00 p.m. to

10:00 p.m., seven days a week, you are going to generate anywhere between $500 to $600 a month in electric. That does not include service.

Mr. Showe: Yeah.

Mr. Scheerer: But we will certainly bring that information to you, unless there are solar panels.

Ms. Carpenter: Does anybody fish at the ponds?

Mr. Antolovich: Yes, they do. They're not supposed to, but they do.

Ms. Carpenter: That's why I was asking. We have one District that just put a beautiful fountain in. I think it's on its third motor now, because of fishing lines. There is more now in maintenance than the cost of installation.

Mr. Scheerer: It's about $6,000 for a motor.

Mr. Showe: Yeah.

Mr. Scheerer: It cost you a couple hundred to pull it out and clean it and put it back, but if the motor goes...

Ms. Carpenter: They're trying to figure out cages, anything to stop the fishing lines.

Mr. Grimm: She wants to tie it into her house.

Ms. Carpenter: Oh yeah, another $500.

Mr. Scheerer: Whereabout are you on K-1?

Mr. Grimm: I'm near the wetlands. Not directly related. I'm at the big lake over the weir into the conservation where the path to nowhere goes.

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah. As we talked about earlier with the cleanup of Hammock Park on Satire Street, OmegaScapes has indicated that they will be out on Monday to spray that. We'll make sure that they have proper placards in place to let people know that it is being sprayed.

Mr. Showe: We'll get a message out through the HOA.

Mr. Grimm: Thank you.

Mr. Scheerer: That's all I have.

Mr. Showe: Obviously that's all weather permitting too.

Mr. Smith: Yeah.

Mr. Boermans: About the fountains, when I just did my quick research, whenever you look for the water fountains on solar, it can maybe go up to one horsepower, maybe sometimes

three to five horsepower with configurations. But to get seven and a half horsepower, you still need a main grid.

Mr. Showe: Yeah.

Mr. Scheerer: Well, you don't necessarily need to have a seven and a half horsepower one. If you were looking at the corner fountain at Story Time Drive and Dowden Road, you may not need any more than a three horsepower. You just need something that's going to move the water.

Mr. Grimm: Just get three horses for that.

Mr. Boermans: That was initially what Lennar told us.

Mr. Scheerer: I used to have one when I had a pool. Now I don't have a pool.

Mr. Antolovich: We were supposed to have equestrian shows. That was in the original sales literature.

Mr. Scheerer: Equestrian trails?

Mr. Antolovich: Quarterly equestrian shows and stables and everything for everyone in the community.

Mr. Scheerer: Reunion has one.

Ms. Carpenter: We've got a stable for sale.

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah, we've got a stable for sale, if you have a couple of million dollars.

Ms. Carpenter: You have stables, but no trails.

Mr. Antolovich: Horses?

Ms. Carpenter: Well, the horses can't go anywhere.

Mr. Scheerer: Well, the horses couldn't go in there, because they built the stable and found out that they had sand skinks.

Mr. Grimm: Is this at Reunion West?

Mr. Scheerer: Reunion.

Ms. Carpenter: Up on I-4.

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah, I-4 at Champions Gate. I have the prettiest office on the planet up there.

Mr. Smith: I visited for a family event. Is it like an Airbnb or Vrbo type of community or is it open?

Mr. Scheerer: It’s everything.

Mr. Smith: Okay.

Mr. Showe: They have a little bit of everything.

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah. They have long term rentals, short term rentals and full-time residents.

Mr. Grimm: It's in a unique pocket. It's technically old county Davenport, right?

Mr. Showe: Reunion is all Osceola.

Ms. Carpenter: It's right on the Osceola/Polk County line.

Mr. Scheerer: This is one of the newest houses.

Ms. Carpenter: Yeah, they're nice, small little homes.

Mr. Antolovich: Did we have any complaints regarding the fireworks?

Mr. Scheerer: Not one. They did a great job.

Mr. Showe: Alan said that they did a great job cleaning up. We had no issues. That was kind of our foray into CDD fireworks. That's something we would not have any opposition to next year with the same vendor.

Mr. Scheerer: Whoever coordinated it, did a good job.

Mr. Showe: Yeah.

Mr. Antolovich: Did you see it?

Mr. Showe: No.

Mr. Grimm: I heard it.

Ms. Carpenter: Was it good?

Mr. Grimm: I wasn't going to get out in the rain.

Mr. Antolovich: When you do these packages, they show you a video, to show you kind of what it will look like. It was five times better than what they were advertising.

Mr. Showe: Wow.

Ms. Carpenter: Wow.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Public Comment Period

There being no comments, the next item followed.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Supervisor's Requests

Ms. Carpenter: Are there any Supervisor's Requests?

Mr. Grimm: No.

Mr. Antolovich: No.

Mr. Boermans: No.

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS **Other Business**

There being no comments, the next item followed.

ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS **Next Meeting Date – October 6, 2026**

Mr. Showe: The next meeting is scheduled for October 6, 2026. We need a motion to adjourn.

TWELFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS **Adjournment**

On MOTION by Mr. Boermans seconded by Mr. Smith with all in favor the meeting was adjourned.

_____ _____

Secretary / Assistant Secretary Chairman / Vice Chairman

MINUTES OF MEETING
STOREY PARK
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

The regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Storey Park Community Development District was held on Tuesday, November 3, 2026 at 4:00 p.m. at the Offices of GMS-CF, 219 E. Livingston Street, Orlando, Florida.

Present and constituting a quorum were:

Willem Boermans *by phone*	Chairman
Matthew Antolovich	Vice Chairman
Travis Smith	Assistant Secretary
David Grimm	Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

Jason Showe	District Manager
Jan Carpenter	District Counsel
Cameron Roberts *by phone*	District Engineer
Alan Scheerer	Field Manager

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS **Roll Call**

Mr. Showe called the meeting to order and called the roll. A quorum was present.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS **Public Comment Period**

Mr. Showe: We only have members of the Board and staff present.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS **Approval of Minutes of the September 1, 2026 Meeting**

Mr. Showe: We have the minutes of your September 1, 2026 meeting. Those minutes were included as part of your agenda package. We can take any corrections or changes at this time or a motion to approve.

> On MOTION by Mr. Antolovich seconded by Mr. Boermans with all in favor the Minutes of the September 1, 2026 Meeting were approved, as presented.

Mr. Grimm: Can I make a point of reference?

Mr. Showe: Sure.

Mr. Grimm: I'm just reading through this, and it just seems like it's not flowing very well. I feel like it went from the pond issue to another issue. Then there are some comments that say, *"Ms. Carpenter"*, but I'm like, *"Why would she be saying things like this?"* Because I didn't think she would.

Ms. Carpenter: What page?

Mr. Grimm: It just doesn't look like comments that she would make as Counsel. While I'm not saying that they need to be totally amended. I don't know. Maybe I'm losing my mind.

Mr. Scheerer: What page are you on, David?

Mr. Grimm: I've just been reading through them.

Ms. Carpenter: Why don't we just hold those for next month and we'll go through and send any comments. I looked at them really quickly, but not well enough.

Mr. Grimm: I mean, it has you talking through the whole conversation of the pond and I'm like, *"What?"* I don't recall that. I know you did maybe interject here and there.

Ms. Carpenter: Well, I do talk a lot.

Ms. Carpenter: Was this the meeting where we had...

Mr. Grimm: I started saying that I was a real estate agent. I'm like, *"Why would I have even said that?*" I know I am, but I don't recall saying it in that context. It just seems very confusing. I decided not to even be a part of the conversation. I deferred to, I think Matt and Willem, during about the intersection issue. I don't know. You tell me how to proceed.

Mr. Showe: We can hold the minutes. We'll just do what Counsel recommended.

Ms. Carpenter: Yeah, and if we get stuck, we'll just ask for a copy to the audio and listen to it.

Mr. Grimm: It's just confusing.

Mr. Showe: I'll have them review them.

Ms. Carpenter: I don't remember talking about some of these things.

Mr. Grimm: Right, I agree. You were a big part of the conversation, which I was pretty excited about.

Ms. Carpenter: Wow, thank you. It was important.

Mr. Boermans: I recall that we had a lot of questions, especially on the grading.

Mr. Showe: Yeah.

Ms. Carpenter: We did talk a lot about it.

Mr. Showe: We'll double check it.

Ms. Carpenter: We'll double check it. We should have looked more carefully.

Mr. Boermans: Do we need to rescind the motion?

Ms. Carpenter: Yeah, rescind it.

Mr. Showe: Yeah, we'll just have a motion to rescind those minutes and hold for review.

Mr. Grimm: Well, since it's my fault, I'll make the motion.

> On MOTION by Mr. Grimm seconded by Mr. Boermans with all in favor rescinding the prior motion to approve the Minutes of the September 1, 2026 Meeting and present at the next meeting, was approved.

Ms. Carpenter: Sorry for missing that.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS **Consideration of Proposals for Prologue Avenue & Theme Alley Intersection Repair**

A. Hall Company, Inc.
B. All Terrain Tractor Service, Inc.

Mr. Showe: The Board at the last meeting directed us to obtain proposals for the repair at Prologue Alley and Theme Alley. We did use the Engineer criteria and sent that out to three vendors. We received two proposals back; one from Hall Company (Hall). Their initial proposal was $85,466. We also received a proposal from All Terrain Tractor Service (All Terrain). All Terrain are the folks that did the other stormwater work about a year ago. Cameron, are you on the call?

Mr. Roberts: I am.

Mr. Showe: Okay, you can just jump in here in a second. But I just want to explain for the Board, Cameron reviewed both proposals. Obviously, given the price and the closeness of the scope of work, he had some additional comments for All Terrain, since they were a cheaper price. In front of you, we presented a revised proposal for All Terrain. The one thing that I did talk to All Terrain about, it is still less than the Hall proposal, with all of the things that the Engineer requested. It's $83,683. We did want to note, that no permits are required, or no permits are proposed in this. To the extent that any permits are needed, that will be an additional charge to the District. The one thing that he did not include, that the Engineer recommended as part of

it, is a bid bond. However, they did note in their proposal, that it does have a one-year warranty, which functionally covers the same process as a bid bond. But again, that's really a Board request. If you choose to do the bid bond, obviously they would just pass that cost along, as part of the contract, because they have to go out and obtain that. With that, we can let Cameron go through any questions or comments that he has on the proposals and then bring it back for any Board discussion.

Mr. Roberts: Sure. Both Hall and All Terrain were fairly similar. All Terrain was reviewed more in depth, because they were cheaper and provided some comments. They responded with the ones I'm assuming are in front of you now. We do recommend a one-year maintenance bond, but if they have a one-year warranty, I guess the question for Counsel is would that be sufficient in terms of any sort of contract for a maintenance bond that we could remove that recommendation?

Ms. Carpenter: I guess it depends on the amount of the contract and the experience with the contractor. You only have to have a bond if it's for certain government type projects.

Mr. Showe: Typically, we prefer a bond, just because it's easier to get cash out of it. But we've used All Terrain for several projects.

Mr. Scheerer: For many years.

Mr. Showe: I think functionally a bond is just as good as their one-year warranty, based on our experience with this vendor. As soon as they were inspected for the other repair that they did, they came out and made them right away before payment was made.

Ms. Carpenter: Maybe a question is how much are they charging for the bond?

Mr. Showe: Because they got the comments so late, they didn’t have an answer on that.

Ms. Carpenter: It might not be bad to ask for it, if we’re not paying for it.

Mr. Showe: Well, no, they would pass the cost on.

Ms. Carpenter: Oh.

Mr. Smith: Where would I see that in the Hall proposal? Because I don't see the bond. Maybe I’m missing it.

Mr. Showe: It wasn't part of it in the initial proposal. They would do the same thing. If we went with the Hall proposal, we would still have to add on a bond, if that was what the Board wanted.

Mr. Roberts: If I requested some of the same changes as All Terrain, I'm sure Hall's proposal would go up.

Mr. Showe: Correct.

Mr. Smith: Okay. I looked at it, because I was trying to compare it.

Mr. Grimm: There are no apples and oranges, because it's not itemized.

Mr. Smith: Well, I use AI to kind of try to group it and put it in the same category, but each chunk was different.

Mr. Grimm: They don’t say the same thing.

Mr. Smith: They're very differently priced. You couldn't compare the chunks. You can't really rely on a comparison.

Mr. Roberts: The methodology of the way it's priced, is different.

Mr. Showe: Yeah.

Mr. Roberts: But the items and general workflow that they're proposing, is similar. All Terrain just provides more detail.

Mr. Smith: In the past, we've had All Terrain. They did the alcove and they did that one well. Have you had Hall do any work in the community?

Mr. Showe: Not in your community? I think we've had Hall at some of our Districts. I would have to go back and look. But the All Terrain proposal that you have in front of you, was revised. They added about $5,000, based on comments from the Engineer. The Hall proposal at this point, is not really apples to apples. It probably would have some additional costs if we went back with the same criteria and reviewed their individual components with what the Engineer was requesting.

Mr. Smith: Maybe one comment before we approve the proposal.

Mr. Showe: Sure.

Mr. Smith: I don't know if the other Board Members have had a chance to see that area where the repair is needed. I live close to it and went by it a couple times, especially when it was raining the other day, you can really see it just sitting there. I assume it's stable. I don't think it's a question of do we need to do the work. For me it's a question of who we go with. Because if we go and look at it, it's definitely...

Mr. Scheerer: It's gotten worse, if I may say, over my time driving by there. It's slowly degrading and at some point, we want to avoid a catastrophic failure, in my opinion.

Mr. Smith: Yeah.

Mr. Scheerer: Let Cameron talk to that, because I'm not an Engineer, I just drive by it and see that it's holding more and more water.

Mr. Smith: Yeah. I've driven by it a couple times, especially when it's been raining the last couple days or last couple weeks.

Mr. Scheerer: It rained last night.

Mr. Smith: Because we didn't have the October meeting, I was surprised that we didn't get another email back to the CDD on it. I think it's something that we do need to address.

Mr. Scheerer: The city is involved too, right?

Mr. Showe: Yeah. Those residents have contacted the city and that's one of things that is going to be done from the Commissioner's office. Now, again, just as a note, you'll look at your amended budget later, but you do have about $436,000 in your Capital Projects Fund, which obviously would be used to complete a project of this type, if you choose to approve it.

Mr. Antolovich: What is the difference between a bond and a warranty from them?

Mr. Showe: If we make a call on it, we can just get the money back and repair it ourselves.

Ms. Carpenter: A bond is an insurance policy.

Mr. Showe: Yeah.

Ms. Carpenter: We would make a claim on the bond saying, *"Okay, pay us."* Then we have to argue with the bonding company that it's a covered event.

Mr. Antolovich: Versus arguing with them.

Mr. Smith: Yeah.

Mr. Antolovich: If it's a warranty issue.

Ms. Carpenter: If it's a company saying, *"Okay, you need to fix this,"* we have to file suit against them.

Mr. Antolovich: Do we normally do bonds for things like this?

Mr. Showe: I don't know that we did one on the stormwater structure repair. Typically, we use a bond if it's about a $500,000 roadway project. Those bonds typically have a longer lifespan as well. They may be two years, because you don't really know the impact. I think with an area this small, if we're using All Terrain, I'm fairly comfortable with the warranty, as long as it's described in the front-end contract. Because we're not going to have them sign just this

paperwork and move on. Your Counsel will draft up a complete contract that would include the terms. All Terrain has always been really good to work with, in terms of both quality and responsiveness.

Mr. Smith: Do you have any other intersection repairs? Because I don't have the basis to say, *"Is this kind of that typical range of what you would expect or is it high?"*

Mr. Showe: I think it's right where we would expect. We obtained two proposals. We tried to get a third and they were unresponsive. Both of the proposals are fairly close. There is about a $5,000 difference.

Ms. Carpenter: Do we have a better description of the area?

Mr. Showe: There is a map.

Ms. Carpenter: In the contract.

Mr. Showe: Yeah. If you go to Page 54 in the agenda, there's a photo and then there are all of the schematics that the Engineer laid out.

Ms. Carpenter: Okay, I didn't go that far. Got it. Well, just so we know how far. Okay. That's good. We can include that in the contract.

Mr. Showe: Yeah, all of that will be attached to whatever contract we have.

Ms. Carpenter: What about the trees? If the trees die, are we going to ask them to cover the trees?

Mr. Antolovich: I see that there is protection, restoration and landscaping. It is listed in the revised contract. Would that cover something like the trees as well?

Mr. Showe: Yeah. That's typically a kind of placeholder number. Obviously, if it goes higher or lower, sometimes they may change that. But they wouldn't do that without our request. There's not a whole lot.

Mr. Scheerer: It's $2,200.

Ms. Carpenter: It's on the last page.

Mr. Antolovich: What is a detectable warning map?

Mr. Showe: Oh, a truncated dome. If you look right here on the sidewalk, before you cross the sidewalk.

Mr. Antolovich: Oh, those.

Mr. Showe: We typically call them truncated domes.

Mr. Scheerer: That's a nice way of describing it. I'll have to save that one.

Mr. Showe: Detectable warning map. Yeah.

Ms. Carpenter: Do you mean those bumpy things?

Mr. Scheerer: Yes, the bumpy things. I like that one. The bumpy things.

Ms. Carpenter: Yeah, I know the Engineer thinks that's great. I saw one this morning and the whole truncated dome was completely off of where it was supposed to be and sliding down the street.

Mr. Antolovich: Did they say how long it will take?

Mr. Showe: I did not get an answer on that yet.

Mr. Antolovich: Is that something that they will close that roadway for?

Ms. Carpenter: Yes.

Mr. Showe: They will have to provide mobilization. There is an MOT

Mr. Scheerer: There is an MOT in there.

Mr. Showe: There will be road closures.

Mr. Smith: It's a side street abutting Imaginary Way and Satire Street. You have multiple ways out from Theme Alley to up to Dairy Alley.

Mr. Scheerer: The homeowners can come in the other way, if they have to.

Mr. Showe: Based on the emails that we're getting from the homeowners, I think they'll be okay with it being closed for a few days.

Mr. Grimm: Is the cracking from the water weights?

Mr. Scheerer: It's everything. I don't want to speak for the Engineer, but I agree with Travis.

Mr. Smith: It's depressed.

Mr. Grimm: Cameron, you're saying that the proposals, even though one is itemized and one is not, that everything that's in the Hall proposal…

Mr. Roberts: It does make sense when you compare the quantities and material that they've chosen, which is ultimately what matters.

Mr. Grimm: Can you clarify? What is LS?

Mr. Roberts: Lump Sum.

Mr. Grimm: I understand SF.

Mr. Showe: It is one lump sum. So, for mobilization they just charge…

Mr. Grimm: No, I'm telling him what I understand. I'm going through the list. Sorry. I know Square Footage, Linear Footage, Lump Sum. There's no Superintendent on Hall's proposal, which I assume is like a Supervisor of the project. Would that be accurate?

Mr. Showe: Probably.

Mr. Grimm: Because they're charging 40 hours.

Mr. Roberts: Correct. They will have a 10% markup in their Excel sheet, if they don't include it as part of a general conditions item.

Mr. Grimm: I know for the sake of time, we don't want to ask for an itemized cost to be able to compare. Some of it's not even comparable, because it's different terminology or in a different spot.

Mr. Showe: But just for the Board's information, the Engineer drew up a scope. That same scope was sent to both vendors. It's just a difference in the way that they are presenting the information to you on the proposal. They both have the same scope to start with. My guess is with the Hall proposal; the Supervisor and all of the staff fees are probably just wrapped up into that mobilization general conditions line. But yeah, they don't itemize it.

Mr. Scheerer: They used ADA mat truncated dome in Hall's proposal.

Ms. Carpenter: They didn't like the bumpy things.

Mr. Scheerer: They didn't like the bumpy things.

Mr. Grimm: Willem, do you have anything?

Mr. Boermans: No, not at all. I think for me, it makes sense. Both of them.

Mr. Antolovich: All Terrain, we've worked with them before.

Mr. Grimm: What permit cost could we expect?

Mr. Showe: They don't know yet, because they have to put in for it. Landon just got this. They may not need it, based on the type of work,

Mr. Roberts: We would argue that it's not necessary.

Mr. Showe: Okay.

Mr. Scheerer: I agree. Not that it matters.

Mr. Grimm: We can expect these numbers to pretty much be final for the most part.

Mr. Smith: The only question is, is there anything that could be causing this that wouldn't be covered? Because they had a lot of drainage work, other stuff in that area, when we first moved in. Could there be other unknowns when they open it up that we need to kind of be

concerned about? Again, it probably doesn't change who we go with, but are there any other concerns with that area? Just because I remember when we first moved in, the builder, Lennar did a lot of visits and drainage work in that area.

Mr. Grimm: Well, it's working as designed.

Ms. Carpenter: Perfect developer response.

Mr. Roberts: The main concern would be for any unforeseen costs that could come out, once we actually open up the ground.

Mr. Smith: Yeah.

Mr. Grimm: Is a sinkhole coming? I mean, you never know.

Mr. Roberts: The main concern would be the extent of how much would actually need to be repaired, as it's difficult to determine the suitability without opening up the ground for the outer edges. The outer edges may extend further, once we open it and we find the sub-base material and the base course material of the road is inadequate. We would obviously want to repair it at that time.

Mr. Scheerer: That was one of the questions that I had, to get them to provide us with a layout.

Mr. Roberts: If I may, we've shown it a little bit further out than what potentially they may need to do, to give us some contingency. But you never really know until you open up the ground.

Mr. Showe: Like right there.

Mr. Scheerer: Oh, there it is. The last page, David.

Mr. Showe: Page 57 should show you the extent of what they're going to be opening.

Mr. Scheerer: You're pretty close on what you were describing.

Mr. Smith: Door to parking.

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah.

Mr. Roberts: Page 57 or 56?

Mr. Showe: Page 56.

Mr. Scheerer: Page 56 or 57. It's on both pages. Yeah. It's, it's quite a bit of work to haul that out. That existing manhole should be a sanitary manhole anyway.

Mr. Antolovich: But in either case we won't know until it’s opened.

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah.

Mr. Smith: I'm just putting it out there.

Mr. Scheerer: It's always possible.

Mr. Smith: So, we may have to come back. What would happen in that case, because we only meet monthly? Would we have a meeting?

Mr. Showe: Typically, if it's going to be a considerable charge and it's in between meetings, we'll work with the Chairman and get his feel. If he's comfortable approving it, we would just approve it and then ratify it at the next meeting. But we would also let the Board know, *"Hey, this is what's happened. This is the additional cost and we'll notify you immediately if there's something outside the realm that we weren't prepared for."*

Mr. Smith: Okay.

Mr. Showe: But you know, we also don't want to just open it and leave it open.

Mr. Smith: Yeah.

Mr. Scheerer: I'm close to the area. Go ahead, Willem.

Mr. Showe: Go ahead.

Mr. Boermans: How much are we talking about? Because now I think it's between like $85,000 and $90,000. But if it becomes $120,000, then it becomes way too much.

Mr. Antolovich: We won't know until it's opened, if there's anything more that has to be done.

Mr. Smith: Yeah.

Mr. Roberts: A 10% contingency is probably fair enough.

Mr. Boermans: I agree with you, Cameron.

Mr. Scheerer: $8,300.

Mr. Roberts: If you really want to be conservative, just because we don't want to wait until a meeting, the Board could approve a 15% to 20% contingency.

Mr. Boermans: Okay.

Mr. Roberts: I don't expect it to go up to $120,000, 50% more.

Ms. Carpenter: So, you're suggesting a motion to approve the low bidder and grant authority to the Chairman to approve up to 15% in addition, if there's an emergency.

Mr. Showe: I think he said $15,000.

Mr. Roberts: No, 15%.

Mr. Showe: Oh, 15%. Yeah.

Ms. Carpenter: As a contingency.

Mr. Roberts: I would also like to say, let us review the latest proposal that was just sent today.

Mr. Grimm: Because 15% on the $85,000, is up to $97,000. One last question, would you say that these are decently priced proposals? If you already answered that, I apologize.

Mr. Roberts: These costs are always higher than we expect with the one-off jobs, unfortunately. The cost of gas is freezing our costs in all of our projects. Considering that Hall did give us a comparable number, yes, it's probably wasting time.

Mr. Grimm: Okay. What did we add?

Mr. Boermans: Also, the fact I think the longer we wait, maybe more gets destroyed and now maybe in two months, if we don't have a meeting next month, now we have to pay $180,000, because everything gets destroyed around it. That's what I'm afraid of.

Mr. Smith: Yeah.

Mr. Roberts: That is extremely true.

Mr. Smith: It's close to the homeowners. They've already complained. So, if something happens, I just don't want that risk for us.

Mr. Showe: Understood.

> Mr. Antolovich MOVED to approve the All Terrain Tractor Service proposal for the Prologue Avenue and Theme Alley intersection repair and authorizing the Chairman to approve up to an amount 15% higher than the contract and Mr. Boermans seconded the motion.

Mr. Showe: Is there any further discussion? Hearing none,

> On VOICE VOTE with all in favor the All Terrain Tractor Service proposal for the Prologue Avenue and Theme Alley intersection repair and authorizing the Chairman to approve up to an amount 15% higher than the contract, was approved.

Mr. Showe: Process-wise, we'll let the Engineer review it again. We just received some additional comments, which have been exchanged between All Terrain and the Engineer today. We'll also let Counsel draft the front-end document that will go with this, along with all of the

diagrams. Then we'll rock and roll. We'll give you an update, as well as some of the residents that have been asking. We'll try to provide them with an update.

Mr. Smith: Should we give it to the residents, or should we send it to the HOA?

Mr. Showe: I was just going to say. We'll send the whole thing to the HOA, because it is going to be a disruption for the entire neighborhood. As soon as we get some dates from the vendor, we'll make sure that we send it out, so that the neighborhood is aware.

Mr. Smith: Okay. But you can send it to the residents beforehand, just let them know.

Mr. Showe: Oh, absolutely.

Mr. Smith: That we met and agreed.

Mr. Showe: Yep.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS **Consideration of Resolution 2027-01 Amending the Fiscal Year 2026 Budget**

Mr. Showe: The next item that we have is Resolution 2027-01. This is kind of compliance work that we do every year, to true up some of your funds. We have to show in our audit process, that the revenues match the expenses. In some cases, we get some additional revenues, or we need to adjust some of the budgets. So, you'll see in your Capital Reserve Fund budget, we received some additional interest. So, we categorized that and accounted for that.

Mr. Grimm: You got a raise.

Mr. Showe: Yeah. Then we did the same thing on your debt service. There was some additional interest that we received that wasn't in your budget. We have to balance those out, so when we do the audit, it shows that we had a balanced budget. Other than that, actually, those are pretty minor adjustments. So, we can take any questions from the Board, or we would look for a motion to approve.

On MOTION by Mr. Antolovich seconded by Mr. Grimm with all in favor Resolution 2027-01 Amending the Fiscal Year 2026 Budget, was approved.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS **Consideration of Agreement with PayGov.US for Electronic Payment Processing Services**

Mr. Showe: The next item is again, actually more of a compliance item as well. Last year, the Florida Legislature mandated that all government entities have some form of electronic payment that they're allowed to take. We've been diligently working, because all of our CDDs

are going to have to meet this requirement by January 1st. We've worked with this company, PayGov.US, to ensure that they will be the provider of our electronic payment services. District Counsel has reviewed that agreement. I don't know if you have any additional comments, other than we kind of have to do this.

Ms. Carpenter: Yeah, we don't have much of a choice. This is pretty much an extra agreement that all of the Counsels in the State have agreed to. There don't seem to be that many options that aren't costly from what it appears out there.

Mr. Grimm: Who is utilizing this?

Mr. Showe: This would typically be for somebody that wants to rent the facility and rent the parks. Instead of having to send a check in, they can use an electronic payment.

Mr. Grimm: Okay. So, this is not an assessment.

Ms. Carpenter: It's not assessment.

Mr. Showe: No, it's not assessment and it's not for our vendors.

Ms. Carpenter: It's a State Law that passed that had to make governments accessible to the people.

Mr. Smith: How often is this used and is there a fee that is passed on?

Mr. Showe: Yes.

Ms. Carpenter: Yeah, the person who uses it, has to pay 3%, which is actually pretty good, because I just looked at something in Orlando and it was like more than 3%.

Mr. Showe: Yeah. So, you have folks that rent the parks probably a dozen times a year. Most of the time, when we explain to them that the parks are first come/first serve, they just go out and use it. But if they want to reserve the park, they'll have an electronic payment option as well.

Mr. Smith: Yeah, the only question is, a number of times the HOAs use it for different events over time. Would they need to pay the fee and go through this process?

Mr. Showe: This Board has typically in the past just said, *"If it's for an actual HOA event, we will not charge you for it."* That makes sense to me for the most part. You don't need to charge the HOA for an event.

Ms. Carpenter: Charge yourself.

Mr. Antolovich: It just opens up another payment avenue. It doesn't change anything else.

Mr. Showe: No. I think that's been the policy of this Board, so we're kind of going with that for now.

Mr. Smith: Okay.

> On MOTION by Mr. Grimm seconded by Mr. Antolovich with all in favor the Agreement with PayGov.US for Electronic Payment Processing Services, was approved.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Staff Reports

A. Attorney

Mr. Showe: With that, we'll go to Counsel.

Ms. Carpenter: We don't have anything much this week. You guys were very quiet at your last meeting and thankfully, other than PayGov.US, I think we're in pretty good shape. We have a couple things in mind that have come up at meetings that we're still thinking about.

Mr. Showe: Yeah.

Ms. Carpenter: We will let you know when we have better answers.

Mr. Grimm: I'm intrigued.

Ms. Carpenter: Yeah. You won't be intrigued.

Mr. Grimm: Oh, boring stuff.

Ms. Carpenter: Yeah. Alright.

B. Engineer

i. Consideration of Proposal for Additional Services Related to Pond K-1 Trail Grading

Mr. Showe: We can go to the Engineer's Report. I know you have a proposal, Cameron, if you want to walk the Board through that.

Mr. Roberts: Sure. This was sent quite a while ago, regarding the Pond K-1 trail grading modification, where we will provide a markup to contractors to raise the trail elevation to the maximum allowable and not cause additional permitting, which is really the scope.

Mr. Antolovich: So, this is $2,000 to draft up basically our piece.

Mr. Showe: To draft up a scope that we could then use to bid.

Mr. Antolovich: Okay.

Mr. Roberts: Yes.

Ms. Carpenter: I'm not sure if I recall, did we agree on the survey last time?

Mr. Smith: Well, we said we wanted to see the cost.

Ms. Carpenter: Okay. I just wanted to make sure.

Mr. Smith: Yeah, we wanted to see the cost.

Ms. Carpenter: I think that was me making all of those comments in the last minutes, because now I recall making those.

Mr. Showe: Yeah.

Ms. Carpenter: I was just questioning whether you want to spend money on a survey if you don't know what you're comparing it to.

Mr. Showe: Yeah.

Mr. Antolovich: Yeah.

Mr. Smith: Then we also said, because the cost of the grading we thought was going to be quite high. I know it was over $100,000. I can't remember the exact amount.

Mr. Showe: Yeah.

Mr. Smith: But it was quite high. We said that it would make sense to have a baseline before we went forward. There was a lot of discussion around how fine of a survey do we need to really understand, in case there were low lying spots or other things?

Mr. Showe: Yeah, this would be to just develop the scope so that we could then bid that project out.

Ms. Carpenter: Sorry, one more question. Cameron, do you have the original plans? Are you basing this on the original plans as a modification to those?

Mr. Showe: Yes, I think we sent those out.

Mr. Roberts: We will essentially be adding markups to the original plan.

Ms. Carpenter: Okay.

Mr. Roberts: To show revisions to the original plan, to the extent of the maximum allowable without requiring permit modifications.

Mr. Grimm: But the issue was we didn't know if it was done. What did we know?

Mr. Smith: If it was built to plan.

Ms. Carpenter: Yeah, we didn't know if it was built to plan. But I thought we were told that there wasn't a permit required. So, if we're worrying about a permit modification, what kind of permit would have to be modified?

Mr. Smith: No, I think there's still the part of the stormwater or the drainage that we have.

Mr. Roberts: Correct.

Mr. Grimm: You mean the grade?

Mr. Roberts: There is an ERP with the City of Orlando.

Ms. Carpenter: For the stormwater pond?

Mr. Roberts: Correct.

Ms. Carpenter: I'm just trying to find out what permit is needed. So, you're talking about basically the Water Management permitting for the stormwater pond and that this isn't going to affect how that operates.

Mr. Roberts: Correct. So, we'd be designing the revised plan to not require a modification permit. We are still adhering to the calculations but billing it to the maximum extent we would be allowed and still be compliant with our permits.

Mr. Grimm: I think the survey was intended to determine if it had been graded as the plans originally said. Is that right?

Mr. Roberts: You can go out there today and it's obvious that it's not graded. The survey was more to say that we could minimize and maximize the amount of work throughout the trail, based off of the conditions at that location. So, the way that this proposed scope is written, is that the contractor would complete the work, without requiring any permit modification, which would provide the greatest alleviation to the problem of it flooding.

Mr. Smith: If I look back, because somewhere we said that one of the proposals of regrading was up to $95,000 and I guess this $2,000 allows us to maybe more target it and bring that down, if we were to incur those costs.

Mr. Roberts: Correct. I think this looks like Option 2 of filling to the elevation that we are able to and appropriately grading the trail.

Mr. Grimm: Cameron you just stated that it was not graded as designed by the plans.

Mr. Roberts: It was not graded as designed on the plan.

Ms. Carpenter: Is that because over time it degraded or was it just not done properly?

Mr. Roberts: It was not done properly.

Ms. Carpenter: Okay, that's a bit different than what came up a couple of meetings ago. Can you go into your files and find out who did the grading work?

Mr. Roberts: The contractor at the time. I would have to look to see who it was.

Ms. Carpenter: Okay, yeah. If you can follow up with that.

Mr. Antolovich: That brings up if it wasn't done.

Ms. Carpenter: Yeah, because we were told that we couldn't tell if it had been done properly. If it was designed a different way and it wasn't done properly, then there may be a claim that the CDD might have against either the contractor or developer or somebody.

Mr. Roberts: As I understand it, the question was why wasn't this picked up during the as-built phase? We don't necessarily get as-builts at the time that it was constructed. So, therefore we would not be able to tell.

Mr. Roberts: We don't get as-builts of these types of trails.

Ms. Carpenter: That makes sense. But how can you tell today that it's not built according to plan? Sorry, I don't mean to put you on the spot, but it's a different issue.

Mr. Roberts: In my opinion, it is graded towards the wetland, not towards the pump.

Mr. Scheerer: It's going this way, not that way.

Mr. Roberts: But that is only obvious now, because if you go out to a road today, it's hard to tell which way its graded. Well, it depends on the trail, until you have standing water on it.

Mr. Boermans: I think we're coming into a dry season and I truly think that we should research this more, because we're talking about a lot of money. Let's see what kind of claim we can have, especially out of a legal perspective.

Mr. Garcia: Yeah, I would agree with all of these comments as well.

Ms. Carpenter: Do we want to have the plans done, so we know what the scope of the cost would be? I mean, without the plans, we don't know if it's a $20,000 cost or a $200,000 cost. If it's a small cost, it's not going to be feasible to go after somebody, because by the time you hire an Engineer to do a report on what was done properly or not properly, you're spending $20,000.

Mr. Smith: But I guess before that, I know we're talking a year, but if I go back a couple of meetings, I had a good understanding of what the baseline was. Now we're saying it's there. Do we need anything to document that first or do we need to verify? Because again, if I go back, like the last two meetings when this came up, I don't know if everyone else had a different understanding. I took away from that, that it was done according to plan.

Mr. Grimm: It is much more than the last two. It's probably been the last six.

Mr. Smith: Yeah, I took away from that, that it might have not been done great. But it was done to plan and it was done to design and it was working as designed.

Ms. Carpenter: That was kind of my understanding as well, that it was designed. They knew it would flood, but it was designed and there was no evidence that it wasn't built properly. But the question I have, is just a practical one.

Mr. Antolovich: I understand what you are saying.

Ms. Carpenter: By the time we talk to construction litigators and we have to get an Engineer to do a report and go out there, that's $10,000 to $20,000, easily.

Mr. Smith: Yeah, but I guess where I'm coming from, I do agree that you probably should take that step, but we should also document that. Because again we were first talking that it was one way and now we have a different perspective.

Mr. Grimm: Now it's on record.

Mr. Showe: Yeah,

Mr. Grimm: Either way it's documented, why we would be creating the scope by Cameron. So, I don't think it would be like us saying, *"We were planning to fix it, because we thought that it was our responsibility."*

Ms. Carpenter: No.

Mr. Grimm: Because there is plenty of documentation that had us arguing that.

Mr. Smith: But I was saying in the scope of this survey, will that also be part of that documentation? Because again if it's in the comparative plan and it's not built to that plan, now we're looking at what we need to do to kind of fix it or get back to it. Is that picked up in the scope?

Ms. Carpenter: Yeah. The scope says they're going to mark up the previously approved construction plan sheets. So, I guess they're going to show what doesn't match the plan and what you would have to elevate to, to meet the plan. Then I guess as part of that, is for our Engineers to help us determine how much degradation, because it's been so many years and stuff.

Mr. Smith: Well, this is Phase K, so it's only been…

Mr. Scheerer: A couple of years.

Ms. Carpenter: How long has that trail been in?

Mr. Antolovich: Just over three years.

Ms. Carpenter: Okay, so we haven't had that many hurricanes. Okay. Alright. I thought it was a little older than that.

Mr. Scheerer: No. I probably have some photos somewhere.

Mr. Showe: Yeah.

Mr. Antolovich: So, on this proposal, is that would it take to bring the grading up to the best we can get it without permitting only, or would it also reveal what the current situation is there compared to what the plans were and what it was supposed to be? Would it be able to cover both?

Mr. Roberts: The only way to reveal what is currently there, would be to get a bid.

Mr. Antolovich: Okay.

Mr. Smith: I guess maybe to build on what Matthew is saying, would we be able to get two cost estimates; one, if we were to just go back to what was planned, which was what I guess our claim is and the other to make it really function where it's not flooding or to the maximum extent?

Mr. Antolovich: Oh, I see in here, it does recommend that an additional survey be done, because at the time, the scope will be completed based on the pre-development topographic survey shown to the city a long time ago. So, we would need to add in an addition survey.

Ms. Carpenter: It is $6,000 for the survey.

Mr. Antolovich: Yeah.

Mr. Roberts: I can look at something like that.

Ms. Carpenter: He talks about any as-built data, but said there isn't any.

Mr. Antolovich: What does Counsel recommend as the best course of action?

Mr. Roberts: It is $6,500 for a typographical survey.

Ms. Carpenter: Yeah. They talked about the survey last month and couldn't decide if the survey would give enough information. But I thought the determination was that the survey wouldn't tell us if it was built to plan. Now he’s saying that it was built to plan.

Mr. Roberts: I understood the determination that the survey was maybe not necessary if the goal was to remediate anyway.

Mr. Antolovich: Yeah.

Mr. Roberts: Because remember, guys, I'm making sure that it is understood that it won't ever flood again.

Mr. Antolovich: The survey doesn't matter, if we're just going to try to increase the grading as much as we can. But the survey could potentially tell us if it was not installed correctly.

Mr. Grimm: That was the purpose of it. But he just acknowledged in his comments that it was not ever graded originally correctly. So, the survey is a moot point in my opinion.

Ms. Carpenter: Because if it wasn't graded properly originally, I'm not sure what the survey is going to show.

Mr. Grimm: It is not going to confirm that.

Mr. Antolovich: How do we prove that it wasn't graded correctly?

Mr. Grimm: Because he said that.

Mr. Smith: No.

Mr. Roberts: You still need a survey. I'm just walking out onsite to see if water is ponding. Water is ponding higher on the wetland side than the pond side.

Ms. Carpenter: Okay. When Christy was here, she said that this was designed to flood. So, are we really just going down a bad path to try to figure out who did something wrong? Because six inches one way or the other isn't going to matter, because it would have flooded anyway. I'm just trying to look at the entire picture.

Mr. Antolovich: I think also the question was, was it designed for the water to flow over it and flow into the pond, or was it designed to have stagnant flooded water? It flowing over and then running off into the pond, sure that makes sense. But it running over and just making a giant pothole that sits there forever, I think that's the question. Is that what was designed? Not whether it was supposed to always be dry.

Mr. Roberts: I will make one comment to that. I want to make sure that there's not a misconception of that once the rain occurs and it spills over, then there's going to be no water there. That's not exactly how it will work. It will pond. It is difficult to construct things to specific point 1, point 2 elevation. So, it will never be perfect. There is not enough water pressure or head as we would say, to push the water over the trail at a speed that would mean there's no flooding on the trail, after a storm event, for example.

Mr. Grimm: Yes.

Mr. Boermans: I think the most important part, is that it should be a maximum time of flooding. Let's say four to six hours and then after that, it should be dry. It should not be stacked water for at least one or two days.

Ms. Carpenter: We just don't know how it's designed and I guess that, that's the hard part. It sounded like, *"Oh, if it wasn't graded properly, then somebody didn't do a good job, so it's*

flooding more than it should." But how do we tell if that more than it should, is worth going after somebody and spending a bunch of money?

Mr. Smith: Will we need it though?

Mr. Roberts: I think that it's designed to flood anyway.

Ms. Carpenter: So, even if we did the trail modification and spent $100,000 to elevate it and do whatever, it's still going to flood a little bit anyway.

Mr. Antolovich: Yes.

Mr. Grimm: Even to that spot near the house.

Mr. Boermans: I think it's a very difficult conversation to have. Oh, sorry, I'm interrupting.

Mr. Grimm: Go ahead, Willem.

Mr. Boermans: For me, the most difficult part, is that I really want this amenity to look good. However, we have the weir and it was truly like a true responsibility in us. Now we have the streets where we spend another $90,000. To spend this amount of money for this amenity, when it's like an improvement, I don't know if it's the right way of spending funds. That's my only opinion on this. Of course, we're a complete Board of five people in total and that makes it very difficult.

Mr. Grimm: The only issue that I would say, obviously standing water is something that's just aggravating. However, the portion of the trail that keeps getting damaged, because of the water and the asphalt that now has holes in it, that's a liability for the District. So, to me, the number one issue is the water that continuously drains to that spot.

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah, we got a price about a year or so ago, to asphalt that for about $21,000. Because it comes off of the road and drops down between the two homes. Then it's supposed to sheet flow water, but then you've got the residents that are discharging their gutters into the same area and creating more water. But I think at the time, we had Dellinger Construction come out and we were going to go from the top of the hill, all the way to Imaginary Way.

Mr. Grimm: Language Way.

Mr. Scheerer: Sorry, wrong side street. Language Way was about $21,000 to re-asphalt all of that.

Mr. Grimm: That is going to continuously happen.

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah.

Mr. Grimm: I mean, considering it's only been…

Mr. Scheerer: Three years.

Mr. Grimm: Yeah, or less.

Ms. Carpenter: Maybe that's where we should look at health and safety stuff and then put this, as when you're looking at capital repairs and reserves, as a long-term item.

Mr. Scheerer: When we get potholes on the trail, we can ask to have those saw cut out and fix them. But as David said, this is a bigger issue than trying to get that resolved. Kind of what they did on Story Time Drive. Whoever did that work on the walking trails, they did a great job. I wish I could figure out who that was.

Mr. Grimm: The asphalt?

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah, the asphalt trails.

Mr. Grimm: Oh, the city did that, right?

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah. I don't know who they use.

Mr. Grimm: It makes no sense to me.

Mr. Antolovich: If we were to do this, it's going to be $100,000. Is that correct?

Mr. Scheerer: Right.

Mr. Antolovich: If we do a survey to see if maybe we don't have to spend $100,000, in round numbers here, that's what, 6%? So, the gamble is, do you want to risk an extra 6% cost to potentially negate the other?

Mr. Grimm: But I still have a hard time hearing that it wasn't originally graded correctly. Now, I also heard him say that doesn't necessarily mean it's going to keep flooding from happening, but it could diminish the amount of flooding.

Mr. Antolovich: I mean, the water is still going to overflow that area.

Mr. Smith: Yeah, but I guess at what cost?

Mr. Grimm: But how much? Would it take away the amount of water that's flooding and prevent the asphalt from constantly being damaged? I don't know. I guess I still have a hard time swallowing that we have to keep paying and dealing with contractor issues.

Mr. Antolovich: Again, that's what the survey would be for, right? If I'm understanding correctly.

Ms. Carpenter: I'm not 100% sure that if we get the survey, we're going to be able to tell whether it was graded right or not, because I know there are comments about different parts of it and I wasn't clear at that meeting and whether the survey would show that.

Mr. Smith: Maybe could we ask District Counsel and the Engineer to go back and look and bring it to the next meeting? Because again, if I look at cost, we have $2,100 plus another $6,500, which is $8,000 that we could be out, before we know which path to go. I would like to have like a firm ruling or your opinion, if we are going down a path that won't be fruitful or based on what you understood now, you would recommend to not incur those costs and potentially look at other options, whether it be only regrading part of the path or deferring it to later. Because it's hard for me to spend $8,000 when I'm still hearing that it was done incorrectly, but I'm not certain that we're going to get a recovery.

Mr. Grimm: Let me ask you this question. What type of information would you need, besides knowing the cost of the repair or modification? What type of information does Counsel need to say, *"Yeah?"*

Ms. Carpenter: I'm not a construction litigator, so I will caveat that. But looking at construction litigation claims that we see, we probably need a third-party Engineer to come and do a formal report, which would probably include a survey and looking at the design plans to see if it was actually the design plans that were correct and if it was built to design. I think that's an expensive proposal, because it may show that there were defects and it may not show that there were defects. They probably would need a survey, but I don't know for sure, which is why I can't say, *"Yeah, go ahead and do this."* It would be great, because it will give you a scope of the work. If you do the survey and get the plans, you can go out and get some at least rough bids to say, *"Yeah, this is a $50,000 project"* or *this is a $300,000 project."* But I'm not sure if that would be enough to be able to make any kind of claim against anyone. I can talk to construction litigators or another Engineer that does a lot of construction litigation and get a feel for what scope it would take for them to actually come up with a formal report that a lawyer would feel comfortable writing a 558-claim letter against, whether it's to Lennar or to the contractor. That's the other hard part. Once you start pointing fingers, if you're going after your developer, it's never a great thing, because you may need them along the line, since they built the development, as they have a lot of ways to assist. But then you go after all of the contractors and subcontractors and sometimes you have so many different people and insurance companies, it's

hard to really figure out who caused the problem, because they will all point fingers at each other.

Mr. Grimm: Just do all of the above.

Ms. Carpenter: We've got that one CDD right now, where it's not the Engineer, it's not the geotech, it's not the…yeah.

Mr. Grimm: Ideally the work of creating a scope, would be necessary, because if we're going to have to get it fixed, we're going to have a solid amount of cost with them getting proposals. You would also need that to find out if we're going to have a claim.

Mr. Showe: Yeah.

Mr. Antolovich: And if it's worth pursuing the claim.

Mr. Grimm: You don't necessarily need the survey to have it repaired.

Ms. Carpenter: It sounds like we need the survey to know whether it was built to grade.

Mr. Antolovich: Yeah, but not to get it repaired.

Ms. Carpenter: Cameron, is that incorrect? Do you need the survey? It says in the proposal that they need the survey.

Mr. Roberts: The survey is recommended to come up with the most efficient option. In this 100-foot section, all we do is remove some of the sod. The next 100-foot section, we regrade the trail. In the next 100-foot section, we regrade the trail and remove the sod. The way that the current scope for this proposal is, it's just simply raising it as high as we can, filling it as high as we can and regrading the trail, versus minimizing and maximizing the potential.

Mr. Antolovich: Without the survey, we need proposals for the costliest way to fix it. Is that an accurate understanding?

Mr. Roberts: I wouldn't say it's the costliest, because we provided three different options before.

Mr. Antolovich: No, no, I'm saying if we get proposals…

Mr. Roberts: There is a way that we can do it, to minimize the chances of flooding as much as possible, while still being somewhat cost efficient.

Mr. Antolovich: If we don't know what it currently is, then the proposals would basically be more based on redoing all of it, not just this section. That is what I meant by the costliest version of proposals for regrading with the survey or without. Having it without, proposals would come in higher.

Mr. Showe: Potentially yeah.

Mr. Roberts: Yes, I would assume so. That's why it's generally recommended.

Mr. Showe: Okay.

Mr. Antolovich: If they get proposals and then say it's $200,000, can we just get a survey done and then resend out those proposals, versus if we get the proposals without the survey and they're like, *"Oh, it's only $50,000,"* maybe it's not worth getting the survey.

Ms. Carpenter: I don't know.

Mr. Roberts: Last time, you guys just wanted to see what it would end up costing.

Mr. Showe: Yeah.

Mr. Smith: $2,100 is to prepare the Request for Proposals (RFP), to see how much it costs us.

Mr. Roberts: Yes.

Mr. Showe: Basically, using the original topographical maps, to raise it as far as he can go without permit modification.

Mr. Smith: But one question though, because we said it's not built as the maps show, potentially, or at least that's the indication. Once they go out and actually start working, they're going to base their cost on a map that's not accurate.

Mr. Roberts: Jason, do you mind repeating that? He's a little bit far away from the microphone.

Mr. Smith: My understanding is the as-built or the maps that we have today or the drawings, don't reflect reality or explain it differently. So, if I go out and get a proposal based on those maps, it may be once they start working that they get out there and they say, *"Well, I bid something else, it's not built for this way. So, this is now the cost."* To get an accurate baseline, you need the survey.

Ms. Carpenter: I think that's probably accurate.

Mr. Roberts: That is part of the recommendation. But we would also likely put in, that the contractor is to verify existing site conditions as part of the proposal and they would need to go out and inspect.

Mr. Antolovich: One other question, you're saying to do the work, it needs to be graded as much as it can without requiring a permit change. What's so bad about doing a permit, other than the fact that permitting takes forever?

Mr. Roberts: The permitting would require reviewing the wetland and that then introduces other consultants like environmental and potentially geotechnical.

Mr. Antolovich: Okay.

Mr. Roberts: Our fee would also be much, much higher. Then, of course, you're paying permitting fees and you're looking at a six-month duration.

Mr. Antolovich: Got it. Okay. So, it would be more than just simple paperwork.

Mr. Showe: Yeah.

Mr. Antolovich: Got it.

Mr. Scheerer: What's our path forward here then?

Mr. Grimm: I'm going to defer to Counsel, because this has all kind of been confusing to me as the direction, since hearing what he said. So, to me it sounds like both items are almost necessary. Now, the other thought is, based upon what Willem said, we're getting into a dry season. Do we have to make a decision today? But again, that just pushes everything back more and more.

Mr. Antolovich: Yeah. We're in the dry season, but do we want to wait until it's wet to resume?

Mr. Scheerer: That would allow us to fix the asphalt that's between the houses.

Mr. Grimm: To fix the asphalt?

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah.

Mr. Grimm: Instead of doing anything else for now?

Mr. Scheerer: Well, I'm not going to tell you what to do. This is your Board and your money. But if you're going to defer, because we're going into the dry season, my comment was, maybe we turn our attention to the slope in the asphalt off of Language Way, that we know we have an issue with, that we anticipated being repaired before Dan left the Board and it didn't happen. We can focus on that while we can continue to monitor the wetland activity, which, like I said, my last number was $21,000, not $100,000, but it's all costly whichever way we're going to go.

Mr. Roberts: I agree.

Ms. Carpenter: Yeah, the Board has a tough decision, just thinking of the amount of reserves out there and how quickly they can go, if you have a reserve.

Mr. Grimm: Was Dan with Lennar?

Mr. Antolovich: Yeah,

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah, when Mr. Dan LaRosa was here, before he left, he was going to get that repaired and it just never happened

Ms. Carpenter: On Lennar's dime?

Mr. Scheerer: Well, I thought it was on his dime, but knowing the way things work sometimes, it may have just come back to the District.

Mr. Antolovich: If it went down the road of us going, *"You know what, maybe we do have a claim,"* maybe the contractors did it wrong and we wanted to go down that road. Do we have a Statute of Limitations or something like that, that we need to keep in mind?

Ms. Carpenter: Yes, there is a Statute of Limitations from discovery. So, when this was discovered would be the question.

Mr. Antolovich: Which I think was this year.

Mr. Grimm: Well, I brought it up when I first joined the Board, which was when, November?

Mr. Smith: November.

Mr. Showe: Yeah.

Mr. Grimm: Oh, wow. Time flies.

Ms. Carpenter: Alright, I can get a construction litigator to come talk to the Board or just describe it. The guy we have is swapped right now, but I know another person who is handling these matters. We have another firm using them.

Mr. Antolovich: The other thing is if...

Ms. Carpenter: To see whether they think this is something that they want to pursue and what would be required.

Mr. Antolovich: They could also come back and be like, *"Yeah, it's not right, but you're never gonna win."*

Ms. Carpenter: Yeah. I brought it up briefly with an Engineer that does some of this kind of work, 558 claims and he's like, *"Well, it depends if it's permitted or not permitted."* He gave me a lot of what ifs. I didn't get a warm, fuzzy feeling that, *"Okay, let's see if we can gauge somebody to do this."* I'll talk to at least one, if not another construction litigator, just to see what their feeling would be, knowing the little bit of facts that we know right now, to see if they think it's worth spending the money. My biggest concern is just if it's a $100,000 problem, it's

probably not worth the money. By the time you do surveys and reports and hire lawyers, you're spending $20,000 for the report, $10,000 for the lawyers to talk about it and then delays and whatever else. So, you're spending half of that anyway and then we get there and you say it's a $100,000 problem. They agree to settle for $25,000. So, you've spent more than you're getting. These claims take forever, as Jason knows. They take forever and they're very expensive. Once you file a claim, suddenly you get discovery and everybody files discovery. So, your lawyers and GMS, or maybe we've spent hours on another one, because the HOA sued before the CDD did. So, now the HOA is asking for tons of records and its tens of thousands of dollars. So, that's the concern I have, is litigation is so expensive. For a $1,000,000 problem, then, yeah, you need to go forward.

Mr. Antolovich: For a $100,000 problem, it's not worth it.

Ms. Carpenter: It may not be, but yeah, I'll talk to a construction litigator.

Mr. Grimm: Do you have any record of flooding into residents' homes, because of this situation? That you know of?

Mr. Scheerer: Into homes?

Mr. Grimm: Onto homes, but into yards?

Mr. Scheerer: Not that I know of.

Mr. Grimm: I didn't know.

Mr. Showe: I think, as Jan does, that way we can also have Alan update those quotes and bring it back to the Board for the asphalt. Just so you can see what that cost is.

Mr. Grimm: I mean, temporarily, can it be patched? I mean, can we do that?

Mr. Scheerer: I don't know. I think the guy that I brought out there, didn't recommend patching it, because it's kind of degraded in multiple spots.

Mr. Showe: We can take a look at it.

Mr. Scheerer: We can certainly take a look at it.

Mr. Grimm: Just for preventative liability.

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah.

Mr. Antolovich: We have to fix it.

Mr. Grimm: If anything, we have to block that off.

Mr. Antolovich: Spend $20,000 every two years.

Mr. Grimm: That's the thing.

Mr. Antolovich: Even if we can't see it. I'm not saying that we can't.

Ms. Carpenter: Yeah, no.

Mr. Antolovich: It sounds like dammed if we do, dammed if we don't. I'm not saying that we necessarily should just pull the trigger and start doing it all right now. But I also don't want to be like, *"Okay, it's now the wet season."* Let's address the issue.

Mr. Grimm: I mean, it's been an issue for three years.

Mr. Scheerer: I hear two different paths. One, Counsel will come back with a recommendation.

Ms. Carpenter: We'll get some more information for you.

Mr. Smith: Then you'll give us an update of the $21,000. Is it $21,000 still?

Mr. Showe: Yeah.

Mr. Scheerer: It's a little higher now that diesel's up.

Mr. Antolovich: It sounds like no matter what, if we do get a fixer or sue or something, we're going to need a survey.

Ms. Carpenter: Cameron, can you maybe next month come back with what exactly the survey will show? Will it show that things weren't graded according to plan or the construction wasn't done according to plan? Will you be able to do that?

Mr. Roberts: Yeah.

Ms. Carpenter: Okay, because I think that that would be very helpful to know if we do a survey, is this going to actually give us information to be able to go back to somebody and say, *"This wasn't done properly?"* We may have a claim.

Mr. Antolovich: Is a $6,000 survey going to save $6,000 on repairs?

Mr. Grimm: You can just upgrade it.

Mr. Antolovich: I'm happy with that.

Mr. Scheerer: Are you?

Mr. Antolovich: I am. Are you, Alan?

Mr. Scheerer: Yes, sir. If you're happy, I'm happy. Yes, sir.

C. District Manager's Report

i. Approval of Check Register

Mr. Showe: I think we can move on to the District Manager's Report. We have your Check Register.

Mr. Roberts: If there's nothing else for me, do I need to sign off?

Mr. Scheerer: Go get dinner. Sure. Okay.

Mr. Showe: Yeah, I think you're good Cameron.

Mr. Roberts: Thank you. Have a good day, everybody.

Mr. Showe: We have two sets of Check Registers; one from August to September and one from September through October. Those are provided for your information, as well as summaries of those Check Registers. Both Alan and I could take any questions or comments on those, or we can take a motion to approve.

> Mr. Boermans MOVED to approve the August 25, 2026 through September 29, 2026 Check Register in the amount of $136,123.50 and September 29, 2026 through October 28, 2026 Check Register in the amount of $87,321.21 and Mr. Antolovich seconded the motion.

Mr. Antolovich: What is a special call.

Mr. Showe: That is with your bonds.

Mr. Showe: There is a provision that, say we get a certain amount of interest in, if you have $5,000 in this account, you make a special call to just basically help pay down the bonds. There's a provision that if there's a certain amount in that prepaid or additional revenue line, they automatically call it.

Mr. Antolovich: Got it. Okay.

> On VOICE VOTE with all in favor the August 25, 2026 through September 29, 2026 Check Register in the amount of $136,123.50 and September 29, 2026 through October 28, 2026 Check Register in the amount of $87,321.21 were approved.

ii. Balance Sheet and Income Statement

Mr. Showe: Behind that, is your Balance Sheet and Income Statement. No action is required by the Board. This is through September 30th, but these numbers are not audited yet though, so there may be some additional invoices still floating out there. But you are performing better than budget to actuals. I think we are at 102% collected on assessments. So, we're in great shape on that.

D. Field Manager's Report

Mr. Showe: With that, we'll turn it over to Alan to go through the field side.

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah. Just a few things. I don't know if you noticed, but the mulch installation started right now. They were supposed to start on Dowden Road, but they started on Storey Park Boulevard. We continue to meet with the landscaper on a weekly basis. The irrigation inspections are ongoing. In Hammock Park, the new Bahia sod was installed. We let that sit for a while, to try to take. It's being cut on a regular basis right now. We backed the water off. We had to water it in for a while. So, that was done. OmegaScapes was able to get TruGreen to pay for some additional sod. So, around the sidewalk and curb area by Epic Park, where we replaced it a while back, they're going to cover the cost to replace that and some other areas on Dowden Road. We've had multiple sidewalk repairs in the community. The new street sign, I know that we waited for a while for the no parking in Phase K and the temporary parking by the Clubhouse. I'm being told it's completed now. So, before we pay that invoice, I'm going to meet with the install contractor, to review what was on the plans provided by the Engineer.

Mr. Grimm: The signs are completed?

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah. There were some no parking signs. We added some no parking areas within Phase K and some other stuff, based on the Engineers drawing. Like I said, I've been told it's done. We'll take that set of plans and verify that all of the signs that they're billing for, were installed.

Mr. Grimm: Yeah, I would check on that, because people are still parking there.

Mr. Scheerer: Well, whether they're parking there, I can't do anything about that, sir, if there's a sign. We installed no fishing sign and people are fishing.

Mr. Grimm: Will the striping happen?

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah. It's going to be happening in both sections. We're going to get them both done at the same time. I know that there was a request about solar powered fountains. I did reach out to Lake Fountains and Aeration. They do a lot of work for us. They are not familiar with solar power. We also had a vendor provide pricing for the Dowden West CDD, to the east of you. He doesn't have any information on solar power, but we haven't given up on that. We're going to continue to look at that as requested. We had several black fence rails that were damaged, that were replaced and repaired. Just for informational purposes only, Jason and I have been going back and forth with the homeowner who lives at 11755 Language Way. He basically lives on the power line easement.

Mr. Showe: Several of you were probably copied on emails.

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah, some of you I think were copied. This is informational only, if you'll please pass those down. I brought a little show and tell.

Mr. Grimm: My question initially to Jason was and maybe you can confirm this.

Mr. Scheerer: The house is outlined.

Mr. Grimm: Was the issue on CDD property, or was the issue on his property?

Mr. Scheerer: Well, the issue is, you're looking at a power line transmission easement. Basically, everything that's in there is weeds. It's not irrigated.

Mr. Grimm: As it should be.

Mr. Scheerer: We just mow it. There's another track that's known as OSK-9. There's an easement granted to the power utility company. This follows this particular line. He's arguing that the weeds are coming in from the power line easement into his yard. We've been to his house. We've mowed as close to his aluminum fences as we feel comfortable. We've explained to him that we're not going to string trim that fence, because as soon as we do and he gets a nick or a ding, he's going to come after the landscaper. One of the things that I talked to Jason about, when I visited this area and I apologize for not taking any pictures. Some of the neighbors have taken that landscape plastic landscape edging and put it on the back of their fence. That's going to prohibit anything from coming. We can spray a maintenance strip, but if we damage anything on his side, again, he's going to come after the District.

Mr. Grimm: Where is his line, versus the CDD line?

Mr. Scheerer: Where the black fence is, is his property.

Mr. Showe: Again, without survey, we're not a 100% sure, but that's what we assume is his property line.

Mr. Grimm: Is there a buffer?

Mr. Scheerer: An easement?

Mr. Showe: A setback.

Mr. Scheerer: Setback.

Mr. Grimm: Yeah.

Mr. Showe: I don’t know.

Ms. Carpenter: Is it his fence?

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah.

Mr. Showe: Yes.

Ms. Carpenter: Can we see if he obtained a permit? It will show a survey.

Mr. Scheerer: Well, I'm assuming that the HOA approved the fence. I have the address. I'm not trying to open a big can of worms here. I'm just trying to let the Board know, our advice to the homeowner is this is weeds. It's a power line easement. It's not irrigated with Floratam St. Augustine. We don't have irrigation in there. We don't have fertilizer and pest control. We can't do anything. But we're mowing probably within six inches of his fence.

Ms. Carpenter: As close as we can to not damage the fence.

Mr. Grimm: The assumption is that this is the line.

Mr. Scheerer: Yes.

Ms. Carpenter: But his fence would not be directly on the line. Usually, you have to put it inside of your line.

Mr. Smith: He needs to go out and mow it himself.

Mr. Scheerer: Well, what some of the other residents have done, is they have put in a maintenance strip. They went ahead and sprayed it. They've done that. They put in the plastic landscape barrier. It's about four inches. Some have put stone back there and it looks really nice. But he sent a video of him pulling weeds out of his grass.

Ms. Carpenter: We can go under the fence. You can't do much.

Mr. Smith: But I guess the question that I have is, like on our side where the warehouse is, that strip right at the back, was mulch. There wasn't grass.

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah. Some of them had mulch beds with landscaping back there in the back. He just has sod.

Mr. Smith: But some people took it out.

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah. All I'm letting the Board know, is I'm not asking you to do anything today. We're just making you aware. Because I know that some of the Board was copied on the email from the homeowner. There's an area there, if you look at the photo. That's solid water at the time that picture was taken, where it's just full of water. We can't do anything. We did the best that we could and I'm just letting you know in case we get any concerns.

Mr. Grimm: There should be a pin.

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah. I can't see it.

Ms. Carpenter: I don't think they put them in anymore. Do they?

Mr. Grimm: I have mine.

Mr. Scheerer: They bury it in the ground. Usually that's when they sell the house and they come to survey your lot.

Mr. Antolovich: They either lose a couple feet or gain a couple feet.

Mr. Grimm: We actually gained quite a bit.

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah.

Mr. Grimm: Believe it or not.

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah, I have that in the house I bought

Mr. Grimm: They originally had us at a diagonal.

Ms. Carpenter: Oh wow!

Mr. Showe: I could look it up on County or the City website to see if they have a permit.

Mr. Grimm: I would be curious to know, because if you look down the line, they're all the same. They're all even.

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah. The fences are pretty much the same.

Mr. Grimm: So, do you know whether they did or did not follow procedure?

Mr. Antolovich: It could be that there are some weeds.

Mr. Grimm: What's that?

Mr. Antolovich: There might not be anything wrong. There are just weeds back there.

Ms. Carpenter: Yeah, it's weeds.

Mr. Scheerer: Well, the issue is that area is non-maintained landscape and irrigation.

Mr. Antolovich: There's not really anything to do.

Mr. Scheerer: We're always going to have weeds there.

Mr. Antolovich: Yeah.

Mr. Showe: I tried to make clear to him the last time, his expectation was that it's going to look like any other common area in the community.

Mr. Scheerer: It's not going to look like the front yard.

Mr. Showe: It’s not.

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah.

Mr. Showe: We have no fertilizer and pest control.

Mr. Scheerer: Again, it was just for the Board’s information, because I saw some of the Board was listed on the email and I wanted you to know that Jason and I have been actively

speaking to the homeowner and making several trips out there. So, other than that, like Mr. Grimm said, we will be working on the striping plan, to get those implemented for the last two sections within the neighborhood and we'll continue to do sidewalk work.

Mr. Boermans: Can I say one thing?

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah, go ahead.

Mr. Boermans: I want to say thank you for always being so prompt. Whenever I send you a text message and anything is going on in the community, you're always there. I truly appreciate you. Thank you.

Mr. Scheerer: You're more than welcome, sir. Thank you.

Mr. Grimm: Can you clarify the schedule with OmegaScapes on the Pond K lawn maintenance?

Mr. Scheerer: I think we're every other week now on mowing, going into the winter months.

Mr. Grimm: Do they edge that whole path?

Mr. Scheerer: They're supposed to edge the path and they're supposed to string trim the bottom of the pond.

Mr. Grimm: Okay.

Mr. Scheerer: It’s been a challenge lately.

Mr. Grimm: There have been times where it's been this tall.

Mr. Scheerer: I got you. Yes, sir.

Mr. Grimm: It's been challenging to make sure that they get it done?

Mr. Scheerer: No, it's just weather-wise.

Mr. Grimm: I understand.

Mr. Scheerer: Manpower-wise and stuff.

Mr. Grimm: Well, manpower, that's not our issue. That’s their problem.

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah, I know. Sometimes it's wet and they don't always are able to mow those ponds. We've been getting a ton of rain lately. I'm not just saying from yesterday, but we've been challenged with the weather conditions when mowing. He'll call me and tell me if he's mowing or not. I probably have a text message from him telling me that we're not mowing K-1 today.

Mr. Grimm: Is there a reason that it’s every two weeks?

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah, usually when we get into October, November, the schedule goes from weekly to every other week.

Mr. Grimm: It was supposed to be weekly throughout…

Mr. Scheerer: Through September.

Mr. Grimm: Yeah. That's definitely not the case. So, if you can just encourage that.

Mr. Scheerer: Just remember, we will be bringing you an RFP the first of the year.

Mr. Showe: Yeah.

Mr. Grimm: I do remember that.

Mr. Scheerer: We'll be taking care of that.

Mr. Grimm: Like the dog park grass.

Mr. Scheerer: We can talk about that dog park grass all you want. I'm only gonna say this.

Mr. Grimm: Not the park itself.

Mr. Scheerer: The grass around the park, is all the same grass that's in the park. It is that nasty grass we've talked about at the last meeting. The roots grow laterally. They don't grow up. The grass doesn't grow up. It grows out and that's why it just looks that way.

Mr. Grimm: Even the coloring makes it look like that?

Mr. Scheerer: Well, it doesn't have any way to maintain all of the nutrients, from what I know about that grass.

Mr. Grimm: What grass is that again?

Mr. Scheerer: I'll get it to you in a second. It's in the minutes. I can't believe that I can't remember the name of the grass.

Mr. Grimm: It's not Bahia.

Mr. Scheerer: It is not Bahia.

Mr. Grimm: And it is not St. Augustine.

Ms. Carpenter: Is it that webby stuff that grows on the top?

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah.

Ms. Carpenter: It's nasty.

Mr. Grimm: It's not Zoysia.

Mr. Scheerer: Nope. It's not Bermuda. Go ahead and chat amongst yourselves.

Mr. Grimm: Anything else?

Mr. Showe: That's all we have.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Public Comment Period

There being none, the next item followed.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Supervisor's Requests

Mr. Showe: Are there any Supervisor's Requests?

Mr. Antolovich: What dead animal did we have removed for $800?

Mr. Scheerer: A big deer on the back of the K-1 pond. He was laying on the asphalt trail.

Ms. Carpenter: He was laying there?

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah. It was dead.

Ms. Carpenter: Aww.

Mr. Grimm: He?

Mr. Scheerer: She.

Mr. Grimm: We've had a doe and the fawn for almost six to eight months. Correction, we had two does and a fawn. The fawn is a male. So, he's a buck. But then one ran around and left ruts. We saw on our camera like probably an eight point.

Mr. Scheerer: Nice.

Ms. Carpenter: Wow. Hopefully that wasn't him.

Mr. Grimm: $800.

Mr. Scheerer: It didn't have any horns, so I'm assuming it was she, not he.

Mr. Grimm: That stinks.

Mr. Boermans: Just one question.

Mr. Showe: Yes.

Mr. Boermans: At one point we said, because of this election, we need to re-appoint or re-confirm the Board Members.

Mr. Showe: That will be at your next meeting.

Mr. Boermans: Okay. It takes two weeks after the election date, before your new term starts. So, at your next meeting, we'll probably do the new Oaths.

Ms. Carpenter: How many seats do we have up for election?

Mr. Showe: I think there were two.

Ms. Carpenter: I'll find out.

Mr. Showe: There are three.

Mr. Grimm: I already won a post.

Mr. Showe: David and Willem re-qualified. I think Ricardo's seat was unopposed.

Mr. Grimm: I thought that I was the only one. Willem didn't qualify. It was just me.

Mr. Showe: Yes, you're right.

Mr. Grimm: I was the only sucker that paid the money.

Mr. Showe: Yeah.

Ms. Carpenter: Congratulations.

Mr. Showe: Anything else for the Board? Hearing none,

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Other Business

There being no comments, the next item followed.

ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Next Meeting Date – December 1, 2026

Mr. Showe: The next meeting is scheduled for December 1, 2026. Is there a motion to adjourn?

TWELFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Adjournment

On MOTION by Mr. Grimm seconded by Mr. Smith with all in favor the meeting was adjourned.

_____ _____

Secretary/Assistant Secretary Chairman/Vice Chairman

SECTION V

SECTION C

SECTION 1

Storey Park

Community Development District

Summary of Invoices

October 28, 2026 - November 24, 2026

Fund	Date	Check No.'s		Amount
General Fund				
	11/6/26	1772-1773	$	48,171.01
	11/17/26	1774-1783		40,193.51
			$	88,364.52
Payroll				
	November 2026			
	David Grimm	50153	$	184.70
	Matthew Antolovich	50154		184.70
	Ricardo Garcia	50155		184.70
	Travis Smith	50156		80.08
	Willem Boermans	50157		184.70
			$	818.88
TOTAL			**$**	**89,183.40**

*** CHECK DATES 10/28/2026 - 11/24/2026 *** STOREY PARK - GENERAL FUND
BANK A GENERAL FUND

CHECK DATE	VEND#	INVOICE DATE	INVOICE	EXPENSED TO... YRMO	DPT	ACCT#	SUB	SUBCLASS	VENDOR NAME	STATUS	AMOUNT	CHECK AMOUNT	CHECK #
11/06/26	00028	10/30/26	9485	202611	320	53800-47300				*	2,362.00		
			IRRIGATION ENHANCEMENT										
		11/01/26	9457	202611	320	53800-46200				*	44,813.01		
			LANDSCAPE MAINT NOV26										
									OMEGASCAPES INC			47,175.01	001772
11/06/26	00043	10/27/26	INV42335	202610	320	53800-48100				*	996.00		
			10/19/26-10/21/26										
									OFF DUTY MANAGEMENT INC			996.00	001773
11/17/26	00012	11/15/26	240714	202611	320	53800-47000				*	4,005.00		
			AQUATIC PLANT MGMT NOV26										
									APPLIED AQUATIC MANAGEMENT INC			4,005.00	001774
11/17/26	00020	11/05/26	6254	202610	320	53800-48000				*	295.00		
			CLEAN BROKEN CONCRETE PCS										
		11/05/26	6255	202610	320	53800-47500				*	1,225.00		
			RPR CONCRETE SECT-SCIENCE										
		11/05/26	6256	202610	320	53800-47500				*	1,100.00		
			RPR CONCRETE SECT-SATIRE										
		11/05/26	6257	202610	320	53800-47500				*	1,100.00		
			RPR CONCRETE SECT-HISTORY										
		11/05/26	6258	202610	320	53800-47500				*	2,200.00		
			RPR CONCRETE SECT-HISTORY										
		11/11/26	6263	202611	320	53800-47500				*	2,200.00		
			RPR CONCRETE SECT-LTRTURE										
		11/11/26	6264	202611	320	53800-47300				*	390.00		
			LITERATURE-RPR IRRG BREAK										
		11/11/26	6265	202611	320	53800-47500				*	1,100.00		
			RPR CONCRETE SECT-PROLGUE										
									BERRY CONSTRUCTION INC			9,610.00	001775
11/17/26	00002	11/01/26	309	202611	320	53800-12000				*	1,703.33		
			FIELD MANAGEMENT NOV26										
		11/01/26	310	202611	310	51300-34000				*	4,258.42		
			MANAGEMENT FEES NOV26										
		11/01/26	310	202611	310	51300-35200				*	113.58		
			WEBSITE ADMIN NOV26										
		11/01/26	310	202611	310	51300-35100				*	170.33		
			INFORMATION TECH NOV26										
		11/01/26	310	202611	310	51300-31300				*	1,656.00		
			DISSEMINATION FEES NOV26										
		11/01/26	310	202611	310	51300-51000				*	.42		
			OFFICE SUPPLIES NOV26										
		11/01/26	310	202611	310	51300-42000				*	10.33		
			POSTAGE NOV26										

CHECK DATE	VEND#	INVOICE DATE	INVOICE	EXPENSED TO YRMO	DPT ACCT# SUB	SUBCLASS	VENDOR NAME	STATUS	AMOUNT	CHECK AMOUNT	CHECK #
		11/01/26	310 COPIES NOV26	202611	310-51300-42500			*	3.15		
							GOVERNMENTAL MANAGEMENT SERVICES			7,915.56	001776
11/17/26	00005	11/11/26	159700 ELECTRONIC PAYMENT AGREE	202610	310-51300-31500			*	176.50		
		11/11/26	159700 REV AGENDA/PREP CDD MTG	202610	310-51300-31500			*	173.50		
		11/11/26	159700 REVIEW POSSIBLE 5K ISSUES	202610	310-51300-31500			*	39.50		
		11/11/26	159700 REV D.COULTOFF DEFECT	202610	310-51300-31500			*	79.00		
		11/11/26	159700 FLOOD WALKING PATH ISSUE	202610	310-51300-31500			*	275.00		
							LATHAM LUNA EDEN AND BEAUDINE LLP			743.50	001777
11/17/26	00043	11/03/26	INV42766 SECURITY10/26/26-10/28/26	202610	320-53800-48100			*	996.00		
		11/10/26	INV43165 SECURITY 11/2/26-11/4/26	202611	320-53800-48100			*	996.00		
							OFF DUTY MANAGEMENT INC			1,992.00	001778
11/17/26	00015	11/13/26	11132026 FY27 DEBT SERVICE SER2015	202611	300-20700-10000			*	5,972.35		
							STOREY PARK CDD C/O REGIONS BANK			5,972.35	001779
11/17/26	00015	11/13/26	11132026 FY27 DEBT SERVICE SER2018	202611	300-20700-10100			*	2,410.48		
							STOREY PARK CDD C/O REGIONS BANK			2,410.48	001780
11/17/26	00015	11/13/26	11132026 FY27 DEBT SERVICE SER2019	202611	300-20700-10200			*	2,320.47		
							STOREY PARK CDD C/O REGIONS BANK			2,320.47	001781
11/17/26	00015	11/13/26	11132026 FY27 DEBT SERVICE SER2021	202611	300-20700-10500			*	3,247.58		
							STOREY PARK CDD C/O REGIONS BANK			3,247.58	001782
11/17/26	00015	11/13/26	11132026 FY27 DEBT SERVICE SER2022	202611	300-20700-10600			*	1,976.57		
							STOREY PARK CDD C/O REGIONS BANK			1,976.57	001783

TOTAL FOR BANK A 88,364.52

TOTAL FOR REGISTER 88,364.52

SECTION 2

Storey Park

Community Development District

Unaudited Financial Reporting

October 31, 2026

Table of Contents

1	Balance Sheet
2-3	General Fund Income Statement
4-5	Month to Month
6	Capital Reserve Income Statement
7	Debt Service Series 2015 Income Statement
8	Debt Service Series 2018 Income Statement
9	Debt Service Series 2019 Income Statement
10	Debt Service Series 2021 Icome Statement
11	Debt Service Series 2022 Income Statement
12	Capital Projects Series 2021 Income Statement
13	Capital Projects Series 2022 Income Statement
14	Long Term Debt
15	Assessment Receipt Schedule

Storey Park

Community Development District

Balance Sheet

October 31, 2026

	General Fund	Capital Reserve Fund	Debt Service Fund	Capital Projects Fund	Totals Governmental Funds
Assets:					
Cash - Truist	$ 111,623	$ 24,147	$ -	$ -	$ 135,770
Investments:					
Series 2015					
Reserve	-	-	370,139	-	370,139
Revenue	-	-	296,238	-	296,238
Interest	-	-	188,447	-	188,447
Sinking Fund	-	-	225,073	-	225,073
General Redemption	-	-	1,633	-	1,633
Prepayment	-	-	2,253	-	2,253
Series 2018					
Reserve	-	-	77,327	-	77,327
Revenue	-	-	184,490	-	184,490
Interest	-	-	0	-	0
Sinking Fund	-	-	0	-	0
General Redemption	-	-	75	-	75
Series 2019					
Reserve	-	-	124,135	-	124,135
Revenue	-	-	193,446	-	193,446
Interest	-	-	0	-	0
Sinking Fund	-	-	0	-	0
Prepayment	-	-	1	-	1
Principal	-	-	41	-	41
Series 2021					
Reserve	-	-	173,366	-	173,366
Revenue	-	-	200,595	-	200,595
Interest	-	-	0	-	0
Sinking Fund	-	-	65	-	65
Construction	-	-	-	21,582	21,582
Series 2022					
Reserve	-	-	105,513	-	105,513
Revenue	-	-	119,965	-	119,965
Interest	-	-	0	-	0
Sinking Fund	-	-	0	-	0
Construction	-	-	-	15,314	15,314
SBA - Operating	265,639	-	-	-	265,639
SBA - Capital Reserve	-	371,209	-	-	371,209
SBA - OCPS	-	32,496	-	-	32,496
Total Assets	**$ 377,262**	**$ 427,851**	**$ 2,262,801**	**$ 36,895**	**$ 3,104,810**
Liabilities:					
Accounts Payable	$ 8,656	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 8,656
Total Liabilities	**$ 8,656**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ 8,656**
Fund Balances:					
Assigned For Debt Service 2015	$ -	$ -	$ 1,083,782	$ -	$ 1,083,782
Assigned For Debt Service 2018	-	-	261,892	-	261,892
Assigned For Debt Service 2019	-	-	317,622	-	317,622
Assigned For Debt Service 2021	-	-	374,027	-	374,027
Assigned For Debt Service 2022	-	-	225,478	-	225,478
Assigned For Capital Projects 2021	-	-	-	21,582	21,582
Assigned For Capital Projects 2022	-	-	-	15,314	15,314
Unassigned	368,607	427,851	-	-	796,458
Total Fund Balances	**$ 368,607**	**$ 427,851**	**$ 2,262,801**	**$ 36,895**	**$ 3,096,155**
Total Liabilities & Fund Equity	$ 377,262	$ 427,851	$ 2,262,801	$ 36,895	$ 3,104,810

Storey Park

Community Development District

General Fund

Statement of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance

For The Period Ending October 31, 2026

	Adopted Budget	Prorated Budget Thru 10/31/26	Actual Thru 10/31/26	Variance
Revenues:				
Special Assessments	$ 1,191,240	$ -	$ -	$ -
Interest	14,000	1,167	1,235	68
Linus Cost Share Agreement	15,000	-	-	-
Total Revenues	**$ 1,220,240**	**$ 1,167**	**$ 1,235**	**$ 68**
Expenditures:				
Administrative:				
Supervisor Fees	$ 12,000	$ 1,000	$ -	$ 1,000
FICA Expense	918	77	-	77
Engineering Fees	12,000	1,000	-	1,000
Attorney	25,000	2,083	744	1,340
Arbitrage	1,800	-	-	-
Dissemination Agent	19,872	1,656	1,656	0
Annual Audit	10,400	-	-	-
Trustee Fees	17,500	-	-	-
Assessment Administration	8,517	8,517	8,517	(0)
Management Fees	51,101	4,258	4,258	0
Information Technology	2,044	170	170	0
Website Maintenance	1,363	114	114	(0)
Telephone	100	8	-	8
Postage	800	67	110	(44)
Printing & Binding	500	42	-	42
Insurance	8,347	8,347	8,157	190
Legal Advertising	2,500	208	-	208
Other Current Charges	700	58	60	(2)
Office Supplies	100	8	0	8
Property Taxes	200	-	-	-
Dues, Licenses & Subscriptions	175	175	175	-
Total Administrative:	**$ 175,938**	**$ 27,788**	**$ 23,962**	**$ 3,827**

Storey Park

Community Development District

General Fund

Statement of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance

For The Period Ending October 31, 2026

	Adopted Budget	Prorated Budget Thru 10/31/26	Actual Thru 10/31/26	Variance
Operation & Maintenance				
Field Management	$ 20,440	$ 1,703	$ 1,703	$ 0
Property Insurance	21,750	21,750	17,645	4,105
Electric	3,000	250	129	121
Streetlights	263,140	21,928	20,263	1,665
Water & Sewer	56,400	4,700	3,541	1,159
Landscape Maintenance - Contract	537,756	44,813	44,813	(0)
Landscape - Contingency	20,000	1,667	-	1,667
Lake Maintenance	48,060	4,005	4,005	-
Mitigation Monitoring & Maintenance	13,750	1,146	-	1,146
Irrigation Repairs	25,000	2,083	-	2,083
Repairs & Maintenance	20,000	1,667	295	1,372
Roadways & Sidewalks	15,000	1,250	9,275	(8,025)
Trail & Boardwalk Maintenance	7,500	625	-	625
Dog Park Maintenance	7,500	625	350	275
Operating Supplies	1,500	125	-	125
Pressure Washing	7,500	625	-	625
Signage	11,000	917	-	917
Enhanced Traffic Enforcement	51,792	4,316	3,984	332
Contingency	1,977	165	-	165
Total Maintenance - Shared Expenses	**$ 1,133,065**	**$ 114,360**	**$ 106,003**	**$ 8,357**
Reserves				
Capital Reserve Transfer	$ 76,022	$ -	$ -	$ -
Total Reserves	**$ 76,022**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**
Total Expenditures	**$ 1,385,025**	**$ 142,148**	**$ 129,965**	**$ 12,183**
Excess Revenues (Expenditures)	$ (164,785)		$ (128,730)	
Fund Balance - Beginning	$ 164,785		$ 497,336	
Fund Balance - Ending	$ 0		$ 368,607	

Storey Park

Community Development District

Month to Month

	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sept	Total
Revenues:													
Special Assessments	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
Interest	1,235	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,235
Linus Cost Share Agreement	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Revenues	**$ 1,235**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ 1,235**
Expenditures:													
Administrative:													
Supervisor Fees	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
FICA Expense	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Engineering Fees	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Attorney	744	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	744
Arbitrage	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dissemination Agent	1,656	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,656
Annual Audit	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Trustee Fees	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Assessment Administration	8,517	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8,517
Management Fees	4,258	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4,258
Information Technology	170	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	170
Website Maintenance	114	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	114
Telephone	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Postage	110	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	110
Printing & Binding	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Insurance	8,157	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8,157
Legal Advertising	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other Current Charges	60	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	60
Office Supplies	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Property Taxes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dues, Licenses & Subscriptions	175	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	175
Total Administrative:	**$ 23,962**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ 23,962**

Storey Park

Community Development District

Month to Month

	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sept	Total
Operation & Maintenance													
Field Management	$ 1,703	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 1,703
Property Insurance	17,645	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17,645
Electric	129	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	129
Streetlights	20,263	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20,263
Water & Sewer	3,541	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3,541
Landscape Maintenance - Contract	44,813	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	44,813
Landscape - Contingency	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lake Maintenance	4,005	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4,005
Mitigation Monitoring & Maintenance	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Irrigation Repairs	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Repairs & Maintenance	295	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	295
Roadways & Sidewalks	9,275	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9,275
Trail & Boardwalk Maintenance	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dog Park Maintenance	350	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	350
Operating Supplies	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pressure Washing	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Signage	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Enhanced Traffic Enforcement	3,984	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3,984
Contingency	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Maintenance - Shared Expenses	**$ 106,003**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ 106,003**
Reserves													
Capital Reserve Transfer	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
Total Reserves	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**
Total Expenditures	**$ 129,965**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ 129,965**
Excess Revenues (Expenditures)	$ (128,730)	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ (128,730)

Storey Park

Community Development District

Capital Reserve Fund

Statement of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance

For The Period Ending October 31, 2026

	Adopted Budget	Prorated Budget Thru 10/31/26	Actual Thru 10/31/26	Variance
Revenues:				
Transfer In	$ 76,022	$ -	$ -	$ -
Interest	12,000	1,000	1,425	425
Total Revenues	**$ 88,022**	**$ 1,000**	**$ 1,425**	**$ 425**
Expenditures:				
Contingency	$ 600	$ 50	$ 41	$ 9
Capital Outlay	12,000	1,000	-	1,000
Total Expenditures	**$ 12,600**	**$ 1,050**	**$ 41**	**$ 1,009**
Excess Revenues (Expenditures)	$ 75,422		$ 1,384	
Fund Balance - Beginning	$ 426,166		$ 426,467	
Fund Balance - Ending	$ 501,588		$ 427,851	

Storey Park

Community Development District

Debt Service Fund - Series 2015

Statement of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance

For The Period Ending October 31, 2026

	Adopted Budget	Prorated Budget Thru 10/31/26	Actual Thru 10/31/26	Variance
Revenues:				
Special Assessments	$ 615,036	$ -	$ -	$ -
Interest	24,000	2,000	3,218	1,218
Total Revenues	**$ 639,036**	**$ 2,000**	**$ 3,218**	**$ 1,218**
Expenditures:				
Series 2015				
Interest - 11/01	$ 188,456	$ -	$ -	$ -
Principal - 11/01	225,000	-	-	-
Interest - 05/01	183,394	-	-	-
Total Expenditures	**$ 596,850**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**
Excess Revenues (Expenditures)	$ 42,186		$ 3,218	
Fund Balance - Beginning	$ 705,827		$ 1,080,564	
Fund Balance - Ending	$ 748,014		$ 1,083,782	

Storey Park

Community Development District

Debt Service Fund - Series 2018

Statement of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance

For The Period Ending October 31, 2026

	Adopted Budget	Prorated Budget Thru 10/31/26	Actual Thru 10/31/26	Variance
Revenues:				
Special Assessments	$ 248,827	$ -	$ -	$ -
Interest	4,800	400	777	377
Total Revenues	**$ 253,627**	**$ 400**	**$ 777**	**$ 377**
Expenditures:				
Series 2018				
Interest - 12/15	$ 81,088	$ -	$ -	$ -
Principal - 06/15	85,000	-	-	-
Interest - 06/15	81,088	-	-	-
Total Expenditures	**$ 247,175**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**
Excess Revenues (Expenditures)	$ 6,452		$ 777	
Fund Balance - Beginning	$ 179,976		$ 261,115	
Fund Balance - Ending	$ 186,428		$ 261,892	

Storey Park

Community Development District

Debt Service Fund - Series 2019

Statement of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance

For The Period Ending October 31, 2026

	Adopted Budget	Prorated Budget Thru 10/31/26	Actual Thru 10/31/26	Variance
Revenues:				
Special Assessments	$ 238,964	$ -	$ -	$ -
Interest	6,000	500	943	443
Total Revenues	**$ 244,964**	**$ 500**	**$ 943**	**$ 443**
Expenditures:				
Series 2019				
Interest - 12/15	$ 73,588	$ -	$ -	$ -
Principal - 06/15	90,000	-	-	-
Interest - 06/15	73,588	-	-	-
Total Expenditures	**$ 237,175**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**
Excess Revenues (Expenditures)	$ 7,789		$ 943	
Fund Balance - Beginning	$ 187,446		$ 316,679	
Fund Balance - Ending	$ 195,235		$ 317,622	

Storey Park

Community Development District

Debt Service Fund - Series 2021

Statement of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance

For The Period Ending October 31, 2026

	Adopted Budget	Prorated Budget Thru 10/31/26	Actual Thru 10/31/26	Variance
Revenues:				
Special Assessments	$ 334,300	$ -	$ -	$ -
Interest	8,000	667	1,110	443
Total Revenues	**$ 342,300**	**$ 667**	**$ 1,110**	**$ 443**
Expenditures:				
Series 2021				
Interest - 12/15	$ 96,731	$ -	$ -	$ -
Principal - 06/15	140,000	-	-	-
Interest - 06/15	96,731	-	-	-
Total Expenditures	**$ 333,463**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**
Excess Revenues (Expenditures)	$ 8,838		$ 1,110	
Fund Balance - Beginning	$ 190,209		$ 372,917	
Fund Balance - Ending	$ 199,047		$ 374,027	

Storey Park

Community Development District

Debt Service Fund - Series 2022

Statement of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance

For The Period Ending October 31, 2026

	Adopted Budget	Prorated Budget Thru 10/31/26	Actual Thru 10/31/26	Variance
Revenues:				
Special Assessments	$ 203,549	$ -	$ -	$ -
Interest	4,500	375	669	294
Total Revenues	**$ 208,049**	**$ 375**	**$ 669**	**$ 294**
Expenditures:				
Series 2022				
Interest - 12/15	$ 72,521	$ -	$ -	$ -
Principal - 06/15	55,000	-	-	-
Interest - 06/15	72,521	-	-	-
Total Expenditures	**$ 200,043**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**
Other Sources/(Uses)				
Transfer In/(Out)	$ (2,500)	$ (208)	$ -	$ (208)
Total Other Financing Sources (Uses)	**$ (2,500)**	**$ (208)**	**$ -**	**$ (208)**
Excess Revenues (Expenditures)	$ 5,507		$ 669	

Storey Park

Community Development District

Capital Projects Fund - Series 2021

Statement of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance

For The Period Ending October 31, 2026

	Adopted Budget	Prorated Budget Thru 10/31/26	Actual Thru 10/31/26	Variance
Revenues:				
Interest	$ -	$ -	$ 64	$ 64
Total Revenues	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ 64**	**$ 64**
Expenditures:				
Capital Outlay	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
Total Expenditures	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**
Other Financing Sources/(Uses)				
Transfer In/(Out)	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
Total Other Financing Sources (Uses)	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**
Excess Revenues (Expenditures)	$ -		$ 64	
Fund Balance - Beginning	$ -		$ 21,518	
Fund Balance - Ending	$ -		$ 21,582	

Storey Park

Community Development District

Capital Projects Fund - Series 2022

Statement of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance

For The Period Ending October 31, 2026

	Adopted Budget	Prorated Budget Thru 10/31/26	Actual Thru 10/31/26	Variance
Revenues:				
Interest	$ -	$ -	$ 46	$ 46
Total Revenues	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ 46**	**$ 46**
Expenditures:				
Capital Outlay	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
Total Expenditures	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**
Other Financing Sources/(Uses)				
Transfer In/(Out)	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
Total Other Financing Sources (Uses)	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**
Excess Revenues (Expenditures)	$ -		$ 46	
Fund Balance - Beginning	$ -		$ 15,268	
Fund Balance - Ending	$ -		$ 15,314	

Storey Park

Community Development District

Long Term Debt Report

SERIES 2015, SPECIAL ASSESSMENT BONDS (ASSESSMENT AREA ONE PROJECT)		
INTEREST RATES:	4.000%, 4.500%, 5.000%, 5.125%	
MATURITY DATE:	11/1/2045	
RESERVE FUND DEFINITION	50% OF MAXIMUM ANNUAL DEBT SERVICE	
RESERVE FUND REQUIREMENT	$303,522	
RESERVE FUND BALANCE	$370,139	
BONDS OUTSTANDING - 9/30/15		$9,210,000
LESS: PRINCIPAL PAYMENT 11/1/16		($90,000)
LESS: PRINCIPAL PAYMENT 11/1/17		($155,000)
LESS: PRINCIPAL PAYMENT 11/1/18		($160,000)
LESS: PRINCIPAL PAYMENT 11/1/19		($170,000)
LESS: PRINCIPAL PAYMENT 11/1/20		($175,000)
LESS: PRINCIPAL PAYMENT 11/1/21		($180,000)
LESS: SPECIAL CALL 11/1/21		($10,000)
LESS: PRINCIPAL PAYMENT 11/1/22		($190,000)
LESS: PRINCIPAL PAYMENT 11/1/23		($200,000)
LESS: PRINCIPAL PAYMENT 11/1/24		($205,000)
LESS: PRINCIPAL PAYMENT 11/1/25		($215,000)
LESS: SPECIAL CALL 05/1/26		($15,000)
CURRENT BONDS OUTSTANDING		**$7,445,000**

SERIES 2018, SPECIAL ASSESSMENT BONDS (ASSESSMENT AREA TWO PROJECT)		
INTEREST RATES:	3.750%, 4.375%, 4.875%, 5.000%	
MATURITY DATE:	6/15/2048	
RESERVE FUND DEFINITION	25% OF MAXIMUM ANNUAL DEBT SERVICE	
RESERVE FUND REQUIREMENT	$62,200	
RESERVE FUND BALANCE	$77,327	
BONDS OUTSTANDING - 5/22/18		$3,865,000
LESS: PRINCIPAL PAYMENT 6/15/19		($65,000)
LESS: PRINCIPAL PAYMENT 6/15/20		($65,000)
LESS: PRINCIPAL PAYMENT 6/15/21		($65,000)
LESS: PRINCIPAL PAYMENT 6/15/22		($70,000)
LESS: PRINCIPAL PAYMENT 6/15/23		($70,000)
LESS: PRINCIPAL PAYMENT 6/15/24		($75,000)
LESS: PRINCIPAL PAYMENT 6/15/25		($80,000)
LESS: PRINCIPAL PAYMENT 6/15/26		($80,000)
CURRENT BONDS OUTSTANDING		**$3,295,000**

SERIES 2019, SPECIAL ASSESSMENT BONDS (ASSESSMENT AREA THREE PROJECT)		
INTEREST RATES:	3.500%, 3.750%, 4.250%, 4.400%	
MATURITY DATE:	6/15/2049	
RESERVE FUND DEFINITION	50% OF MAXIMUM ANNUAL DEBT SERVICE	
RESERVE FUND REQUIREMENT	$119,695	
RESERVE FUND BALANCE	$124,135	
BONDS OUTSTANDING - 5/31/19		$3,995,000
LESS: PRINCIPAL PAYMENT 6/15/20		($70,000)
LESS: PRINCIPAL PAYMENT 6/15/21		($75,000)
LESS: PRINCIPAL PAYMENT 6/15/22		($75,000)
LESS: PRINCIPAL PAYMENT 6/15/23		($80,000)
LESS: PRINCIPAL PAYMENT 6/15/24		($80,000)
LESS: PRINCIPAL PAYMENT 6/15/25		($85,000)
LESS: PRINCIPAL PAYMENT 6/15/26		($90,000)
CURRENT BONDS OUTSTANDING		**$3,440,000**

SERIES 2021, SPECIAL ASSESSMENT BONDS (ASSESSMENT AREA FOUR PROJECT)		
INTEREST RATES:	2.375%, 2.875%, 3.300%, 4.400%	
MATURITY DATE:	6/15/2051	
RESERVE FUND DEFINITION	50% OF MAXIMUM ANNUAL DEBT SERVICE	
RESERVE FUND REQUIREMENT	$167,150	
RESERVE FUND BALANCE	$173,366	
BONDS OUTSTANDING - 6/15/21		$6,030,000
LESS: PRINCIPAL PAYMENT 6/15/22		($125,000)
LESS: PRINCIPAL PAYMENT 6/15/23		($125,000)
LESS: PRINCIPAL PAYMENT 6/15/24		($130,000)
LESS: PRINCIPAL PAYMENT 6/15/25		($135,000)
LESS: PRINCIPAL PAYMENT 6/15/26		($135,000)
CURRENT BONDS OUTSTANDING		**$5,380,000**

SERIES 2022, SPECIAL ASSESSMENT BONDS (ASSESSMENT AREA FIVE PROJECT)		
INTEREST RATES:	4.250%, 4.500%, 5.000%, 5.150%	
MATURITY DATE:	6/15/2052	
RESERVE FUND DEFINITION	50% OF MAXIMUM ANNUAL DEBT SERVICE	
RESERVE FUND REQUIREMENT	$101,774	
RESERVE FUND BALANCE	$105,513	
BONDS OUTSTANDING - 9/15/22		$3,105,000
LESS: PRINCIPAL PAYMENT 6/15/23		($50,000)
LESS: PRINCIPAL PAYMENT 6/15/24		($50,000)
LESS: PRINCIPAL PAYMENT 6/15/25		($55,000)
LESS: PRINCIPAL PAYMENT 6/15/26		($55,000)
CURRENT BONDS OUTSTANDING		**$2,895,000**

Storey Park

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

Special Assessment Receipts

Fiscal Year 2027

Gross Assessments		$ 1,267,495.00	$ 654,294.00	$ 264,077.00	$ 254,217.00	$ 355,784.00	$ 216,542.05	$ 3,012,409.05					
Net Assessments		$ 1,191,445.30	$ 615,036.36	$ 248,232.38	$ 238,963.98	$ 334,436.96	$ 203,549.53	$ 2,831,664.51					
			ON ROLL ASSESSMENTS										
			42.08%	21.72%	8.77%	8.44%	11.81%	7.19%	100.00%				
Date	*Distribution*	*Gross Amount*	*Commissions*	*Discount/Penalty*	*Interest*	*Net Receipts*	*O&M Portion*	*2015 Debt Service Asmt*	*2018 Debt Service Asmt*	*2019 Debt Service Asmt*	*2021 Debt Service Asmt*	*2022 Debt Service Asmt*	*Total*
11/5/26	ACH	$11,144.77	$1,459.99	$599.30	$0.00	$9,085.48	$3,822.79	$1,973.36	$796.46	$766.72	$1,073.05	$653.09	$9,085.47
11/12/26	ACH	$14,504.76	$0.00	$580.19	$0.00	$13,924.57	$5,858.87	$3,024.41	$1,220.67	$1,175.09	$1,644.58	$1,000.94	$13,924.56
11/12/26	ACH	$4,674.00	$0.00	$186.96	$0.00	$4,487.04	$1,887.96	$974.58	$393.35	$378.66	$529.95	$322.54	$4,487.04
11/20/26	ACH	$86,525.06	$0.00	$3,460.98	$0.00	$83,064.08	$34,949.87	$18,041.48	$7,281.65	$7,009.77	$9,810.38	$5,970.92	$83,064.07
		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
		$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
	TOTAL	**$ 116,848.59**	**$ 1,459.99**	**$ 4,827.43**	**$ -**	**$ 110,561.17**	**$ 46,519.49**	**$ 24,013.83**	**$ 9,692.13**	**$ 9,330.24**	**$ 13,057.96**	**$ 7,947.49**	**$ 110,561.14**

3.90%	**Net Percent Collected**
$ 2,721,103.34	**Balance Remaining to Collect**

SECTION C

STOREY PARK
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT
$9,210,000
SPECIAL ASSESSMENT BONDS
SERIES 2015
ARBITRAGE REBATE AND YIELD REDUCTION REPORT
AUGUST 31, 2026

Grau & Associates
CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS

1001 Yamato Road ▪ Suite 301
Boca Raton, Florida 33431
(561) 994-9299 ▪ (800) 299-4728
Fax (561) 994-5823
www.graucpa.com

September 24, 2026

Storey Park Community Development District
City of Orlando, Florida

Re: $9,210,000 Storey Park Community Development District
(City of Orlando, Florida),
Special Assessment Bonds, Series 2015 (the "Bonds")

Storey Park Community Development District has requested that we prepare certain computations related to the above-described Bonds for the year ended August 31, 2026 ("Computation Period"). The engagement consisted of the preparation of computations to be used to assist in the determination of the amount, if any, of the Rebate Requirement and Yield Reduction Payment Amount for the Bonds for the Computation Period as described in Section 148(f) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended ("Code"). You have the ultimate responsibility for your compliance with arbitrage rebate laws; therefore, you should review the calculations carefully.

In order to prepare these computations, we were provided with the following information: various trust statements and the prior report for the Bonds. We did not verify or otherwise audit the accuracy of information provided to us by you or the Trustee, and accordingly, we express no opinion on such information. The attached schedules are based upon the aforementioned information provided to us. A brief description of the attached schedules is attached.

The results of our computations based on the information provided to us indicate a negative Rebate Requirement of ($568,409.72) for August 31, 2026. Consequently, our results indicate no amount must be on deposit in the Rebate Fund.

The results of our computations based on the information provided to us indicate no Yield Reduction Payment Amount as of August 31, 2026.

The Rebate Requirement and Yield Reduction Payment Amount has been determined as described in the Code and the Arbitrage Rebate Regulations. We have no obligation to update this report because of events occurring, or information coming to our attention, subsequent to the date of this report. It is understood that these calculations are solely for the information of, and assistance to, the addressee for the purpose of complying with the Code and the Arbitrage Rebate Regulations. Our report is not to be used for any other purpose.

Grau & Associates

DESCRIPTION OF ATTACHED SCHEDULES

Summary of Rebate and Yield Restriction Calculations

Provides a summary of the rebate and yield restriction calculations including the Arbitrage Yield Limit, Internal Rate of Return, rebate liability, and yield reduction payment determination.

Purpose Expenditures Future Value Report

Verifies the rebate calculation. The report future values the purpose expenditures by the arbitrage yield limit to the computation date (August 31, 2026).

I.R.R. Report Via Purpose Expenditures

Verifies the Internal Rate of Return calculation. The report computes present values of purpose expenditures at the investment yield to verify the IRR solution (FV sum at IRR ≈ $0.00).

Yield Restriction Analysis – Section 148(a)

Summarizes the bond information, temporary period status, fund classifications, and yield reduction payment determination including forward-looking considerations.

Rebate Calculation Summary

Provides a consolidated summary of rebate liability, yield reduction payments, unspent proceeds by account, and method notes.

STOREY PARK COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

$9,210,000 Special Assessment Bonds, Series 2015
(City of Orlando, Florida)

Summary of Rebate and Yield Restriction Calculations

Computation Date: August 31, 2026

Section 148(f) - Arbitrage Rebate

Arbitrage Yield Limit (AYL)	5.1188657%
Internal Rate of Return (IRR)	116.7200355%
Spread (AYL - IRR)	-111.6011698%
Gross Proceeds (Issue Price)	$9,100,563.60
Unspent Proceeds	$367,928.44
Unspent Proceeds (Rounded)	$367,928.00
Full Rebate Liability	($568,409.72)
90% Rebate Liability	($511,568.75)
Rebate Requirement	$0.00

Section 148(a) - Yield Restriction

Aggregate Yield Restriction Test	PASSES - Cumulative Earnings Below AYL (See Note)
A&C Temporary Period Expiry	08/28/2018
Temporary Period Status	Expired
Schedule 2 Required	No - A&C Account Exhausted Prior to Computation Period
Yield Reduction Payment	$0.00

Interest Account Closeout (Section 1.11)

Capitalized Interest Deposited	None - No Capitalized Interest Account Funded
Final Disbursement Date	N/A
Closeout Date (Next Interest Payment)	05/01/2016 (first interest payment date)
Closeout vs. Computation Date	Case A - Closeout Prior to Computation Date
Treatment This Period	No adjustment; no INT row required

STOREY PARK COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

$9,210,000 Special Assessment Bonds, Series 2015
(City of Orlando, Florida)

Purpose Expenditures Future Value Report

Dated: 08/28/2015 Delivered: 08/28/2015 Future Valued To: 08/31/2026
Gross Proceeds: $9,100,563.60 AYL: 5.1188657% Calculation Standard: MSRB 30/360 SEMI 4/3

Date	Fund	Periods	Calc Amount	Pool %	FV Factor	FV Amount
09/17/2005	COI	41.9111111	1,250.00	100.00%	2.8840317	3,605.04
08/28/2015	GP	22.0166667	(9,100,563.60)	100.00%	1.7444011	(15,875,033.41)
09/10/2015	COI	21.9500000	25,000.00	100.00%	1.7414646	43,536.62
09/10/2015	COI	21.9500000	5,000.00	100.00%	1.7414646	8,707.32
09/10/2015	COI	21.9500000	27,500.00	100.00%	1.7414646	47,890.28
09/10/2015	COI	21.9500000	27,500.00	100.00%	1.7414646	47,890.28
09/10/2015	COI	21.9500000	12,500.00	100.00%	1.7414646	21,768.31
09/10/2015	COI	21.9500000	36,500.00	100.00%	1.7414646	63,563.46
09/10/2015	COI	21.9500000	37,500.00	100.00%	1.7414646	65,304.92
09/10/2015	COI	21.9500000	5,077.00	100.00%	1.7414646	8,841.42
09/10/2015	COI	21.9500000	1,551.00	100.00%	1.7414646	2,701.01
09/10/2015	COI	21.9500000	(27,500.00)	100.00%	1.7414646	(47,890.28)
09/10/2015	UW	21.9500000	197,278.00	100.00%	1.7414646	343,552.65
09/10/2015	COI	21.9500000	2,608.00	100.00%	1.7414646	4,541.74
09/10/2015	COI	21.9500000	51,000.00	100.00%	1.7414646	88,814.69
09/10/2015	COI	21.9500000	2,093.00	100.00%	1.7414646	3,644.89
09/10/2015	COI	21.9500000	1,954.00	100.00%	1.7414646	3,402.82
09/25/2015	A&C	21.8666667	4,929,563.00	100.00%	1.7378009	8,566,599.01
01/07/2016	A&C	21.3000000	1,371.00	100.00%	1.7130913	2,348.65
03/18/2016	Reserve	20.9055556	114.00	100.00%	1.6960991	193.36
04/05/2016	COI	20.8111111	8,223.00	100.00%	1.6920557	13,913.77
04/13/2016	A&C	20.7666667	1,253,955.00	100.00%	1.6901562	2,119,379.83
08/08/2016	A&C	20.1277778	1,464.00	100.00%	1.6630858	2,434.76
06/30/2017	A&C	18.3333333	2,205,691.00	100.00%	1.5893499	3,505,614.83
03/07/2019	A&C	14.9666667	3,500.00	100.00%	1.4597158	5,109.01
05/24/2019	A&C	14.5388889	2,644.00	100.00%	1.4440199	3,817.99
12/16/2020	A&C	11.4166667	3,500.00	100.00%	1.3344579	4,670.60
03/19/2021	A&C	10.9000000	3,247.00	100.00%	1.3171467	4,276.78
04/15/2021	COI	10.7555556	352.00	100.00%	1.3123473	461.95
08/31/2026	ALL	0.0000000	367,928.00	100.00%	1.0000000	367,928.00
TOTALS			**87,799.40**			**(568,409.72)**

Full Rebate Liability: ($568,409.72)
90% Rebate Liability: ($511,568.75)
Rebate Requirement: $0.00

STOREY PARK COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

$9,210,000 Special Assessment Bonds, Series 2015
(City of Orlando, Florida)

I.R.R. Report Via Purpose Expenditures

Internal Rate of Return: 116.7200355% Calculation Standard: MSRB 30/360 SEMI 4/3

Date	Fund	Day Count	Calc Amount	Pool %	PV Factor	PV Amount
09/17/2005	COI	-3632	1,250.00	100.00%	2200.0155290	2,750,019.41
08/28/2015	GP	0	(9,100,563.60)	100.00%	1.0000000	(9,100,563.60)
09/10/2015	COI	13	25,000.00	100.00%	0.9728289	24,320.72
09/10/2015	COI	13	5,000.00	100.00%	0.9728289	4,864.14
09/10/2015	COI	13	27,500.00	100.00%	0.9728289	26,752.80
09/10/2015	COI	13	27,500.00	100.00%	0.9728289	26,752.80
09/10/2015	COI	13	12,500.00	100.00%	0.9728289	12,160.36
09/10/2015	COI	13	36,500.00	100.00%	0.9728289	35,508.26
09/10/2015	COI	13	37,500.00	100.00%	0.9728289	36,481.08
09/10/2015	COI	13	5,077.00	100.00%	0.9728289	4,939.05
09/10/2015	COI	13	1,551.00	100.00%	0.9728289	1,508.86
09/10/2015	COI	13	(27,500.00)	100.00%	0.9728289	(26,752.80)
09/10/2015	UW	13	197,278.00	100.00%	0.9728289	191,917.74
09/10/2015	COI	13	2,608.00	100.00%	0.9728289	2,537.14
09/10/2015	COI	13	51,000.00	100.00%	0.9728289	49,614.27
09/10/2015	COI	13	2,093.00	100.00%	0.9728289	2,036.13
09/10/2015	COI	13	1,954.00	100.00%	0.9728289	1,900.91
09/25/2015	A&C	28	4,929,563.00	100.00%	0.9423938	4,645,589.40
01/07/2016	A&C	132	1,371.00	100.00%	0.7560041	1,036.48
03/18/2016	Reserve	203	114.00	100.00%	0.6504065	74.15
04/05/2016	COI	221	8,223.00	100.00%	0.6260659	5,148.14
04/13/2016	A&C	229	1,253,955.00	100.00%	0.6155422	771,862.25
08/08/2016	A&C	346	1,464.00	100.00%	0.4803813	703.28
06/30/2017	A&C	672	2,205,691.00	100.00%	0.2407563	531,033.95
03/07/2019	A&C	1287	3,500.00	100.00%	0.0654050	228.92
05/24/2019	A&C	1365	2,644.00	100.00%	0.0554408	146.59
12/16/2020	A&C	1937	3,500.00	100.00%	0.0164981	57.74
03/19/2021	A&C	2030	3,247.00	100.00%	0.0135472	43.99
04/15/2021	COI	2057	352.00	100.00%	0.0127939	4.50
08/31/2026	ALL	4021	367,928.00	100.00%	0.0001993	73.34
TOTALS			**87,799.40**			**0.00**

PV Sum at IRR: $0.000000 (target $0.00; residual reflects IRR rounded to 7 decimals)

STOREY PARK COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

$9,210,000 Special Assessment Bonds, Series 2015
(City of Orlando, Florida)

Yield Restriction Analysis - Section 148(a)

Bond Information

Bond Issue	$9,210,000 Special Assessment Bonds, Series 2015 (City of Orlando, Florida)
Par Amount	$9,210,000.00
Original Issue Premium/(Discount)	($109,436.40)
Gross Proceeds (Issue Price)	$9,100,563.60
Closing/Delivery Date	08/28/2015
Computation Date	08/31/2026
Arbitrage Yield Limit (AYL)	5.1188657%
Materially Higher Yield (MHB)	5.2438657%
Internal Rate of Return (IRR)	116.7200355%

Temporary Period Status

A&C Account Temporary Period	3 Years
Temporary Period Expiry Date	08/28/2018
Status at Computation Date	EXPIRED
Schedule 2 Analysis Required	No - A&C Account Exhausted Prior to Computation Period

Yield Reduction Payment Determination

Aggregate Test (IRR vs AYL)	PASSES (See Note)
Account-Level YR Analysis	Not Required - A&C Exhausted Prior to Period
Yield Reduction Payment	$0.00

Fund Classifications

Acquisition & Construction Account	Bond Proceeds - Fully Expended; Account Closed
Costs of Issuance Account	Bond Proceeds - Fully Expended; Account Closed 04/05/2016
Reserve Account	RRRF - Exempt from Yield Restriction
Interest Account	No Capitalized Interest Account Funded - See Section 1.11

Interest Account Closeout (Section 1.11)

- Section 1.11 check performed. The carried-forward transaction ledger records activity in three funds only - Costs of Issuance, Acquisition & Construction and Reserve. No Interest or Capitalized Interest account appears in the ledger, and no such account appears in the trust statements supplied for the computation period.
- The first interest payment date on the Series 2015 Bonds is 05/01/2016, in the amount of $305,585.16. That date is the Section 1.11 closeout date and it precedes the computation date, so this is a Case A fact pattern: no INT row is added and no amount is included in unspent proceeds.
- The Official Statement was not supplied for this engagement. Whether a capitalized interest deposit was funded at closing and, if so, in what amount, is not separately identifiable from the information provided. Obtain the Official Statement for the file.

Forward-Looking Notes:

- The Acquisition & Construction Account temporary period expired 08/28/2018, three years from the delivery date. The last A&C disbursement recorded in the ledger is $3,247.00 on 03/19/2021, and the account held no balance at any time during the computation period (09/01/2025 - 08/31/2026).
- Schedule 2 is therefore suppressed under Master Prompt v2.19 Section 3.5 as applied by the firm: the A&C Account was fully exhausted before the computation period began. No post-temporary period cash flow remains to analyse and no account-level yield reduction payment can arise.
- Reasonably required reserve fund test, IRC Section 148(d)(1) / Treas. Reg. 1.148-2(f). The limit is the least of 10% of proceeds $921,000.00, maximum annual debt service $603,118.72 (11/01/2019 + 05/01/2020), and 125% of average annual debt service $755,993.76. The least is $603,118.72. The Reserve Account held $367,928.44 at the computation date, 61.00% of that limit, so it is a reasonably required reserve fund and is exempt from yield restriction.
- The Materially Higher Yield of 5.2438657% (AYL + 0.125%, Treas. Reg. 1.148-2(d)(2)(i)) is stated for reference and is not operative this period. The A&C, Costs of Issuance and Interest accounts hold no balance, and the Reserve Account is a reasonably required reserve fund and therefore not replacement proceeds, so the 0.001% spread of Treas. Reg. 1.148-2(d)(2)(ii) does not attach to it.
- No Yield Reduction Payment Amount arises as of August 31, 2026. IRS Form 8038-T is not required for this computation period.

STOREY PARK COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

$9,210,000 Special Assessment Bonds, Series 2015
(City of Orlando, Florida)

Rebate Calculation Summary

Computation Date: August 31, 2026

Rebate Liability

Full Rebate Liability (FV at AYL)	($568,409.72)
90% Rebate Liability	($511,568.75)
Rebate Requirement	$0.00

Yield Reduction Payment

Yield Reduction Payment	$0.00
90% YRP Due	$0.00
Form 8038-T Required	No

Unspent Proceeds by Account

Reserve Account - Regions Bank 3380005909	$367,928.44
Acquisition & Construction Account	$0.00
Costs of Issuance Account	$0.00
Capitalized Interest Account	$0.00
Total Unspent Proceeds (Exact)	$367,928.44
Total Unspent Proceeds (Rounded)	$367,928.00

Interest Account Closeout Detail (Section 1.11)

Capitalized Interest Deposited	None - No Capitalized Interest Account Funded
Closeout Date (Next Interest Payment)	05/01/2016 (first interest payment date)
Closeout Treatment	No adjustment - no capitalized interest account

Method Notes

- Arbitrage Yield Limit of 5.1188657% carried forward unchanged from the prior Grau & Associates report for the year ended August 31, 2025 (Master Prompt v2.19 Section 2.4). It is a property of the issue, not of the computation period.
- Future value convention: 30/360 (MSRB 30/360 SEMI 4/3), periods = days / 180, FV Factor = (1 + AYL/2) ^ periods, future valued to the computation date (Section 2.1 / 2.2).
- Internal rate of return convention: actual/365 with annual compounding, present valued to the delivery date of 08/28/2015 (Section 2.3). This differs by design from the future value convention.
- Prior period replication: the model reproduced the prior report's published full rebate liability of ($535,690.10), 90% liability of ($482,121.09) and net interest of $74,368.40 to the penny, and reproduced the published Periods and FV Factor columns on all 29 carried-forward rows.
- The rebate liability is the sum of the unrounded future value amounts, rounded once. The per-row rounded future value column sums to ($568,409.70) and is presented as a memo only; it is not the controlling figure.
- Unspent proceeds of $367,928.44 are the Reserve Account balance at the computation date per the Regions Bank statement for account 3380005909. The Acquisition & Construction, Costs of Issuance and Capitalized Interest accounts hold no balance. The schedule carries the whole-dollar figure of $367,928, consistent with the prior report.
- Twelve money market dividends totalling $13,431.33 were credited to the Reserve Account during the computation period. Each was reinvested within the same account as a sweep purchase of Fidelity Government Portfolio; none was swept out to a non-bond-proceeds account. Under Section 2.9 no expenditure row arises and the earnings are captured in unspent proceeds. Roll-forward: $354,497.11 + $13,431.33 - $0.00 = $367,928.44, agreeing exactly with the statement.
- Net interest verification (Section 2.6): net interest moved from $74,368.40 to $87,799.40, a change of $13,431.00, against $13,431.33 of money market dividends. The $0.33 is the whole-dollar rounding of the unspent proceeds row.
- The reported internal rate of return of 116.7200355% is the upper of two roots of the present value equation. The row dated 09/17/2005 precedes the 08/28/2015 delivery date by 3,632 days, which makes the present value function non-monotonic and produces a second root at 0.9694497%. The upper root is reported for continuity with the prior Grau & Associates report, which published 116.7193568% on the same ledger. The lower root of 0.9694497% is the economically meaningful yield and is below the Arbitrage Yield Limit; the negative rebate liability confirms that cumulative earnings fell below the Arbitrage Yield Limit. Root selection has been flagged for review.