

MINUTES OF MEETING
NARCOOSEE
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

The regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Narcoossee Community Development District was held Tuesday, July 27, 2021 at 3:00 p.m. at the Offices of GMS-CF, LLC, 6200 Lee Vista Boulevard, Suite 300, Orlando, Florida.

Present and constituting a quorum were:

Jeffrey Smyk	Chairman
Steve Giercyk	Vice Chairman
Peter Wong	Assistant Secretary
Betsy Burgos	Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

Jason Showe	District Manager
Roy Van Wyk	District Attorney by telephone
Alyssa Willson	Hopping Green & Sams by telephone
Rey Malave	District Engineer by telephone
Alan Scheerer	Field Manager

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

Roll Call

Mr. Showe called the meeting to order and called the roll.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS

Public Comment Period

There being none, the next item followed.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS

Discussion of Letter Regarding District Counsel

Ms. Willson stated essentially Roy and the other named individuals in the letter have departed the Hopping Green & Sams law firm and have formed KE Law so in accordance with the Florida Bar rules we have to present you, as current clients of Hopping Green & Sams who have had legal services rendered by Roy, with your various options. Now it is up to you to elect which alternative presented in the letter you would like to proceed with.

Mr. Van Wyk stated we are obligated under the Florida Bar rules not to communicate with the client prior to you receiving that letter. That is the reason I have not discussed it with anybody in advance. The letter gives you a couple of options, it allows you to stay with Hopping Green & Sams or it allows you to move to the new law firm KE Law and that is the first decision to make as a group.

Mr. Smyk asked do we have an interim counsel until a certain date?

Ms. Willson stated until you make a decision your counsel is Hopping Green & Sams. You can make that decision today or at a future Board meeting. It is a decision of the Board so you can't really make that decision in between Board meetings.

Mr. Van Wyk stated it is a new firm and three of my partners from the firm and it would be the same services provided under the same amount of fees.

Mr. Wong asked what services would Hopping Green provide that KE Law being a new group would not be able to provide?

Ms. Willson stated you would have the continuity of services with me if you selected to stay with Hopping Green & Sams. Everyone in our practice is the same except for those individuals named. We still provide CDD and special District services. You have our litigation piece that is currently still with Hopping Green & Sams, our environmental expert attorneys. If you elect to go with KE Law Group, you would be served by the individuals listed on this letter.

Mr. Wong stated I came on the Board after the initial Board was in place for a number of years and when they handled the refinancing of the bonds. Knowing there was a period after the refinancing the rates have been very low, I brought this up with Jason and Roy and Roy was going to keep an eye on the interest rates and if the opportunity to refinance came up again that would be taken by him at Hopping Green & Sams. Will that still be the case with a different staff coming from Hopping Green?

Ms. Willson stated absolutely, we are always looking out for our clients' best interests, and we have a strong relationship with the various underwriters in the field and are always looking for ways to provide better financing options when the opportunity arises. You will still have those same services if you stay with Hopping Green & Sams.

Mr. Van Wyk stated we work well with all of the underwriters, and you would have those same services with the new firm. We did a refinancing not too long ago and those bonds are call protected and there is not much we can do. I have the same staff that I had before, there are six

lawyers that we have on staff now along with two paralegals that will start on Monday as is my former paralegal. Given my experience with the District, I have been there since 2003 I know the area well, I was down there yesterday.

Mr. Wong asked you have been with the CDD for a number of years. What do you see as differentiators based on your dealings with us that you would bring some value to the table?

Mr. Van Wyk stated the value I bring is the experience and knowledge of what is going on out there. I have known that District since day one, I have done a lot of work with the city, I have worked with the underwriter for many years. I bring experience and the ability to service the District as in the past with what I feel is a good quality service at the same rate I was charging at Hopping Green & Sams.

Mr. Smyk asked will you have an office located in Tallahassee?

Mr. Van Wyk stated yes.

Mr. Smyk stated with Hopping Green we have been getting the Capital Conversations and things of that nature concerning special Districts. Would that be continuing with the KE Law Group?

Mr. Van Wyk stated that is a good question. The partner that was preparing that for us, actually went with me and a couple other people to form this law group. She is with us and will be preparing that letter in the future I hope.

Ms. Willson stated Hopping will also continue to provide similar services with a different individual.

After discussion the Board took the following action.

On MOTION by Mr. Smyk seconded by Ms. Burgos with all in favor alternate 1 in HGS Letter was approved.

On MOTION by Ms. Burgos seconded by Mr. Smyk with all in favor the agreement with KE Law Group was approved.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Approval of the Minutes of the May 25, 2021 Meeting

On MOTION by Ms. Burgos seconded by Mr. Wong with all in favor the minutes of the May 25, 2021 meeting were approved as presented.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Public Hearing

On MOTION by Mr. Smyk seconded by Mr. Wong with all in favor the public hearing was opened.

A. Consideration of Resolution 2021-05 Adopting the Fiscal Year 2022 Budget and Relating to the Annual Appropriations

Mr. Showe stated Resolution 2021-05 adopts the Fiscal Year 2022 budget that has been updated to reflect the actuals, however the rest of it is the same. There are no assessment increases.

Ms. Burgos asked are you combining Ziani and Mirabella under LaVina?

Mr. Scheerer responded yes along with Capri and Solvino, there are four communities.

Mr. Showe stated what we call LaVina consists of all four communities.

Ms. Burgos stated you separate streetlights. Do you combine LaVina, Ziani and Mirabella and then separate the streetlights for Solvino and Capri?

Mr. Giercyk stated we pay our own streetlights.

Mr. Showe stated all four, Mirabella, Capri, Ziani and Solvino all pay the same base assessment so you split the same cost per home. Then in addition we add to Capri and Solvino their exact streetlight cost to their assessments. In Table 11 the base assessment for all homes there is \$473.15 for operations and maintenance. Then there is a street lighting supplemental assessment so Capri and Solvino get added on, Capri pays \$558.17 for operations whereas Mirabella and Ziani pay \$473.

Mr. Wong asked on the debt service assessment, how is that proportioned?

Mr. Showe stated a methodology was prepared when the bonds were issued that specified how those funds are collected. Your debt assessments are leveled at issuance.

Mr. Wong stated it is basically a fixed rate and that doesn't change.

Mr. Showe stated the debt service won't change unless there is a refinancing and it could go down.

Ms. Burgos stated none of the places from page 28 to 35 separate or talk about Ziani and Mirabella. Is there a way to say that LaVina includes those two communities? Can we put them there?

Mr. Showe stated on page 32, we can make that where it says LaVina as the heading and include the four communities for clarity.

Mr. Wong stated I think the proposed budget is fine in terms of where each community stands there is no problem. What I would like to bring up if for example Nona Preserve, the budget for Nona Preserve is on page 27.

Mr. Showe stated I will point out that 27 is only the operations and maintenance budget. They pay a portion of the admin and the two of those combined is what makes up that assessment.

Mr. Wong stated correct and that makes sense. Let's talk about the budget, which in this case it is the maintenance budget for each community, how much it costs each community to be maintained each year. In the case of Nona Preserve the budget is \$41,800 and the amount of assessment for that community on page 36 shows it is \$58,000. The assessment of \$58,000 covers the \$42,000 of the budget and then some and that is consistent throughout all the communities because we need to make sure the budget for each community is covered. The number varies from community to community and how much over the budget are we collecting in the assessment?

Mr. Giercyk stated I don't understand what you mean by over the budget.

Mr. Showe stated of that \$58,000, \$41,000 goes to the operations side the remaining \$17,000 is funding a portion of the admin, which is the \$110,000.

Mr. Wong stated as a gross estimate I'm looking at comparing the assessment to the maintenance budget, granted I'm leaving out the admin portion because we can put the assessment wherever we want it to be or what is reasonable, that is the topic I'm trying to bring up for discussion. Right now, Nona Preserve has a budget for maintenance of \$42,000 and the overall assessment including admin, but the over assessment is \$58,000. If you compare just the maintenance part of the budget to the overall assessment you have to flip an inverse number on top. If you look at it the other way, I'm trying to simplify the understanding. I understand the difference for the admin part of it. Let's pretend that the overall budget for maintenance and we are collecting \$48,000 from the Nona Preserve community. \$58,000 divided by \$42,000 that

means they are paying 39% more than their maintenance budget. Compare that to the LaVina communities it is 45% over the maintenance budget so you have 39% over for Nona Preserve, 45% for LaVina and 74% for NonaCrest. In a simplistic way we are saying that if the budget is \$42,000 and you are collecting \$58,000 then you are basically collecting 39% more than the budget in your assessment. The point is it is different for each community. My point is maybe we should think about it in the future to make that more in line with each other.

Mr. Giercyk stated I think what you are missing out of the whole equation is there are two parts to LaVina, Phase 1 and Phase 2 and the Phase 1 numbers are separated from the Phase 2 numbers and I think that is what you don't see at the moment. The four communities on Dowden Road are Phase 2.

Mr. Showe stated I can explain how the admin portion is calculated because I think that is the delta you are looking at. Because that is the difference between the \$42,000 and the \$58,000. The reason that is different for each community is because the admin portion is based on an ERU factor, which factors in the size of each individual home. As an example, the reason Lake Nona Preserve is smaller is because those are multi-family homes. When you go to the debt, they pay less on debt and we use that same factor for each of those properties to calculate the admin portion. You are comparing a townhome versus a 50- or 75-foot lot. That is why the allocations for NonaCrest and LaVina are larger. If the Board wants to change that allocation for next year's budget we can certainly look at other applications and we would work with counsel to make sure he is comfortable with the changes but it will require us to look at those properties in a different manner than we currently look at them.

Mr. Wong stated let me take a different tack. Let me step back to what motivated me into looking at the budget in a different way. I will point out that right now the maintenance budget for NonaCrest is almost identical to Nona Preserve. That caught my eye, one community is townhomes, one community is single-family. In terms of living units they are about the same in each case. I'm looking at it and saying, why is it that the same maintenance cost, the total budget for maintenance is the same for these two communities, being that they are somewhat different, a single-family versus a multi-family townhome unit. You could say there is a lot of common area perhaps.

Mr. Smyk stated this District is really only doing outside of the neighborhood so when you look at the frontage along Narcoossee Road that is maintained it is almost identical.

Mr. Scheerer stated we do have ponds inside as well that we maintain just like we do at NonaCrest.

Mr. Smyk stated inside the community NonaCrest HOA may be paying for the upkeep of the playground and pool and all this and the condos Nona Preserve would have different, but outside it is very similar. I'm not sure exactly where you are going, I can tell you when I first came on the Board almost 20 years ago, I had the same questions about things and to be honest it was just one giant budget and NonaCrest was the only community that was built out and I said we need to come up with a more equitable way to have these expenses divvied up. When someone is mowing open fields with a batwing, yet somebody has an actual landscape company providing services those things are charged accordingly. We did go through a process as well with the administration budget, that is where we went back to that same split as Jason said, it is a ratio dependent upon the number of units, the size of the unit. Even at the front of LaVina there is a different stipulation from the commercial property but that is what we did go through. I went through a lot to get it more equitable but I'm open if you think there is something that would need to be adjusted to reflect something.

Mr. Wong stated you made a good point. That answers a lot of my questions. We are talking about the outside of the community. The similarity in the budget makes a lot of sense. That addresses that point, but another point that I observed is the amount of the budget for irrigation compared to landscaping. It is a very high proportion. If you look at the financials, the actuals, NonaCrest year to date has paid 40% of their landscaping costs in irrigation repair, LaVina is 29% and Nona Preserve it is 28%. In all cases year to date it is over 25%. I don't know what comprises the irrigation repairs.

Mr. Scheerer stated let me explain to the Board that there were several main line breaks and valve failures and we have done steps at NonaCrest and other places to try to move the valves back. There is a cost associated with that. Your section as you know you has had a lot of construction going on up and down Dowden Road and it is only going to continue. The most recent was the gas line, the gas line guys have been very upfront and I had several meetings with them to try to help mitigate some of those expenses but the irrigation system is old too, you have old valves, old solenoids, old controllers and those things are going to fail from time to time and unfortunately, main line breaks are typically the most expensive portion of any repair we make or if you have a valve that is bleeding which means it is constantly letting water go through,

those valves can't always be repaired and they need to be replaced and those are relatively expensive. There is a lot of irrigation between Narcoossee Road, NonaCrest, Nona Preserve and especially the Dowden Road section. That is where a lot of that repair is coming from. We have all the backup if anybody wants to see it.

Mr. Showe stated they individually bill us so when they send a bill it will say NonaCrest irrigation repair. We don't split those charges; those are directly billed to each community.

Mr. Wong stated I see it and I see on the same day; they may charge different amounts.

Mr. Scheerer stated yes because they are doing their wet checks, they go through and do all the irrigation inspections and turn on all the stuff and whatever is outside the typical adjusting of nozzles and stuff like that we get billed for it.

Mr. Wong stated I will just summarize the data I observed so what you have done is explain what it was and if I bring that explanation to the table for your awareness, a significant part of the irrigation budget compared to landscaping is actually significant. It is on the order of 25%. When we move forward on this thing on landscaping you really need to add irrigation into consideration.

Mr. Scheerer stated it is considered based on historical data and everything we do. We can't foresee everything, but we do contemplate what may come up. When we go throughout the course of the 12 months to identify budget items we sit with accounting and District manager and staff, and we say this is where we have been historically and then that is what factors into the number we are using.

Mr. Smyk stated one other thing is I know when we had the discussion on changing our landscape provider about six years ago one of the big considerations was the old company was charging a lot more for irrigation repair and we did look into that and got a better rate on the irrigation repairs.

Mr. Scheerer stated plus they gave us 9% contract reduction over the course of three-years and kept the price the same going forward.

Mr. Smyk asked are you thinking that during this budget discussion we need to think about changing line items or irrigation repair or something?

Mr. Wong stated not that. Apparently, this is something you are aware of. It surprised me that irrigation repair is a quarter of landscaping. I thought that it would be relatively minor.

Mr. Showe stated you have to look at it in proportion. We have the larger properties where irrigation might be 10% but that is because there is so much more land to cover, the contract is so much bigger. In this case because they are breaking it down in such small portions one main line break might be 25% of your landscape contract.

Mr. Smyk stated eight years ago it would have been less because we wouldn't have had the failures. The infrastructure is old and things are changing. Hopefully we will get things repaired and two years down the road we will see it be a lot less.

Mr. Scheerer stated just for clarity everything along Narcoossee Road from the south end of the Tract D pond by the fire station all the way to Nona Preserve is a utility easement. Everything outside your wall is a utility easement and there is a bunch of utilities that run through that. You have some of the same problems down Dowden Road. We don't own the road, we don't own the median, we maintain the improvements but that is why you see the gas guy digging up sidewalks and directional boring, those are all utility easements. We are susceptible to not always being notified as to what is going on. There are a lot of different people who are working in the same areas we are fighting to maintain and keep costs down too.

Ms. Burgos stated they take into consideration in Nona Crest on irrigation repairs in the proposed budget for 2022, cutting repairs in half but LaVina we know there is a lot of construction they just increase it a little bit.

Mr. Wong stated this recognition that the irrigation repair is a sizable plug in the budget and the fact that this past year irrigation repairs have been high because the variances year to date most of it comes out of the irrigation repair. I'm just pointing out that this year is the year where we have some extra irrigation repairs and each community year to date is \$3,000 on average over budget. For the budget in 2022 only LaVina is staying about the same in repair cost and that is 27% of the landscaping but it is half that for the other two communities and maybe because it is on Narcoossee Road that you must have identified something that the current cost year to date \$7,000 but the budget next year is half of that. The same for Nona Preserve.

Mr. Scheerer stated we are hoping it is not going to keep reoccurring. Not to get off topic with this budget adoption, in NonaCrest and Nona Preserve a lot of those valves are between the road and the wall. What we have done over the course of the last year is relocate some of those. We can't do that in the medians on Dowden Road because it is an open median. Where we can move the valves we had those valves relocated in hopes that we are going to minimize the

amount of damage that is caused by whoever your cable provider is, whoever your phone provider is and whoever else is running up and down the gas line easement.

Mr. Wong stated looking at those numbers that stood out to me as being big numbers, now that you have explained it and that is what led me to look at the assessment compared to the budget of each community and there may be some inaccuracies in what I'm saying but in terms of gross metric in terms of conceptual what I'm seeing is that the Nona Preserve is paying 49% more than the budget in terms of assessment and then NonaCrest has the most you are paying 74% more and we are somewhere between LaVina at 45%. I may have to go back and rethink whether it makes sense so that is it more equitable for each community to say okay, maybe each community should be assessed 50% more than their maintenance budget so that you have the potential for the same amount of reserve moving forward. That was my point.

Mr. Showe stated we can certainly work with you and I will show you how we calculate that but again, none of your assessments are budgeted for reserves. The difference between what you see on that page for each individual section and what we fully assess is the portion that would go to admin. I will work with you and show you how we calculate the admin fee.

Mr. Giercyk stated you base each year's budget on the previous year and if you come out with the exact amount that should be assessed to each homeowner you already know and that is a good formula.

Mr. Showe stated in your budget we do work backwards a little bit because we take the Board's advice and if we are going to keep assessments level with your budget because you have the most complicated budget of any that we do because of the way it is broken out. We have a 1,700 home community that we go to next and they all pay the same assessment, it is not broken down by this neighborhood gets this and this neighborhood gets that, it is just split between all the homes.

Mr. Giercyk stated we could go back to the old way but one community would be a whole lot more than another.

Mr. Showe stated the point I was illustrating is that it is very complicated, there are a lot of calculations that you don't necessarily see in the budget that happen in the background to get you to those numbers. I will work with you to show you the background on this.

Mr. Wong stated I'm fine.

Mr. Showe stated we will note for purposes of the recording there are no members of the public here.

On MOTION by Mr. Smyk seconded by Mr. Giercyk with all in favor Resolution 2021-05 was approved as amended to add neighborhoods to the LaVina heading (LaVina, Mirabella, Ziani, Solvino on page 7 and update table on page 11 to correct years.

B. Consideration of Resolution 2021-06 Imposing Special Assessments and Certifying an Assessment Roll

Mr. Showe stated Resolution 2021-06 is the second part of your budget process. We will make the changes that the Board indicated on the budget and that final budget will be attached to Resolution 2021-06 as well as the spreadsheet that gets transmitted to the tax collector for inclusion in the tax bill that goes out in November.

Mr. Van Wyk stated I just wanted to point out for Mr. Wong this resolution in particular, Section 1 of this resolution on page 2, the Board is making specific findings regarding the benefit received by each parcel as identified on the assessment roll from the types of improvements that are being financed by the budget. If you will recall we did have a hearing a couple years back where we changed around the assessment methodology and the benefit calculation. This resolution confirms that benefit calculation and apportionment of the assessments to the various product types based on that calculation. I wanted to bring that to your attention so that you know that is actually in there.

Mr. Wong stated I'm totally convinced that there is a methodology, and it is precise and quantifiable. I was just pointing out from a qualitative perspective that each community tends to underspend each year and be able to put some of that into the reserve and I was using a gross metric to say, if we just look at the maintenance portion, which is a significant part of the budget and that is the only identifiable item in the budget then maybe we think about some evenness or something so it doesn't show up that NonaCrest pays the most above the budget. So, say every community start with 50% over their maintenance budget and this way depending on how each community spends efficiently then each will still come in with a different amount of reserves that they underspend. But at least they come from an equal starting point in their assessment level.

Mr. Van Wyk stated I think that is a great idea, that is exactly what you are supposed to do. That contemplation is what you are supposed to do each year. I think it would be a great

exercise for the Board and Jason to come back at a future date and prepare different options for apportioning the assessments and we can definitely look at which ones are different alternatives and which ones may be better or our calculations are sufficient. For the purposes of this year if we were going to make changes we would have to make those now because we are confirming a benefit allocation in this resolution.

Mr. Wong stated I'm perfectly happy with the current in terms of absolute dollars we have in each community and we are all doing well so I have no problem with the current proposed budget at all.

Ms. Burgos asked would we be working on those proposed change for 2023?

Mr. Showe stated I think we will work on that throughout the next year.

Mr. Smyk asked from GMS' perspective because I know you work off of our input and our community is neighborhood specific so would we need to start giving you anything at the first meeting?

Mr. Showe stated I will probably target the January meeting to look at starting the process. If you are going to change the allocation because of the calculations that go into this if you change those calculations what is going to happen is you still have to assess the same amount to cover the expenses. Somebody is going to go up and somebody is going to go down. Once somebody goes up we have to do the mailed notice process so we would want to start it early enough.

Mr. Wong stated you and I can work together so I can understand what the mechanisms are and I can think about how to combine what is actually done and only if it makes sense to add some ideas and there may be no modification because maybe messing with that is too much. It is not mutually exclusive, you could take the current methodology, maintain that and then if it makes sense to look from the perspective I'm looking at to say looking at the old reserve numbers and so on, does it make sense to increase or decrease or just leave things alone on top of the methodology that is another option but I would like to understand what mechanism then I can present that and my understanding of that.

Mr. Showe stated we will work on it.

On MOTION by Ms. Burgos seconded by Mr. Giercyk with all in favor Resolution 2021-06 was approved.

On MOTION by Mr. Wong seconded by Mr. Smyk with all in favor the public hearing was closed.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**Ratification of Proposals with All Terrain Tractor Service, Inc. for La Vina Stormwater Cut Backs**

Mr. Scheerer stated we have been dealing with some flooding issues in the Ziani community. The engineer's group went through the wetlands and recommended that we cut back the two outfall structures on that particular Tract C pond where we have some concerns and Tract A pond to the west of your entrance. This is the proposal we approved to cut and clear and remove all the vegetation as they come out. We have to take out a section of fence by the Tract C pond to the east in order to get the equipment in and there is funding for about 4,000 square feet of Bahia sod replacement once the work is done. We are looking at the middle of August and weather permitting it will take a week to ten days.

Mr. Giercyk asked should we consider putting in a gate for future use.

Mr. Scheerer stated we could, I haven't thought that far ahead, I'm just trying to get the water off the roads.

Mr. Giercyk stated initially a gate was supposed to go down there but somehow it got switched out.

Mr. Scheerer stated I don't think we have a need for it right now but if we do, we can put one in.

Mr. Wong asked are there future mitigation measures that you recommend?

Mr. Scheerer stated based on whatever the engineer provides in his report.

Mr. Showe stated after this the main thing is to make sure they keep it cut back.

Mr. Scheerer stated the only direction ever given was to keep the bleed down pipes exposed at the ends. There is a white PVC pipe that takes the water out. Now that the vegetation is coming out we may look to Applied Aquatic to give us a number to spray that on a quarterly basis. Once it is cut back we can move across the street to Mirabella. I don't think they have the same problem, I don't think Nona Preserve or NonaCrest have the same level. Maybe the Tract D pond by the fire station at NonaCrest, which is right now a staging area for whatever work they are doing along Narcoossee Road and that piece of property between the fire station and the wetland. That may need to be cut back at some point, but we will work with the Board moving forward.

On MOTION by Mr. Giercyk seconded by Ms. Burgos with all in favor the proposal from All Terrain Tractor Service, Inc. for La Vina in the amount of \$15,230 was ratified.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Staff Reports

A. Attorney

Mr. Van Wyk stated thank you for allowing me to continue to serve as your counsel. It has been a privilege and I appreciate the faith you have shown in me. We will continue to endeavor to do our best for you, we will continue to monitor what is going on in Tallahassee. We have quite a few clients who came with us, but we also have quite a few lawyers. About half the practice group left HGS and we started a new firm.

B. Engineer

Mr. Malave stated I just wanted to know if there any questions about street drainage and ownership and the CDD. I wanted to clarify that streets that are private, maintained and operated by the HOA it was given from the beginning everything inside the right of way would be both operated and maintained by the HOA. Anything that had to do with our ponds, major connects, outfalls the CDD owns are the ones that are responsible for operation and maintenance of those ponds. That is the declared definition. If there is a street that is public or owned by the CDD then we would have taken care of that. Most of the streets that are not owned by the HOA were given to the city and therefore, it is their issue. A case in point is in Ziani and Mirabella the streets are owned by the HOA, therefore, the CDD has no responsibility for it. I hope that clarifies the question that was being asked.

Mr. Scheerer stated that came from Jim Gregoire. He had asked me and I conveyed to him that the inlets in NonaCrest as well as Nona Preserve because the roads are private. I think there was a longstanding understanding that NonaCrest was the exception to the rule and based on some of the concerns that we are dealing with over in the Ziani community I had asked Rey whether or not NonaCrest was private and therefore under the responsibility of the HOA and he said yes. Basically, the four -private gated communities are up to the HOAs and I believe the streets in Capri and Solvino are City of Orlando.

Mr. Malave stated that is correct.

Mr. Scheerer stated the ponds are ours and the outfalls.
Mr. Malave left the telephone conference at this time.

C. Manager

i. Approval of Check Register

On MOTION by Ms. Burgos seconded by Mr. Smyk with all in favor the check register was approved.

ii. Balance Sheet and Income Statement

A copy of the balance sheet and income statement were included in the agenda package.

iii. Approval of Fiscal Year 2022 Meeting Schedule

On MOTION by Mr. Smyk seconded by Mr. Giercyk with all in favor meetings for Fiscal Year 2022 will be held on the following dates: November 16, 2021, January 25, 2022, March 22, 2022, May 24, 2022, July 26, 2022 and September 27, 2022.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Other Business

There being none, the next item followed.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Supervisors Requests

There being none, the next item followed.

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Next Meeting Date – September 28, 2021

Mr. Showe stated the next meeting is scheduled for September 28, 2021 at the same location.

On MOTION by Mr. Giercyk seconded by Ms. Burgos with all in favor the meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

July 27, 2021

Narcoossee CDD



Secretary/Assistant Secretary



Chairman/Vice Chairman