MINUTES OF MEETING
INDIGO
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

The regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Indigo Community Development District was held Wednesday, July 23, 2025 at 6:00 p.m. in the Fairfield by Marriott Daytona Beach, 1820 Checkered Flag Boulevard, Daytona Beach, Florida.

Present and constituting a quorum were:

Mark McCommon	Chairman
Kevin Kilian	Vice Chairman
Ken Workowski	Assistant Secretary
Ron Brown	Assistant Secretary
Ron Byrne	Assistant Secretary

Also Present were:

Jeremy LeBrun	District Manager
Katie Buchanan	District Counsel
Brett Witte	District Engineer by telephone
Kurt von der Osten	Field Operations Manager
Jamie Rountree	Team Rountree
Jeff Littlejohn	National Stormwater Trust

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS **Roll Call**

Mr. LeBrun called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and called the roll.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS **Public Comments**

Mr. Shackleford stated we are having a problem with the pond islands, they are overgrown again.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS **Approval of the Minutes of the May 21, 2025 Meeting**

On MOTION by Mr. Kilian seconded by Mr. Byrne with all in favor the minutes of the May 21, 2025 meeting were approved as presented.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS **Public Hearing**

On MOTION by Mr. Workowski seconded by Mr. Kilian with all in favor the public hearings were opened.

Mr. LeBrun gave an overview of the proposed budget and stated there is no proposed assessment increase for Fiscal Year 2026.

Mr. Shackleford stated there is a separation on the assessments between north and south. Where is that line at?

Mr. von der Osten stated it is the north assessment area and south assessment area, the dividing line is International Golf Drive, which is where the LPGA headquarters is. That road runs east west and divides the community in half. South of that line would be the south assessment area.

Mr. Shackleford asked where are the Preserves?

Mr. von der Osten stated they are in the south section.

Mr. Shackleford asked why is the assessment in the north area $663,000 but on the south area it is $954,000.

Mr. Kilian stated you have 2,700 units in the south and 1,446 units in the north, nearly double the number of units being built. The total assessments are going to be doubled as well.

Mr. Shackleford stated if I understand this correctly what you are saying is the assessment itself is the same for everybody and it is adjusted by the number of units.

Mr. Kilian stated to a great extent, if you look at the top line item in both sections residential single-family, everybody is $470.56. There are some units, undeveloped units that the $127.05.

Mr. LeBrun stated it is by ERUs, for example a single-family home is 1.0 ERU an apartment is .8 ERUs. Unplatted land is assessed at a lower level than a single-family unit.

Mr. Shackleford stated what I'm trying to get at when I first came to a Board meeting it was made perfectly clear to me that the Preserves in LPGA was a stand-alone deal. We weren't getting any help from any of the LPGA communities. We were basically on our own. Then last year we had this big increase and the explanation was, we are all in this thing together. I want to make sure we are paying our fair share and not paying additional in the north section. If it is based on the number of units at the same taxable rate.

Mr. Kilian stated except for the fact that you have an additional charge for your ponds. You see that at the bottom of the south section. You will see Preserve additional, that is where it comes in. Your home is being billed at the same as the homes everywhere else $470.56. But there is an additional $557.77 that covers Preserves specific ponds.

Mr. Shackleford asked if we are paying for our ponds, why are we paying for the north assessment area ponds too?

Mr. Kilian stated you are not. Most of the ponds in the north are in the homeowner association. The CDD owns very few or any ponds that are in anybody else's neighborhood.

Mr. von der Osten stated most of the HOAs in the north have a pretty large line item for landscape maintenance around the ponds. That expense is being placed in their HOA instead in the Preserves it is being placed in the CDD.

Mr. Shackleford stated for our section we pay for the maintenance of the ponds including but not limited to the mowing and the landscaping. There really isn't any landscaping other than the islands.

Mr. von der Osten stated it is the large lake, there is a lot of mowing and multiple stormwater ponds and the floating mats.

Mr. Kilian stated if we weren't doing it, you would be charged that same amount by your HOA.

Mr. von der Osten stated you will find you HOA fee is very low compared to other neighborhoods in the District.

A. Consideration of Resolution 2025-04 Adopting the Fiscal Year 2026 Budget and Relating to the Annual Appropriations

Mr. LeBrun asked are there any questions on Resolutions 2025-04 or 2025-05?

Mr. Kilian stated if you look at landscape maintenance in the Preserve it is going down almost $60,000. They are always working to make sure it is appropriate. Is the fountain at the interchange being fixed?

Mr. von der Osten stated no, it requires total replacement.

Mr. Kilian asked why are we budgeting $27,000 for that?

Mr. LeBrun stated we left it there just in case. That is just the electric.

Mr. Kilian stated I am not interested in doing that unless someone else on the Board is.

Mr. LeBrun stated we can leave it and not use it and it will carry over.

Mr. Workowski stated we can use it for another contingency.

On MOTION by Mr. McCommon seconded by Mr. Brown with all in favor Resolution 2025-04 Adopting the Fiscal Year 2026 Budget and Relating to the Annual Appropriations was approved.

B. Consideration of Resolution 2025-05 Imposing Special Assessments and Certifying an Assessment Roll

Mr. LeBrun stated this resolution is the funding mechanism for the budget and you are also certifying an assessment roll.

> On MOTION by Mr. Kilian seconded by Mr. McCommon with all in favor Resolution 2025-05 Imposing Special Assessments and Certifying an Assessment Roll was approved.

> On MOTION by Mr. Kilian seconded by Mr. Workowski with all in favor the public hearing was closed.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS District Goals and Objectives

A. Adoption of Fiscal Year 2026 Goals and Objectives

Mr. LeBrun stated last year the State legislature made a new rule that CDDs had to adopt annual goals and objectives. We have the Fiscal Year 2026 Goals and Objectives that are identical to our current ones for this fiscal year.

> On MOTION by Mr. Workowski seconded by Mr. Kilian with all in favor the Fiscal Year 2026 goals and objectives were approved.

B. Presentation of Fiscal Year 2025 Goals and objectives and Authorization to the Chairman to Execute

Mr. LeBrun stated at the end of the fiscal year I will go through and make sure we hit them all and have the Chairman sign it and we will post it on the website.

> On MOTION by Mr. Workowski seconded by Mr. Kilian with all in favor the Chairman was authorized to execute the Fiscal Year 2025 Goals and Objectives.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Consideration of Proposal from National Stormwater Trust Related to Lease of District Ponds

Mr. LeBrun stated Jeff is here today, he was here a few meetings back and gave the Board an overview. Our District Engineer is on the line as well. He has had a conversation with them to go through everything; Katie has been working on it behind the scenes.

Ms. Buchanan stated the concept is that NST is able to install some maintenance and monitoring equipment on your stormwater pond that better manages the flow of water but essentially creates additional stormwater capacity. Someone that needs to have stormwater

capacity for a construction project in this vicinity is then able to tap into that system without necessarily digging a separate pond because real estate is incredibly difficult to find in some of these areas.

Mr. Littlejohn stated I wouldn't want to think of this as capacity because you will think about this as storing more water, but it is actually nutrient removal that we are trading. We are managing the lakes in a way that allows them to pull more nutrients out of the system before it is discharged in Tomoka River. Tomoka River is impaired for nutrients so other projects that develop in this area, the Tomoka River Basin Area are required to meet very high nutrient removal standard and the cost of providing that nutrient removal is very high. In places that we can cost effectively squeeze more nutrients out of the systems that are already out here, people will write checks for the nutrient credits. At that point it is a ledger transfer from your permit or our permit if we do this with you to the recipient who would deduct those credits from our permit to their permit and write a check. We would be in a position of marketing and then transferring those credits, collecting the check with revenue sharing back to the CDD. It can be a revenue stream to the CDD if you elect to do an annual fee for the lease versus a lump sum as a revenue share. We have done it both ways with different CDDs.

Ms. Buchanan stated this is something that I hope Jeff can help us fill in, I have done it twice with two different scenarios, one is when a developer was putting it into a new pond to avoid having to create another stormwater pond. That is essentially creating this credit in a new project. Then we have also done it in a situation where similar to now the District has facilities that work well to allow for this transfer of revenues, essentially a cash flow back to the District. You have this extra twist in that you are trying to get rid of the island that is where I feel like we need to make sure we understand what is happening.

Mr. Kilian stated I thought previously you said that that pond was not included in your analysis because you couldn't make it work there. Are you saying that they wouldn't have to have the mats anymore?

Mr. Littlejohn stated correct.

Mr. Kilian stated that is not Grand Champion, that is Preserve.

Mr. Littlejohn stated if I may I will summarize the deal structure. The generation of credits has to be in the same basin as the user of the credits. In this scenario both Preserve and Grand Champion are all in the Tomoka basin. From the state's perspective they are all interchangeable.

Whether we generate credits in the Preserve Phase B we are generating extra credits that would offset the nutrient removal provided by the mats and allow your permit to be modified so that the mats were removed from that permit. We don't remove the mats but we can offset the nutrient reduction provided by the mats, which would allow you or a contractor to remove the mats.

Mr. Kilian stated St. Johns actually suggested the mats. Are they good with this alternative?

Mr. Littlejohn stated St. Johns required you to get a nutrient number that was not possible to hit with a straight wet pond because it is discharging to the Tomoka River. The mats were an option; there were other options. This particular option wasn't available at the time you got your system put in. This is new, this would be our second CDD if we execute this deal.

Mr. Shackelford asked this will eliminate the existing mats?

Mr. Littlejohn stated yes. The mats are removing about 12 kilograms a year of nitrogen and about 2 kilograms a year of phosphorus. In the permit that is what they are providing to the Tomoka River. We can provide much more than that with a retrofit of the Grand Champion system and provide more retrofitting the Phase B Preserve system. We have laid out what we believe the total value of those credits are and what the revenue share back to the CDD would be. By taking out the nutrient offset by eliminating the mats I put a number in here for you so that you know what it is. In all these numbers, it assumes that the mats are going away.

Mr. Kilian stated I see Grand Champion and Phase B but in Grand Champion you are highlighting after elimination of floating mats.

Mr. Littlejohn stated that is the delta, after the mats are gone that is what is left over. There are a lot of credits available in Grand Champion.

Mr. Kilian stated the $5.4 million is paid to us over 99 years.

Mr. Littlejohn stated it is not paid to you. Let me walk you through the financial proforma. Every one of our proposals come with what we call market value credits. We bought and sold credits in a number of places in Florida and we believe we can collect $5.41 million of credits in just the Grand Champion facility after we delete the mats. From the $5.41 million we would either pay the CDD $800,000 in cash, once we collect all the money we pay you in cash upfront and we are done or we can pay you over 99 years an annual fee and that is going to go up every year, the lease payment. The total paid out over a 99-year term if you take the payment plan is $3.9 million. We can split this in terms of some cash, some payment; I'm giving you two scenarios the $100,000 lump sum if you want to take that off the top for example to pay for the cost of removal of the

floating mats and have some left over and put in reserves, but it affects the total payout amount. We cover all the other costs, there is no cash out of pocket from the CDD when we come in with an executed lease.

Mr. Kilian stated you are saying that you are getting $5.4 million in stormwater credits and paying us $800,000 for it.

Mr. Littlejohn stated correct. I did this for the total deal for this end and the Preserve. I'm giving you numbers for Grand Champion plus Preserve mixed together. Once we pay everything out it is $8.6 million is what we come in on a cash sale. If we pay you in cash we pay you a lower number, the rest of the money is for covering the cost of the equipment for 99 years. Repairs, maintenance, my staff time. If we paid you out in cash on an annual basis the total payout over the 99 years is $5.2 million. We collect the $8.6 million in year one we are paying the CDD for 99 years so we have to have enough in the bank as a cash reserve to generate enough income to pay you for maintenance, repairs, replacements, lightning strikes, regulatory compliance and everything and we have to have a cash reserve, a financial assurance for the state to backstop the credits.

Mr. Kilian asked what if your money runs out?

Mr. Littlejohn stated that's my fault.

Mr. Kilian stated if you don't have the money.

Mr. Littlejohn stated we will have to have a financial reserve, there is a bond or letter of credit that we have to set aside that the State requires in case something happens to us.

Mr. Kilian asked what does the equipment look like that you would be installing?

Mr. Littlejohn distributed material with photos of installations in other locations and stared it is a control system that communicates with the internet that does the control of the ponds and on the control box we will retrofit that with a gate that we can remotely operate, move it up or down.

Mr. Brown asked are you regulated by some part of the government?

Mr. Littlejohn stated St. Johns River Water Management District. We continually provide data to them.

Mr. Workowski stated the way I'm looking at it, how much are we spending on maintenance of the mats?

Mr. LeBrun stated $112,000.

Mr. Workowski stated that is going to go up when the new phase goes in.

Ms. Buchanan stated no, they are not doing the mats.

Mr. Workowski stated I think we have to consider we are not going to spend $100,000 a year over the life of this system. We are looking at it as gross, but we need to look at it net.

Mr. McCommon stated I appreciate you pointing that out. From a Board standpoint how does that allocation typically happen? For example, we would potentially be eliminating $112,000 and saving you another $500 a year on your charges but all the benefit can't go to them.

Ms. Buchanan stated they benefit from the reduction.

Mr. McCommon stated that part I understand but what do we do with the rest?

Ms. Buchanan stated the $13,000 per year.

Mr. Kilian asked so we are doing this to satisfy new regulations on requirements of removing nutrients?

Ms. Buchanan stated we are good as is. Scenario A is when you are trying to satisfy regulations without doing more bonds. That is not what is happening here but that is probably what the buyer of these credits is looking to do. The second scenario is trying to create a revenue stream, which is capitalizing on this ability to sell these credits and bring money into the CDD. That is one thing you are looking at and if that were it, then I think the questions that you would want to ask as a board going along with these thoughts of worst case scenario is what happens if the District can't continue to provide that service? What happens if we default? What are our obligations. Their obligation is they stop paying us $13,000 a year that is not really a big fight but what happens if we for some reason have a failure of our pond and can't continue to provide the credit? The one thing I think the engineer can help is that you can get approval for your permit upfront, but you have compliance. You have to keep this every year, it has to stay in compliance. What does happen in that scenario, if for some reason the District didn't have a mechanism to allow for you to manage the nutrient levels like you are anticipating?

Mr. Littlejohn stated we will share our obligations under the permit but our obligations are heavily tilted towards us. You are the landowner, you have to provide access to the ponds for us and all the rest of the obligations in the permit all on our company. We are required to maintain the financial assurance as a backup measure in case we fail, we all get hit by a meteor, we are gone, the District can call that financial insurance mechanism and hire a different company to take over the maintenance or operation.

Ms. Buchanan stated what I'm trying to envision is if we have an unanticipated pond bank failure, that is related to the District's improvements, not yours.

Mr. Littlejohn stated in that scenario, if we don't exist and that happens the District would make you fix it. If we are there and that happens the District would still make you fix it. I don't see that as changing your obligations or liabilities.

Ms. Buchanan stated like a temporary pause. My concern is FDOT, what do they do if we have this failure?

Mr. Littlejohn asked if they purchaser of the credit? Like mitigation credits this whole model, regulatory and financial. I'll go back to the wetland mitigation credit. The banker always holds the liability, financial and regulatory liability for the life of the bank. The purchaser's liability financial and regulatory is separate when the state approves the transfer. The purchaser of the credit is DOT or another developer, when they buy the credit the state approves the transfer, that obligation is permanently transferred to us. We are on the hook for that credit forever. They are never going to go back to DOT.

Ms. Buchanan stated we understand if we have a catastrophic pond failure you have NST and I assume there would be a requirement in the contract that we make reasonable, efficient efforts to repair it and there is not going to be a penalty as long as we are pursuing it in that manner.

Mr. Littlejohn stated the same enforcing agency is enforcing you and us, we are in the same boat and we would encourage e you to get that pond fixed as soon as possible. One of the things this system is built to do is lower pond water levels before big storm events. That is one of the features of the system. That is why we are in the Villages and Babcock so if a really big storm in in the forecast, we can release water days ahead of the arrival of the storm and lower the water level.

Mr. Workowski stated we know these are low lying areas and when it rains these fields flood that homes are going to go on. That would be a concern, but you just addressed that. You are connected directly to St. Johns Water Management District and you can remotely let water out of the existing ponds.

Mr. McCommon asked Kurt, do you know what ponds he is talking about?

Mr. von der Osten stated those are ponds that we own.

Mr. McCommon asked what about the Preserve?

Mr. Littlejohn stated they are owned by the CDD and Preserve Phase B there is one pond that manages most of Phase B and we would control that one pond to generate these credits. We would like to do that as a second step after we sell all the credits.

Ms. Buchanan stated that is the deed that hasn't been recorded, it is on the agenda for conversation but we haven't done it yet.

Mr. Workowski stated I want to make sure that we are aligning that all the ponds the CDD owns that we currently have this mat expense, that is included in this. Is that correct?

Ms. Buchanan stated it is not going on a pond by pond basis, it is done on totality. If you create this additional credit in the CDD Grand Champion pond then that goes to offset what the mats might have been providing in the other pond.

Mr. Workowski stated if we are looking at the net number and taking the $100,000 plus number I want to make sure that is going away.

Ms. Buchanan stated that is his goal. That is the next step. If you are just talking about getting revenue or allowing for this additional equipment then the only thing we need to talk about is money. What you are doing is actually trying to modify your stormwater management permit by changing the mechanism by which the District meets its criteria. Rather than needing the mats you are going to open this additional nutrient treatment level and allow the removal of the mats. That becomes the next question is what if you get this equipment installed and it provides the credit that is necessary to remove the mats but what happens if that doesn't sustain? Then you as a District are going to be responsible for finding another mechanism to meet it. I'm not shutting you down, I want you to understand that is it, there are great advantages and you will never find a community that is happy with the mats, they are very difficult and they are very expensive. There are some detriments to having the mats there and this appears to be an alternative solution. You have to figure out and talk to Mr. Littlejohn about what happens and that is why he is here to help answer that question.

Mr. Littlejohn stated if we become the leaseholder and we get this permit, we generate the credits and then we transfer some of the credits to the Preserve Phase A and delete those mats then just like DOT or another developer you would be off the hook forever at that point. At that point it becomes my problem forever. If something happens to us that is when the financial assurance gets called but the water management district is not going to go back to the District and make you replace the mats. You are a credit purchaser not a credit provider. The Phase A facilities aren't as

good for our product but by transferring it from where they are generated from the mats deleting that and switching the generation over here to Grand Champion you have permanently removed that.

Ms. Buchanan asked would that happen with Grand Champion or would that only happen once the Phase B is online?

Mr. Littlejohn stated we would do that right out of the gate.

Mr. McCommon stated we still have an obligation.

Mr. LeBrun stated we did sign a year agreement and I will look at it to see what the termination clause is.

Brett, will you provide the Board with your opinion? Give us your thoughts as District Engineer.

Mr. Witte stated I talked to Jeff and he walked me through in general how they work. He didn't have any treatment calcs or design information, it is site specific for us, but in general they have gone over how they work, they have done it before in St. Johns as well as other water management districts. They are familiar with how these things go and have been permitted elsewhere. Once they get into the design and permitting everything comes to us for review prior to submitting for the final permit or before any type of breaking ground. That is when the District would be able to sign off on it. So long as the mats can be removed and permitting is not an issue then it is conceptually a good alternative.

Mr. McCommon stated just so I'm clear, it is staff's recommendation to do this. Is the only reason we are doing this to get rid of the mats?

Mr. Workowski stated no, we get money.

Mr. Kilian stated I want to clarify your first page, retail value of floating mat credit, we are not getting those, we are paying the mat company $112,000 a year to install, maintain replace.

Mr. Littlejohn stated I wanted to give you an idea of the quantity of the credit the mats were provided and what that retail cost would be if you went out to the market and we sold you credits. You would write a check to me. If I were doing this on the CDD on the east side of 95 or somewhere else and we had credits available and you wanted to get rid of the mats, you could write our company a check and I would transfer the credits and you could delete the mats for $588,000. That is the credit value, the nitrogen and phosphorous they are removing. It is a five-year payback period on purchasing credits to delete the mats at $100,000 a year. I want to give you

a sense of that impact on the total value deal, we are taking that right out of the top and paying you less because you are internally capturing the benefit.

Mr. Brown stared getting rid of the mats is going to save us in ten years at least $1 million.

Mr. Kilian stated it will save the Preserve homeowners $1 million. $12,000 for 99 years, what value is there for us?

Mr. Littlejohn stated by year 99 it is $75,000, that 2% escalator over 99 years, it is a big number at the end. We worked on a fair market value spreadsheet calculator on these lease deals with DOT and DOT requires they collect fair market value for the lease of their real estate. We had to go through their appraisal department to come up with a calculator to make this work and once we did that it is a standardized calculator for us to work with DOT. This being a public district, if you have bond documents requiring that you collect fair market value for any kind of revenue generated on District owned assets, if that is the case I want to assure you that this has passed muster at DOT.

Mr. Kilian asked is staff recommending that we adopt this and is there a severability clause or are we tied in for 99 years?

Mr. Brown stated I'm looking at the whole thing and we have a better system and we make money and we save $1 million. It's hard for me to say what's wrong with that.

Ms. Buchanan stated what's wrong with that is a good question to ask and I don't know that I have an answer. You will do the best assessment to come up with your cost benefit analysis. I don't know that there is another alternative that is going to allow you to get rid of the mats without out of pocket expense. I do think the $13,000 a year isn't going to do much to your budget one way or the other but it provides you with some revenue stream and takes away an issue that you were going to be spending money on a lot over the years. My reservation is that this is kind of new, but is the most new is this combination of getting the credits in exchange for the mats because it was difficult for me to separate the transactions but there are two transactions. One is you as a purchaser of credits and there is one as you as a seller of credits and to have assurances that when you apply the credits in lieu of the mat and you are done, check that box. I think that is a good answer.

Mr. Workowski stated we need to see a formal agreement.

Mr. McCommon stated we need to know what we are obligated to and when with the mat provider now.

Ms. Buchanan stated also a timeline. I don't think this is immediate, I think you have to commission the equipment.

Mr. Littlejohn stated we have a lease agreement in the packet. This lease agreement puts us together as the leaseholder of just the Grand Champion ponds. It is not the Phase B ponds, just the first project we want to do here. At that point as Brett mentioned we are going to go into design mode, bring back the full set of plans and specs for your District Engineer to review and we are going to go to the water management district and get a permit. Once we get a permit we will come back to you preconstruction if you want us to meet with your neighbors, if you want us to do a mockup, anything you want us to do before we go to construction. Once we do construction that is only three or four days, it is not a big, intensive activity and once that construction is complete you will have the credits at that point. We will take care of the permit process to delete the mats. The only cost to the District will be the physical removal of mats but we will handle the permit transaction and transferring the credits over.

Mr. Kilian stated I would like us to think through this some more and bring it back at the September meeting.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS **Consideration of Tri-Party Agreement with Indigo Holdings, Inc. and U.S. Bank Trust Company, N.A.**

Ms. Buchanan stated this tri-party agreement that relates to the foreclosure that we have been dealing with for years. Essentially, what the Trustee has requested is that the District authorize the establishment of a special purpose entity to own the property and then manage the property as well as negotiate the sale of the property with the understanding that once it is sold those moneys will be placed back into the trust estate as the recovery for the bondholders in lieu of the special assessments that were not collected. This is one of these things that in the past we noted as not our business if you want us to do it, we will do it. I wanted to give you a chance to review the agreement, walk through it, they are going to manage it, control the deal, make decisions. The one thing I will point out is they have requested that they be exempt from operation and maintenance assessments but instead request that we just do a funding request on a quarterly basis for any amounts that relate to that particular property. I don't think it is a significant portion of the budget given the way undeveloped lands are assessed. If the property is sold the SPE receives all the cash from the sale and it remits it back to the Trustee. It does require that the SPE operates

formally, has a budget that is going to be adopted every year, they are accountable to the bondholders and the Trustee funds that budget through the trust estate money, it is separate and apart from the operation and maintenance budget the District has.

> On MOTION by Mr. Brown seconded by Mr. Byrne with all in favor the tri-party agreement with Indigo Community Development District, Indigo Holdings, Inc. and U.S. Bank Trust company for parcels SW-26 and SW13A was approved.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS **Consideration of Conveyance of Common Elements**

This item was tabled.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS **Staff Reports**

A. District Counsel

There being no comments, the next item followed.

B. District Engineer

There being no comments, the next item followed.

C. District Manager

i. Approval of Fiscal Year 2026 Meeting Schedule

> On MOTION by Mr. Workowski seconded by Mr. Brown with all in favor the Fiscal Year 2026 meeting schedule was approved as amended to have all meetings at 1:00 p.m.

D. Field Operational Manager

i. Consideration of Annual Maintenance Service Agreement with Solitude Lake Management

> On MOTION by Mr. Workowski seconded by Mr. Kilian with all in favor the agreement with Solitude Lake Management for quarterly service in the total amount of $900 was approved.

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS **Financial Statements**

A copy of the financials was included in the agenda package.

ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS **Approval of Check Register – May-July**

On MOTION by Mr. Kilian seconded by Mr. McCommon with all in favor the check register was approved.

TWELFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS **Other Business**

There being no comments, the next item followed.

THIRTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS **Supervisors Requests and Public Comments**

Mr. Shackleford stated be careful on the bonds, because you can be bonded and nobody is going to warranty those pumps and equipment for 99 years so if this company goes broke in 20 years you are on the hook for the pumps. Being bonded and having maintenance bond is completely different.

Ms. Buchanan stated the equipment will not be owned by the District.

FOURTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS **Next Scheduled Meeting – September 24, 2025 at 1:00 p.m. at the Fairfield by Marriott Daytona Beach, 1820 Checkered Flag Boulevard, Daytona Beach, Florida**

Mr. LeBrun stated the next scheduled meeting is September 24, 2025 at 1:00 p.m. in the same location.

FIFTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS **Adjournment**

On MOTION by Mr. Workowski seconded by Mr. McCommon with all in favor the meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Signed by:
Jeremy LeBrun
665CD7AA7BB8455...
Secretary/Assistant Secretary

DocuSigned by:
Mark Mccommon
4912124A702E447...
Chairman/Vice Chairman