

**MINUTES OF MEETING
FIDDLER’S CREEK COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT #2**

The Board of Supervisors of the Fiddler’s Creek Community Development District #2 held a Regular Meeting on January 28, 2026 at 10:00 a.m., at the Fiddler’s Creek Club and Spa, 3470 Club Center Boulevard, Naples, Florida 34114.

Present:

Elliot Miller	Chair
Linda Viegas	Vice Chair
William Tomazin Jr.	Assistant Secretary
Scott Spitzer	Assistant Secretary
John Nuzzo	Assistant Secretary

Also present:

Chuck Adams	District Manager
Cleo Adams	District Manager
Tony Pires	District Counsel
John Baker III	District Engineer
Ryan Hennessey	Fiddler’s Creek Director of Community Services
Joe Parisi	Developer’s Representative
Jeff DeFranco	Fiddler’s Creek General Manager
Jody Benet	Fiddler’s Creek Irrigation Manager
Mike Barrow	GulfScapes Landscape Management (GulfScapes)
Robert Engler	Crystal Waterscapes
Monique Irmen	Mussorie Village President

Residents present:

George Bronsky	John Marsh	Marilyn Witcher	Bob Lynch
Nat Pappagallo	Sue Leone		

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

Call to Order/Roll Call

Mrs. Adams called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. All Supervisors were present.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS

Public Comments: Non-Agenda Items (3 minutes per speaker)

It was noted that comments pertaining to agenda items will be held and heard during the meeting.

Resident George Bronsky asked for an update on plans to replace knocked down speed signs on Championship Drive and Campanile Circle. Mrs. Adams stated that Championship Drive is a CDD #1 matter. She asked if he was referring to the 25 MPH sign on Campanile Circle that was knocked down over the holidays. Mr. Bronsky replied affirmatively. Mrs. Adams stated that an incident report was received and the contractor will install a temporary sign until the decorative sign is repaired.

Resident John Marsh, of 9475 Campanile Circle, reported a flooding and drainage issue at his house and stated that during heavy rain, water comes up from the drain onto his curb and his neighbors' curbs. Mr. Parisi stated the issue arose last month and Jack McKenna, of the County, and the engineers visited the area. During development, the County did not want the drainage pipe to go into the lake area; they wanted water to go into the littoral area. Over time, the grasses on the littoral shelf have overgrown and overwhelmed the pipe and drain boxes, limiting drainage; maintenance is needed. The engineer might recommend riprap or something else around the drains to alleviate the problem. The slope in the area is also an issue; water should have been directed the other way. Mark Minor is reviewing the situation with the County to come up with a solution.

Mr. Marsh stated there is always standing water in the drain box in front of his house, even when it does not rain. Mr. Parisi believes that it should disappear once the issues are addressed. Mr. Benet asked if Mr. Marsh is referring to the green drainage box at the curb. Mr. Marsh replied affirmatively. Mr. Benet stated that is the downspout exhaust that goes underground and comes out further away; it is at the lowest point of the drainpipe, and water will likely remain in the pipe year-round.

Resident Marilyn Witcher, of 9577 Campanile Circle, discussed drainage issues that she and others have raised for years. She would like to know what Grady Minor and the CDD are going to do. Mr. Parisi stated that is the matter that he just spoke about. He is waiting for the report from the County and Grady Minor. Mr. Miller asked Mr. Parisi to try to expedite a solution. Mr. Parisi stated working with the County takes time. He will keep residents posted.

Mr. Parisi was given contact information for Ms. Witcher and other affected residents.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS**Update: Superior Waterway Services, Inc.
Treatment Report**

The December 2025 Lake Treatment Report was included for informational purposes.

There were no questions.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Health, Safety and Environment Report (Ryan Hennessey)

Mr. Hennessey presented the PowerPoint and reported the following:

- Concerns related to irrigation and pressure washing, etc., can be emailed to Irrigation@Fiddlerscreek.com and Pressurewashing@Fiddlerscreek.com for staff response.
- Tree Canopy Trimming: Juniper finished trimming the palms and hardwoods on Championship Drive. They are working on the palms and hardwoods around the perimeter of Veneta and in Museo.

A. Irrigation and Pressure Washing Efforts

- Precipitation Data: In December 2025, average rainfall was .71", compared to 3.19" in December 2024.
- Yearly Rainfall Totals: 54.76" of rain was received in 2025, 2' less than the 78.93" of rainfall received in 2024.
- Irrigation Projected Usage: The villages had one rain hold, and common areas had no rain holds due to the lack of rain. Mr. Benet is dialing down the amount of irrigation to 60% to 65% by reducing the number of minutes it runs each scheduled day.

Mr. Miller asked if that is normal usage, given current rainfall conditions. Mr. Hennessey replied affirmatively.

- Total water usage in December 2024 was 61,311,165 gallons and, in December 2025 usage was 55,147,348 gallons.
- Pump Station Usage of 697,941,414 gallons is within the range of the totals for the last five years. Higher than all previous years but one, 710,633,000 in 2021, and has a variance of 620 to 710 million gallons annually. He estimates it will be over 700 million this year.
- Lake #88 Measurements: Lake #88 height was 1.725' last week and this week it is 1.55'. He stated that 1' is the warning height and .5' is the emergency level.

Mr. Baker stated that it is usually recommended to put the County on notice when the level reaches the 1' mark, and at the .5' mark the CDD should consider use of County water. Staff is monitoring the water levels.

- Pumphouse Station #1 is still working in a supportive role until it is fixed.
- Irrigation Report: There was a minor communication failure this month. There were no charges to CDD #2.
- Pressure Washing: Finished working in Aviamar and on Fiddler's Creek Parkway. Work will start in Oyster Harbor tomorrow. The map was updated this month.

B. Security and Safety Update

Mr. Hennessey reported the following:

- Gate Access Control: Both phone numbers are operational. Community Patrol's phone number is 239-231-9878, which should be called for assistance with security matters. In an emergency, 911 should be called first, followed by Community Patrol. The automated gatehouse number is 239-529-4139, which should be called to add vendors or visitors to the list. Information can also be emailed to safety@fiddlerscreek.com.
- Occupancy Report: Overall, the average weekly occupancy went from 1,757 in November to 1,664 in December. January looks like it will be about 2,200.
- Gatehouses and Patrols: Sandpiper, Championship, and the Main gatehouses are operational 24 hours a day, seven days a week. There are two patrols per shift, generally one patrol in CDD #1 and one in CDD #2.
- Gatehouse activity decreased from 77,758 in November to 72,333 in December. It looks like it will go up to 100,000 for January.
- Incidents: Most incidents stayed the same or went down this month compared to November. Open Garage Doors almost doubled.

Mr. Spitzer asked why parking incidents went down so much in the year-to-year comparison. Mr. Hennessey thinks it is due to more compliance.

- Speed Detection and Enforcement: The portable speed detection device was in use in problem areas. First-time offenders accounted for nine out of ten violations; they received written warnings. One was referred to the Fining Committee. 15 violations are expected in January. Year to year, 85% are one-time offenders, which indicates high compliance.
- Per the Collier County Sheriff's Office (CCSO), in December there were 51 extra patrols, 21 medical calls (not 17, as shown in the presentation), 13 accidental calls to 911 (hang-ups), 13 traffic stops, and 11 alarm calls.

Mr. Spitzer asked what constitutes a CCSO traffic stop. Mr. Hennessey stated it could be for speeding, going through stop signs, not wearing a seat belt, being on a cellphone, etc.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Developer's Report/Update

Mr. Parisi reported the following:

- Construction is ongoing in Building 13 in Dorado.
- The irrigation consultant came to a meeting yesterday. Hines Inc. is a new consultant company. Nate Hines, the owner, brought employees with him. They have locations in five different states.
- Mr. Cole was included in the seven staff members representing the CDDs.
- Hines Inc. representatives will attend CDD meetings and provide monthly updates.
- These consultants are not the installers; they will go out for bids for the construction pieces of the project, follow up on construction, and make sure the design is implemented before payment is made.
- Mr. Hines will meet bi-weekly with internal groups; he hopes to be able to provide an update at the next CDD meeting.

- **Discussion/Consideration of Renewal of Irrigation Maintenance Agreement**

Mr. Parisi stated that, during the CDD #1 meeting, the Agreement was discussed and the Board decided to obtain a bid from a third party.

Mr. Miller stated that, when he was made aware of the significant cost increase, he spoke with Joe Schmitt, the CDD #1 Chair, and agreed to request competitive bids.

Ms. Viegas raised two concerns with the Agreement with The Foundation. She stated that CDD #2 has been paying for an Assistant Manager who has not been hired for at least five years. She asked how the villages are charged for Mr. Benet's time.

Mr. Parisi stated that Mr. Benet does not really work in the villages; he primarily works with the main lines in the CDDs. Ms. Viegas noted that Mr. Benet assisted her village with an issue. Mr. Parisi stated that an assistant manager was hired. Ms. Viegas noted that the assistant manager only lasted for one month.

Mr. Tomazin noted that Mr. Benet has collaboratively assisted his village with issues. Mr. Parisi stated that, when The Foundation is on site, Mr. Benet is assisting.

Mr. Benet stated he looks at irrigation as one system, so he does help the villages because it helps the overall system.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Discussion/ Consideration of Moisture Management Proposal

Mr. Barrow discussed "Moisture Manager" which is a product that will help maintain the moisture in the turf. He stated it is necessary to get water somehow; the product relieves the stress of the drought. It is a granular product that is put down by a machine and pulls moisture out of the air, keeps the topsoil moist, and improves nutrient uptake of turf. A three-month application costs \$10,799.62. There is no charge to reapply if a hot spot occurs. He recommends it be applied in February and reapplied in three months, if necessary, for the same price, which should take us close to rainy season.

Ms. Viegas stated she asked for a breakdown of the cost, materials, and labor, but she has not received it yet. She asked how many communities he has treated and how successful the treatments have been. Mr. Barrow stated that he treated Grey Oaks four months ago and has not needed to reapply, with noticeable results. He also treated Mussorie village in Fiddler's a few weeks ago.

Mr. Nuzzo stated that as Mr. Adams noted in the CDD #1 meeting, the County might not have water to sell to the CDD. Mr. Barrow stated that this is not a fix all product, but it could help.

Mr. Benet stated, if the CDDs use this product and all the villages do not use it, water will still be used. All the villages would have to use it to have a real reduction in water usage.

Mr. Tomazin asked if Mr. Benet can reduce the water usage for the CDD areas only and keep it at the current level for the villages. Mr. Benet stated that would create a lot of problems because there are 65 controllers that connect to the system and 25 controllers in manual mode, all of which would have to be programmed. That is one of the main reasons they are doing the upgrade to the irrigation system.

Mr. Tomazin stated that Mr. Barrow does not service all the villages, so they need to understand what could happen. Mr. Miller thinks it is up to Mr. Barrow to meet with the other villages. Mr. Barrow stated after the CDD #1 meeting, three villages approached him for information on the product.

Mr. Spitzer asked Mr. Barrow if the amount he puts down follows what the manufacturer recommends. Mr. Barrow replied affirmatively; the product label is the maximum allowable by law; if he put down any more, it would be wasted and would make the situation worse.

On MOTION by Mr. Nuzzo and seconded by Mr. Tomazin, with all in favor, the GulfScapes Moisture Manager proposal, in the amount of \$10,799.62 per application, to be reapplied every three months or as needed, was approved.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Engineer's Report/Update: Bowman Company

• Consideration of Proposal No. 1 Site Development Services [Irrigation Coordination]

Mr. Baker stated that Mr. Pires reviewed the Agreement included in the agenda, and it will be revised to include Mr. Pires' revisions. The proposal does not increase the costs to the CDD or expand the Engineering budget; it merely breaks out the funding according to the tasks in the Bowman system and allows Bowman to generate invoices as the District Manager requested.

Mr. Pires stated that the document will be revised to be covered under the existing Agreement between the CDD and Bowman.

Mr. Adams stated that items outside General Engineering will be assigned to budget line items to reflect true project costs more accurately.

Mr. Pires stated the majority of the item in the agenda book is being replaced.

Ms. Viegas asked for confirmation that the invoices for each project will be separate so the \$35,000 of miscoding issues she found with the Bowman invoices last year will not be repeated. Mr. Baker confirmed that there will be separate invoices.

On MOTION by Mr. Tomazin and seconded by Mr. Nuzzo, with all in favor, Bowman Proposal No. 1 for Site Development Services related to Irrigation Coordination, in the amount of \$51,250, was approved.

• Consideration of Pointe South Roofing, Co. Proposal to Replace Double Door System on Pumphouse #2

Mr. Baker presented the Pointe South Roofing, Co. Proposal to replace the Double Door System on Pumphouse #2. The proposal's \$9,950 cost would be shared with CDD #1 paying 55% and CDD #2 paying 45%.

Ms. Viegas asked if this price is considered reasonable. There is no breakdown; it is a lump sum. Mr. Baker feels the proposal is reasonable.

On MOTION by Mr. Nuzzo and seconded by Mr. Tomazin, with all in favor, the Pointe South Roofing, Co. Proposal to Replace Double Door System on Pumphouse #2, in the amount of \$9,950 and subject to the cost share with CDD #1, was approved.

- **Consideration of American Infrastructure Services, Inc. Traffic Signal Change Order**

Mr. Baker stated this item did not make it into the agenda book. American Infrastructure Services, Inc. (AIS) will submit a change order regarding the quantity of items installed versus the items in the contract.

This item will be included on the next agenda.

Mr. Miller asked about the Halvorsen payments for the traffic signal. Mr. Adams believes the third payment was received; he will find out.

Mr. Adams stated the last \$50,000 payment will come when Bowman shows evidence that the final punch list items have been completed. Mr. Cole is following up on them.

Mr. Miller asked about the 7-ELEVEN payment and payments from other Developers.

Mr. Pires stated the County wants traffic information from Trebilcock. He needs to go to the County, and the engineer needs to certify it. Mr. Baker will follow up with Mr. Cole regarding this matter.

Mr. Pires stated that a demand cannot be prepared until final numbers are received.

This item will be included on the next agenda.

Mr. Nuzzo asked who approved the Change Order that AIS is going to be submitting. Mr. Baker does not know and will check with Mr. Cole. It was noted that Change Orders need to be submitted in writing and approved in advance.

Ms. Viegas read from last month's meeting minutes which reflect that Mr. Cole reported the traffic information had been accepted by the County, who approved the 24% contribution amount that 7-ELEVEN must pay towards the traffic signal. She believes the problem is that the County cannot send the letter requesting payment to 7-ELEVEN until the final amount is known

so that the 24% can be calculated. In last month's meeting, she recalled that Mr. Cole estimated it will take one to three months to complete the punch list items and come up with a final total.

Mr. Baker committed to finding out the final amount and the Change Order specifics for the next meeting.

Ms. Viegas asked for the status of the Pumphouse #1 bid documents since it is still not working at full capacity. Mr. Baker stated he spoke with Mr. Cole, and they are not receiving the documents they need from the architects. They are not responding, so Mr. Cole and Mr. Baker might reach out to another architect.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Consideration of Responses to Request for Proposals (RFP) for Annual Audit Services

A. Affidavit of Publication

B. RFP Package

These items were included for informational purposes.

C. Respondents

I. Carr, Riggs & Ingram

Bid \$16,500 for Fiscal Year 2025; additional fee with bonds not specified.

II. Grau & Associates

Bid \$15,000 for Fiscal Year 2025, \$15,300 for Fiscal Year 2026, and \$15,600 for Fiscal Year 2027, plus an additional \$1,500 with bond issuance.

III. McIntosh CPA

Bid \$4,500 for Fiscal Year 2025 and an additional \$100 annually for future fiscal years. If bonds are issued, the fee would be adjusted.

D. Competitive Selection Criteria/Ranking

Mr. Tomazin stated that, at the last meeting, it was decided that he would work with Mr. Adams on verbiage to include in the RFP. He asked that the half dozen firms that do all the Florida CDDs be invited to bid. He also asked that two larger firms be included. Even though he called those two firms directly to make them aware of the RFP they did not respond.

Mr. Tomazin requested in the RFP that the firms show their ability to execute the audit, explain their approach on internal control matters and address independence and safeguards against concentration risk. Concentration risk relates to the management firm managing

multiple CDDs and the auditor doing a lot of work with that Manager; in such cases there is an independence issue that has to be considered.

Mr. Tomazin stated that responses were received from two firms, and the third response was from a person who started their own firm but previously worked for one of the other bidders. He contacted the two larger firms. Only one, Grau & Associates (Grau), responded. Carr, Riggs & Ingram (CRI) did not respond to his phone calls.

Mr. Tomazin spoke with two people at Grau. He asked a lot of questions and raised the issue of concentration risk because Grau does a lot of work for Districts managed by Wrathell, Hunt and Associates, LLC, (WHA), the CDD's District Management firm. He found that it is difficult to separate the work. They do the audits for 60% of the CDDs in Florida. Grau told him that they believe CRI is stepping back from doing CDDs.

Mr. Tomazin felt that Grau was very open and honest. They outlined how they would manage the account and stated they would prefer not having such a late start on the audit. They also asked if Mr. Tomazin could be their point person on the Board.

Mr. Tomazin noted that Ms. Viegas distributed a three-page comparison of the bids that covered some of his comments about the bids. While CRI indicates that they are not a CPA firm on the front page of their bid, the subsidiary that would perform the audit is a CPA firm. He stated that most of Ms. McIntosh's experience was gained while she was a CPA at Grau.

Ms. Viegas reviewed her comparison, highlighting the following:

- Grau was the only firm that responded to all the items in the RFP.
- CRI gave a link to their most recent peer review reporting, which Ms. Viegas downloaded and read. The report noted that CRI had a deficiency. CRI was non-compliant with AS2401, which is Consideration of Fraud in a Financial Statement Audit.
- CRI did not give costs for Fiscal Years 2026 and 2027. Grau did. The costs were the same as their last bid in 2024.
- Grau states they have no prior relationship with WHA but then states they are currently the auditor for 87 WHA managed CDDs.

If the Board concurs, Ms. Viegas recommended adding language to the final agreement such that, if the winning bidder does not present the audit report at the May 2026 meeting, a 10% discount to the bid price will be applied. Mr. Miller asked why 10%. Ms. Viegas stated it was a number to start the discussion. Mr. Tomazin noted that it would have to specify that it

was the fault of the auditor and not the District Manager if documentation was not delivered to the auditor in a timely manner.

Mr. Adams believes that similar language was included in a prior agreement with a prior firm when they did the audits. He will check and see what amount was used in that agreement. The Board concurred with Ms. Viegas’ recommendation to include language regarding a discount if the report is not delivered on time. Mr. Adams and Mr. Pires will make sure the appropriate language is included.

Ms. Viegas asked Mr. Spitzer if he had any dealings with Ben Steets from Grau since the bid states he serves the Winding Cypress CDD, where Mr. Spitzer stated he was on the CDD Board. Mr. Spitzer stated he did not, and that Mr. Steets also serves Verona Walk. Ms. Viegas noted that the Grau proposal includes misspellings and typos.

E. Award of Contract

Each Board Member handed their completed Auditor Evaluation Matrix to Mrs. Adams to tally.

This item resumed following the Ninth Order of Business.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Continued Discussion: Internal Control Related Matters

A. Update: Internal Controls Report

Mr. Adams recalled that he agreed to prepare a written report at the last meeting; however, after reviewing the Resolution, it does not define that a written report is required or when it is due. Mr. Pinder is working on it now. Internal controls are reviewed on an ongoing basis and, wherever weaknesses are found, adjustments are made, but, while there is no Statutory requirement to prepare a report, one is being prepared now. Mr. Adams hopes to have the report by the next meeting.

In response to Mr. Miller’s question, Mr. Adams stated the chance of getting the report done for the February meeting is between 60% and 75%. All the audits are being reviewed now so the accounting department is very busy. It was noted that the report needs to be as robust as possible. Mr. Adams stated that they will be in contact with Mr. Tomazin.

Mr. Tomazin thinks the Board needs to revisit the Resolution to make sure the language is clear that an annual assessment report is required. He does not see how something was not

written down regarding internal controls throughout the year. In his opinion, if a claim is made against the District, it would need to have the internal controls assessment documented.

Mr. Pires agreed that, if there is no language about the requirement for a written report, it needs to be added. Mr. Adams thinks the report should be done at the same time as the audit. Mr. Tomazin thinks the report should be done before and shared with the auditor.

Mr. Spitzer asked Mr. Tomazin if he will redraft the Resolution. Mr. Tomazin stated, since it is in the agenda book, everyone should read it and discuss their thoughts at next month's meeting.

Ms. Viegas stated that she has had several concerns about internal controls throughout the years, including the most recent miscoding errors of \$35,000 related to the Bowman invoices. In her discussion and emails with Mr. Pinder she has been frustrated with what she thinks is a "so what" attitude. In her opinion, Mr. Pinder thinks the miscoding did not result in a loss because the account was reconciled, so nothing bad happened. She stated if she had not found the issues it would not have been done. Since there have been so many errors found in previous years in various statements and audits, Ms. Viegas is concerned about what else could be wrong. She believes Mr. Tomazin feels the same way in his dealings with Mr. Pinder regarding the audit. Mr. Tomazin confirmed that he feels the same frustration.

▪ **Award of Contract**

Discussion of this item, previously Item 8E, resumed.

Mrs. Adams tallied the Board Members' individual Auditor Evaluation Matrix scores. The total scores and ranking, were as follows:

#1	Grau & Associates	476 points
#2	Carr, Riggs & Ingram	228 points
#3	McIntosh CPA	95 points

The Audit Selection Committee recommendation is to rank Grau & Associates as the #1 ranked respondent to the RFP for Annual Audit Services.

On MOTION by Mr. Tomazin and seconded by Mr. Nuzzo, with all in favor, authorizing the negotiation of an Engagement Letter with Grau & Associates, the #1 ranked respondent to the RFP for Annual Audit Services, and including the additional language Ms. Viegas recommended regarding the discount, was approved.

Mr. Tomazin stated that Grau committed to keeping him informed during the audit. Calls will be held with Mr. Pinder's team and Mr. Tomazin will be involved.

Mr. Pires stated that information and Mr. Tomazin's role as the liaison for the Board should be included in the Engagement Letter.

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**Discussion: Drainage Issues in Easement
[9504 and 9508 Mussorie Ct]**

Mussorie Village President Monique Irmen reviewed a letter she sent to the Board regarding latent grading and drainage issues in the CDD drainage easement between 9504 and 9508 Mussorie Court. Erosion is occurring and homes are losing sod. She is asking CDD #2 to either re-grade the areas, which would also require resodding and repairs to the irrigation lines, or install drains and piping to evacuate the water to the lake and to the road so that it can run into the storm drains. She asked Mr. Barrow to confirm the issue. He did confirm and submitted a proposal to add drains to the area for \$3,524.

Ms. Irmen believes the Developer is at fault, but the issue is in a CDD #2 drainage easement. Mr. Baker stated that he looked at it a few weeks ago when the comment was received. He needs to re-review the matter, but his understanding is that this is a drainage easement for the CDD. Mr. Pires asked if it is a latent defect and if it is tied to the underground pipes. Mr. Adams stated, if it is a surface issue, it is the responsibility of the adjacent homeowners. Two downspouts go into that area, so it is most likely a surface issue. Mrs. Adams stated the CDD is not responsible for surface areas; rather, the CDD is responsible for what is underneath. If they do not have proper drainage, they will have a washout when it rains.

Mr. Pires asked if the system is designed to have it flow to the drainage easement on the surface, or if it is subsurface drainage. Mr. Adams voiced his opinion that it appears to be subsurface drainage. Mr. Baker stated that an inspector will be sent. If there are no issues with underground drainage pipes, it is not the CDD's responsibility.

Ms. Irmen asked if permission is needed to deal with anything above the underground pipes. Mr. Adams stated it is not necessary because Mussorie owns the property for which the CDD has an easement to allow for its concrete pipe below the surface. The CDD will confirm that there is no leak inside its pipe that is causing soil to erode down into the pipe.

Mr. Pires suggested that the District Engineer can confirm that the surface can be regraded so that it does not interfere with the CDD's drainage easement.

Mr. Baker stated that he will present findings at the next meeting.

Mr. Miller stated that, if the CDD's pipe is not the cause, Mussorie will be billed for the Engineering costs. Ms. Viegas stated, if Ms. Irmien believes the Developer is at fault, she can speak to Mr. Parisi.

ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**Continued Discussion: Wall Bordering Museo Circle**

- **Consideration of GulfScapes Landscape Management Services Proposal #5149**

Ms. Viegas stated the proposal was identical to the one in the last agenda for \$9,640. A proposal from Coastal to remove sections of the wall was supposed to be obtained. Precast by Design submitted a proposal for \$4,500 per section to repair the wall. Mr. Baker stated he was obtaining a proposal from Coastal to remove the wall sections, but they asked questions about the number of sections to be removed because there are other areas in need of repair. Coastal stated they would charge \$1,000 per section of the wall for removal.

Mr. Baker asked the Board if they want to remove the sections that were initially noted as being in need of repair, the 53 sections Coastal says need repairs, or the entire wall. He does not have a price for removal of the wall yet. He asked if the Board's intent is to remove the entire wall, or just remove the sections that are in disrepair and replace them with landscaping.

Mr. Tomazin stated several areas are in disrepair, but only two were brought to the Board's attention by residents. He thinks there was confusion about what is behind the wall and what needs to be done.

Mr. Baker asked how the Board would like to proceed. He asked if the 53 sections that were identified as in need of repair should be repaired or if the Board wants to remove the entire wall and replace it with a solid landscaping buffer, or if the Board wants to remove the 53 individual damaged sections of wall, or just those sections that residents complained about.

Ms. Viegas stated that the three bids obtained differ greatly in price, depending on how much of the wall is addressed and how it is addressed.

Discussion ensued regarding the cost, the bids, and the necessary scope of work.

Mr. Baker noted that the Coastal bid of \$1,000 per section of wall does not include removal and replacement of landscaping that must be removed to access the wall. Mrs. Adams noted that Mr. Barrow bid \$9,600 to remove and replace the landscaping. Ms. Viegas recalled that Precast bid \$4,500 per section to repair the wall.

The Board agreed that only the two sections of the wall that were raised by residents behind 9283 and 9287 Museo Circle should be removed.

On MOTION by Mr. Miller and seconded by Mr. Tomazin, with all in favor, the Coastal proposal to remove two sections of wall, in a not-to-exceed amount of \$2,000, was approved.

TWELFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Continued Discussion: Irrigation Action Items

Ms. Viegas noted that this report is identical to the report in the October agenda and asked why it was included again.

Mr. Adams stated the first two items are included in the budget. Ms. Viegas agreed and asked what the Board needs to do with this report that does not have any changes.

It was agreed that the report was included for informational purposes.

THIRTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Discussion: CDD #1 Front Entrance Pavilion Renovations Project

Mr. Parisi stated that this CDD #1 issue was included in the agenda for informational purposes because CDD #2 residents use the front entrance. CDD #1 requested that it be put out to bid due to the \$196,460.99 price.

FOURTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Update/ Fountains: Crystal WaterScapes (Robert Engler)

Resident Bob Lynch asked to speak. He thanked the Board for approving all the work done on the Veneta fountain. He stated that he sent the Board a current condition report. He thinks the water looks crystal clear; chemicals and jets look good. The only issue he sees on the Veneta fountain is that one pump is down in the upper basin and one section of the lights is out. The fountain has also been on 24/7.

Mrs. Adams stated that Mr. Lynch's report was sent to Mr. Engler.

Mr. Engler stated he did not know a section of the lights was out. He will look at the section. It could be a power supply issue.

Mrs. Adams asked about the five bulbs that were supposed to be addressed. Mr. Engler did not recall them; he will inspect the area and provide a proposal.

Ms. Viegas asked for an Aviamar fountain update. Mr. Engler reported that the water level has gone down, so there appears to be another leak that is impacting rings 1 and 3. They are digging to find the leak.

Ms. Viegas stated the Aviamar fountain had been on 24/7 for a period of time. It was noted that electrical costs might go up. The scheduled hours are 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.

Ms. Viegas asked Mr. Engler to explain how the Aviamar fountain is supposed to work. She showed a photo of how the fountain used to look when it was working, which is full and up all the time. Mr. Engler stated the specifications of the fountain make it go up and down constantly. Ms. Viegas asked if that meant all the way down, so it looks off. Mr. Engler stated no. Ms. Viegas noted that the jets are so low it looks like the fountain is completely off from the road. She heard several complaints from Aviamar residents that they do not like the fountain going off and on so much and would like to see it up and full. Only one resident commented that they like the up and down. Mr. Engler stated the mechanics to make it go up and down cost a lot of money when it was built.

Discussion ensued.

Mrs. Adams stated she can look at the specs to see how it was supposed to look. Ms. Viegas stated, in the 13 years she has lived in Aviamar, it never went up and down like it is doing now. Whatever the specs say is fine and, when residents question it, she can say it is working the way it is supposed to work. She asked Mr. Engler why the fountain was up 24/7 after it was turned back on. She reported it to Mrs. Adams after residents made her aware of it. After she notified Mrs. Adams, the fountain went off overnight as it is supposed to. She was concerned about increased cost to keep it on and wear and tear on the fountain pumps, etc.

Mr. Engler stated that the fountain would have minimal impact being on 24/7. He also had no idea how it could be on 24/7 and questioned the residents who reported it. Mrs. Adams stated that she sent an email to Mr. Engler and did not receive a response.

Mr. Spitzer asked for an update on the Oyster Harbor fountain. Mr. Engler stated the pump is on order; he is waiting for it to arrive.

Resident Nat Pappagallo asked if the Oyster Harbor fountain is supposed to go up and down. Mr. Engler stated it is not. Mr. Pappagallo thinks that is good.

Mr. Lynch asked if the 20HP pump was ordered for the Veneta fountain. Mrs. Adams stated that no proposal was submitted. Mr. Engler and Mr. Lynch discussed the issue; Mr. Engler cannot get parts for the current pump; it will be replaced but it is not considered necessary.

FIFTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Continued Discussion: Existing Sign Inserts

- **Consideration of Lykins Signtek Quote 100401 [Replace/Install New Street Signage/Inserts]**

Ms. Viegas recalled this proposal was originally \$6,410. After her research and pushback on much of the work, which she believes was not necessary, the cost is now \$3,460. That is a savings of \$2,950. Ms. Viegas stated she agrees with this final proposal.

On MOTION by Ms. Viegas and seconded by Mr. Nuzzo, with all in favor, Lykins Signtek Quote 100401 to replace/install new street signage/inserts, in a not-to-exceed amount of \$3,460, was approved.

SIXTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Acceptance of Unaudited Financial Statements as of December 31, 2025

- A. Fiscal Year 2025 Fountains Summary Report/Breakdown**
- B. Fiscal Year 2026 Fountains Summary Report/Breakdown (Year to Date)**

These items were in the agenda. Ms. Viegas stated that she sent corrections and suggestions to Mrs. Adams before the meeting. Mrs. Adams distributed a corrected report before the meeting.

Mr. Tomazin asked about the "Due From" amounts on the Balance Sheet. Mr. Adams stated they are the off-roll debt service billed assessments. They are billed the month before they are due then paid the next month.

Mr. Adams stated that, thanks to homeowners paying their assessments early to get the discount, there is \$2,000,000 in cash. He will transfer \$500,000 to the Synovus Money Market

account. In response to Mr. Miller’s question, Mr. Adams thinks the current interest rate is 3.4%.

The financials were accepted.

SEVENTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Approval of December 10, 2025 Regular Meeting Minutes

Ms. Viegas referred to Lines 138, 139, 155 and 156. She asked Mr. Adams about the forms the lines stated he was supposed to send to the Board after adding verbiage and making changes. Mr. Adams stated he made the edits and will email the final versions to the Board.

The following changes were made:

Line 168: Insert “Mr.” before “Spitzer”

Line 443: Change “mechanics” to “mechanicals”

Lines 507 and 510: Change “COSI” to “COSO”

Line 511: Change “GAAP” to “Government Auditing”

Line 637: After “approved.” insert “subject to final Board approval”

Line 657: Change “Member” to “Members”

On MOTION by Mr. Miller and seconded by Mr. Tomazin, with all in favor, the December 10, 2025 Regular Meeting Minutes, as amended, were approved.

EIGHTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Action/Agenda or Completed Items

This item was not reviewed or discussed.

NINETEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Staff Reports

A. District Counsel: Woodward, Pires and Lombardo, P.A.

- **Consideration of Limited Easement and Right of Way Use Agreement with Amaranda Village Association, Inc**

Mr. Pires stated the attorney for Amaranda asked for this to be tabled because he was unable to attend today’s meeting. The item will be added to the next agenda.

Mr. Pires had nothing else to report.

B. District Manager: Wrathell, Hunt and Associates, LLC

- **NEXT MEETING DATE: February 25, 2026 at 10:00 AM**
 - **QUORUM CHECK**

Supervisors Miller, Viegas, Nuzzo and Spitzer confirmed their attendance at the February 25, 2026 meeting. Supervisor Tomazin will attend via telephone.

C. Operations Manager: Wrathell, Hunt and Associates, LLC

The Operations Report was not included in the agenda.

This item was not discussed.

TWENTIETH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Supervisors' Comments

Ms. Viegas stated that Mr. Baker found a contact for Miromar Lakes Beach & Golf Club with the fountain similar to the Veneta fountain that she showed at the last meeting. She will give the contact information to Mrs. Adams so she can follow up.

Ms. Viegas asked Mrs. Adams for the status of the pole painting by Florida Painters. Mrs. Adams stated that all the posts were painted. They owe the CDD one 25 MPH sign, which had been removed for repairs.

Ms. Viegas asked Mrs. Adams if she heard from Trimmers regarding extending its contract for the holiday lighting on the palms at the Sandpiper entrance for three more years at the same price. Mrs. Adams stated that she did not. She followed up once and will do so again.

TWENTY-FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

Adjournment

On MOTION by Mr. Miller and seconded by Mr. Nuzzo, with all in favor, the meeting adjourned at 11:46 a.m.

[SIGNATURES APPEAR ON THE FOLLOWING PAGE]



Secretary/Assistant Secretary



Chair/Vice Chair