

1 **\MINUTES OF MEETING**

2 **WATERLEAF**

3 **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT**

4 The Regular Meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Waterleaf Community Development
5 District was held on Monday, December 13, 2021 at 6:00 p.m. at The Alley at Southshore Bay, 10221 Big
6 Bend Road, Riverview, Florida 33578.

7 **FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS – Roll Call**

8 Mr. Krause called the meeting to order and conducted roll call.

9 Present and constituting a quorum were:

10 Bob Neal	Board Supervisor, Chairman
11 John Daux	Board Supervisor, Assistant Secretary
12 Rebecca Smith	Board Supervisor, Assistant Secretary
13 Bob Crespo	Board Supervisor, Assistant Secretary

14 Also present were:

15 Larry Krause	District Manager, DPFG Management & Consulting
16 Neysa Borkert	District Counsel, Garganese, Weiss, D'Agresta & Salzman
17 Tonja Stewart (<i>via phone</i>)	District Engineer, Stantec
18 Steve Stafford	Artemis/Breeze

19 *The following is a summary of the discussions and actions taken at the December 13, 2021 Waterleaf CDD*
20 *Board of Supervisors Regular Meeting.*

21 **SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS – Pledge of Allegiance**

22 The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

23 **THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS – Audience Comments**

24 There being none, the next item followed.

25 **FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS – Business Matters**

26 A. Old Business

27 1. Exhibit 2: Discussion of Update on Curb Staining at 12027 Cinnamon Fern Dr.

28 Ms. Borkert stated that a letter had been sent to the property owner on November 30, but
29 that neither the District Manager nor Mr. Stafford had received a response. Ms. Borkert
30 stated that the homeowner had until the end of December to respond, and suggested
31 checking in before the next meeting in order to determine whether a second letter had to
32 be sent. Discussion of this item was tabled to the next meeting pending review of the
33 property.

34 2. Exhibit 3: Discussion of Update on CDD Property Erosion at 13330 Waterleaf Garden
35 Circle – *Proposal to repair property*

36 Mr. Neal recalled that the Board had discussed working with an irrigation consultant at the
37 previous meeting to confirm the root cause of the erosion. Mr. Stafford indicated that
38 Brightview had confirmed that a broken sprinkler had caused the erosion.

39 Mr. Krause stated that he had checked with the resident who advised that she fixed the
40 problem. He noted that the problem did not appear to actually be fixed based off the photos.

Mr. Neal recalled at the previous meeting the Board had discussed charging the property owner \$500.00 for the repairs but added that the repairs had ended up costing \$4,269.00. The Board and staff discussed the high price of the repairs. Mr. Stafford additionally noted that the resident had requested that a seawall be installed.

Mr. Stafford indicated that the resident appeared to be under the impression that the Board would pay for the repairs and that she would not be charged for the damage.

Mr. Neal inquired about the sprinkler head included in the photos. Mr. Stafford explained that it was broken, potentially by the fence installation.

Mr. Stafford pointed out the grass in one of the photos and stated that he did not think the issue had been fixed, as the grass was still dying.

The Board agreed that the resident should be responsible for the damages, as it was her irrigation leak that had caused the erosion. Mr. Neal expressed that he felt the cost was not reasonable and requested Mr. Stafford to speak with John Cornelius about reviewing the quote.

Mr. Stafford suggested that the Board decide on a maximum amount they were willing to pay for the repairs. Mr. Daux asked if the Board could get a quote from another contractor. Mr. Stafford explained that splitting up installation and ongoing maintenance work between different vendors was often unsuccessful in his experience.

The Board and staff discussed the large amount of sod detailed in the quote. Mr. Neal indicated that he suspected this was an error, as it appeared to be far too much sod for the area. He added that the Board had not wanted to encompass the entirety of the yard with sod but to focus on the drain pipe area.

Mr. Neal made a motion to proceed with the repair of the pond erosion, not to exceed the amount discussed, and added that Mr. Stafford would work with Mr. Cornelius to further qualify and quantify the scope of work and cost. The motion included the stipulation that, with Board consensus, Supervisor Daux would provide onsite advisement.

Ms. Smith asked if this would be billed back to the property owner. Mr. Neal indicated that this would be discussed after the repairs were made.

On a MOTION by Mr. Neal, SECONDED by Mr. Crespo, WITH ALL IN FAVOR, the Board approved proceeding with repair of property erosion at 13330 Waterleaf Garden Circle, in an amount not to exceed \$4,269.00, for the Waterleaf Community Development District.

Following the motion, Ms. Smith expressed concerns about the resident not paying for the repairs. Ms. Borkert explained that the Board could file a claim in small claims court. She recommended sending the resident a letter with the invoice explaining how she had been found responsible for the damage. Mr. Neal suggested giving the resident the option of attending the next Board meeting.

Ms. Borkert noted that the Board could negotiate with the resident and agree to accept a lower amount of money at their discretion. Ms. Smith pointed out that residents causing damage had been a frequent issue in the District and expressed it was unfair to the overall community that the District had to pay for repairs.

Ms. Borkert reminded the Board that they were more like a city than an HOA and that CDDs did not have lien rights. She suggested that once the invoice was issued to the CDD to provide the invoice to her so that she could work on a draft letter to bring to the next meeting.

Mr. Neal indicated that he would like to deal with this matter as soon as possible and stated that he would like to get a commitment from BrightView for the date they would be able to complete the repairs by.

Mr. Daux added that if the homeowner had addressed the problem to begin with that it would not be as big of an issue as it was now.

Mr. Neal asked for confirmation that the Board would be charging the homeowner for the repairs. The Board confirmed that this was what was agreed upon.

Mr. Neal inquired about whether Mr. Krause should inform the resident that she would be expected to pay for the repairs. Ms. Borkert stated that this would be up to the Board's discretion. Discussion ensued regarding how much the resident should pay. Mr. Krause indicated that he would draft an email to the resident about the cost of repairs.

3. Exhibit 1: Presentation & Discussion of Maintenance Map from District Engineer

This item, originally item A1 on the Fourth Order of Business, Business Matters, was presented out of order.

Ms. Stewart presented the maintenance map and requested feedback from the Board in order to finalize the map. Mr. Crespo requested clarification on whether this was CDD property. Ms. Stewart confirmed that it was and explained that there were 2 maps. She stated that the ownership map had been finalized.

Mr. Neal asked if the areas in green on the map were to be maintained as a landscape or grass area. Ms. Stewart stated that the green areas represented wetlands. Mr. Neal inquired as to why the wetland area behind Waterleaf Garden Circle had not been colored in. Ms. Stewart reminded the Board that this was a draft and explained that she had been waiting from information from the Board regarding who owned what property to finalize the map. Ms. Stewart additionally asked if residents mowed the pond banks in their backyards.

Mr. Neal stated that he had not been aware of any discussion with the HOA regarding property ownership or maintenance and confirmed that this was all CDD property. He indicated that Brightview maintained the pond banks. He clarified that the HOA was responsible for the Freedom Homes in addition to the gates to the HOA's community.

Ms. Stewart pointed out that the CDD may own the right of way by the gates, in which case they should be maintained by the District. Ms. Borkert stated that she would research to see if there was an agreement in place. Ms. Stewart added that she would look into this matter as well.

Mr. Daux asked Ms. Stewart if she was aware of when the last survey was done to identify where the land ended behind Waterleaf Garden Circle. Ms. Borkert stated that the yellow area on the map was drainage spillway and had no maintenance responsibility. Ms. Stewart clarified that there was a series of swales and conveyance systems in this area in addition to an easement. She noted that easements would be added to the map.

Mr. Neal requested that the maintenance map be modified to more clearly convey what needs to be maintained and what needed to be left alone, specifically for Waterleaf Garden Circle. He pointed out 2 pond areas that needed to be retained as a retention area.

Ms. Borkert asked if there was any requirement to remove invasive exotics within the wetlands. Ms. Stewart stated that there was not to her knowledge. She noted that there was recruitment of invasive vegetation within the wetlands and recommended doing wetland buffer management in the future.

Mr. Stafford asked if there would be a penalty if vegetation in the wetlands that was not supposed to be maintained was mistakenly cut. Ms. Stewart recommended hiring an appropriate professional environmental scientist that would know what should not be cut

In response to a question from Mr. Neal, Ms. Stewart indicated that the wetland line was where the CDD would have jurisdiction. Mr. Neal requested that Ms. Stewart update the map to clarify what the Board was permitted to maintain, particularly for the lower Southwest section of the map. Mr. Neal additionally noted that a trail was not represented on the map and suggested updating the boundary lines by Pond 20 and Pond V to extend about 10 feet further to the West. He added that the boardwalk and bridges should be included as well. Mr. Neal also asked Ms. Stewart to use numbers for all of the ponds instead of letters.

Mr. Daux requested clarification on Waterleaf LLC. Mr. Neal explained that Waterleaf LLC is the developer and explained that it was separate from the CDD.

Ms. Borkert asked why the brown area showing Waterleaf LLC property was included on the map. Ms. Stewart stated that the boundary of the District had appeared to include this area. Ms. Borkert indicated that she would forward Ms. Stewart the research she had conducted on this property for the map to be updated accordingly.

4. Consideration of Fountain Renovation & Painting Proposals

Mr. Stafford informed the Board that the bubblers were going to be installed in the bigger pool. He distributed copies of the proposals to the Board and stated that the renovation and painting work could not begin until March due to the vendor being booked. He reviewed the details of the proposal, noting that there would be a waterfall over the word "Waterleaf" and presented multiple options for placement. Discussion regarding the sconces ensued.

Mr. Neal stated that he would like for the waterspouts to come out of the columns and asked how wide the signs was. Mr. Stafford indicated that he did not know at this time. Mr. Stafford noted that the water would splash from the height Mr. Neal had suggested.

Mr. Daux asked what the column would look like. Mr. Stafford indicated that the column would be fairly basic and square. Mr. Daux agreed that having the sconces come out of the columns would be too close to the edge.

In response to a question from Mr. Daux, Mr. Stafford stated that the columns would be about 10 to 12 inches from the wall out. Mr. Daux suggested widening the columns.

Mr. Daux inquired about lights for the sign. Mr. Stafford stated that he called for 4 lights for the pool to illuminate the water and the wall. He indicated that he would get the measurements for the project laid out.

Mr. Neal expressed that he would like to have something on top of the columns. Mr. Stafford indicated that he did not think this would be necessary.

Ms. Smith asked if colors had been decided on. Mr. Stafford suggested adding sparkle but not reflection to the wall. He asked if the Board would like to bronze or paint the letters. Ms. Smith volunteered to lead a group of residents to pick colors for the sign.

Mr. Stafford noted that the price should stay about the same with the changes the Board discussed.

The Board agreed that Ms. Smith would be responsible for color selection and for Mr. Stafford to update the verbiage of the proposal to reflect the Board's requested changes for the dimensions of the columns. Ms. Borkert suggested using the boilerplate agreement and

noted that the attached invoice must include details. Mr. Neal pointed out that the District had \$3,300.00 in reserve for the painting.

5. Discussion of Bridge Rail Painting & Cleaning Update

Mr. Stafford stated that he had been in contact with Fireman Tom's Pressure Washing, which had come back to agree to the terms in an email regarding the condition of the bridges. Mr. Stafford noted that Mr. Lee had not gotten back to him since they had originally spoken, and that it had been 10 days since the email had been answered. Mr. Neal suggested that Mr. Stafford follow up with Mr. Lee to determine the issue. Mr. Stafford stated that he would mention the District's concerns about the time frame.

6. Presentation & Consideration of Landscape Replacement at Pool Gate

Mr. Stafford distributed copies of the proposal to the Board. He indicated that this proposal would be to remove the dead plants outside the pool gate and replace them with philodendron.

On a MOTION by Mr. Neal, SECONDED by Ms. Smith, WITH ALL IN FAVOR, the Board approved the Proposal for Landscape Replacement at the Pool Gate, in the amount of \$714.16, for the Waterleaf Community Development District.

Following the motion, Ms. Borkert clarified that, as this would be considered a work order, no contract would be necessary.

7. Consideration of Quote for Amenity Center Painting

Mr. Stafford distributed copies of the proposal to the Board. In response to a question from Mr. Neal, Mr. Stafford clarified that the interior would be painted.

Mr. Neal noted that the amenity center painting quote was well within the reserves. Mr. Daux asked whether the scope of the proposal would include the mail kiosk. Mr. Stafford indicated that the kiosk would be separate, as there was an additional quote for trim painting under Old Business #9 on the agenda. Ms. Smith pointed out that the bathroom floors would be separate as well.

Mr. Stafford stated that it would be \$375.00 to paint each bathroom. Mr. Neal noted that this was within the budget. In response to a question from Mr. Daux, Mr. Stafford clarified that this would just be for the floors.

This item was tabled to the next meeting, pending Board review.

Mr. Neal asked if the price of \$7,490 was still accurate. Mr. Stafford confirmed that it was.

8. Consideration of Quote for Sidewalk Repairs

Mr. Stafford indicated that he had not yet received a proposal. Ms. Smith expressed concerns about the size of sidewalk gaps and major tripping hazards. Ms. Borkert suggested asking Ms. Thibault for recommendations, as she had been dealing with this issue in other Districts. Discussion of this item was tabled to the next meeting.

On a MOTION by Mr. Neal, SECONDED by Ms. Smith, WITH ALL IN FAVOR, the Board recessed the meeting at 7:34 p.m. for the Waterleaf Community Development District.

(The Board reconvened the meeting at 7:37 p.m.)

9. Consideration of Mail Station Trim Painting

213 Mr. Stafford distributed copies of the proposal to the Board.

214 Mr. Neal indicated that the quote was over the reserve amount, being in the amount of
215 \$2,100.00, when the District had about \$1,437 budgeted. Mr. Stafford provided additional
216 information as to the scope of the trim painting and staining, noting that the roof would not
217 be included but that the ceiling would, as would everything that can be seen from the inside,
218 with the exception of the asphalt shingles. Mr. Stafford advised that the colors of all items
219 would remain the same, which is brown.

220 On a MOTION by Ms. Smith, SECONDED by Mr. Daux, WITH ALL IN FAVOR, the Board approved
221 the Mail Station Trim Painting proposal, in the amount of \$2,100.00, for the Waterleaf Community
222 Development District.

223 Following the motion, the Board asked when the trim painting work would be done. Mr.
224 Neal indicated that he would like the mail kiosk project timing to coincide with work on
225 the amenity center and floors.

226 10. Discussion of Bill of Sale for Two (2) Pond Fountains to Liberty Field HOA

227 Mr. Krause stated that he had reached out multiple times to the HOA manager, but had
228 received no response. Mr. Neal suggested that this was an ongoing issue that Liberty Field
229 residents had been noting.

230 Ms. Smith asked whether the District was responsible for maintaining and fixing the
231 fountains. Mr. Krause stated that Liberty Fields had been maintaining the pond fountains.
232 Ms. Smith noted that there had been accusations from a resident that the CDD was in fact
233 legally responsible for their upkeep, noting the resident had further implied that the CDD
234 was not being transparent with the matter. Concerns were expressed regarding the CDD's
235 public relations.

236 Ms. Borkert asked about the condition of the fountains, and Mr. Neal stated that one
237 fountain was operational, but one was not, suggesting that the non-functional fountain was
238 due to a lightning strike. Ms. Borkert stated that the District was not required to keep the
239 fountain there, as it was a decorative feature and there was no intended filtration
240 functionality.

241 The Board additionally discussed ownership of the front gates into the community with
242 Ms. Borkert, with Mr. Neal asking whether a potential bill of sale should bundle the gates
243 with the fountain ownership if there was not yet an agreement on file. Ms. Borkert stated
244 that she could research whether there was an agreement in place.

245 The Board's consensus on this item was to continue with the status quo, and to send out a
246 blast with clarifying information on the pond fountains. Ms. Borkert commented about
247 continuing to reach out to get the bill of sale documents executed. Mr. Neal requested for
248 discussion of this item to be brought back at the next meeting if there was any update on
249 gate ownership.

250 11. Discussion of Status on New Pool Entrance Signs

251 Mr. Daux suggested that the contact information on the pool entrance signs should not be
252 tied to a specific vendor in case the District decided to proceed with another amenity
253 management company in the future. Mr. Krause stated that the sign could be changed to
254 list the CDD website instead.

255 Mr. Neal commented on the discrepancy in definitions between dawn and sunrise, and
256 suggested that an opening time of 7:00 a.m. would fairly consistently align with sunrise

throughout the year, with some exceptions. Ms. Borkert cautioned that the District needed to keep in line with the adopted and published rules, which Mr. Krause stated had codified operations to ensue from “dawn to dusk”. Ms. Borkert noted language in the rules stating that these hours were in place “unless otherwise noted”, which would give the CDD room to establish more specific times.

Mr. Neal expressed concerns about having hours fluctuate month by month. The Board discussed potential specific closing times for the pool throughout the year, based on varying sunset times and Daylight Savings Time considerations. The Board came to a consensus to have all opening times set to 7:00 a.m., and closing times from January to March at 6:00 p.m., April to July at 8:00 p.m., August and September at 7:00 p.m., and October to December at 5:30 p.m.

Mr. Stafford and the Board discussed the wording on the sign, and Mr. Stafford stated that he would adjust language applying to all amenities. The Board also expressed support for the 24-inch sign sizing option, and proceeding with the color scheme as presented.

12. Discussion of Meter Review for Unknown Pump Station Bill

Mr. Stafford advised that the pump station was located on the right side entering through the front gate of the community, at the corner of Waterleaf Vista Boulevard and Frost Aster Drive. Mr. Neal sought and received confirmation from Mr. Stafford that this pump is one of several, as he had previously been told that there was only one pump.

13. Exhibit 4: Presentation & Consideration of FY 2021 LLS Tax Solutions Arbitrage Report

Mr. Krause stated that the arbitrage, which was related to interest earned on the bonds, needed to be reported to the IRS every five years. Mr. Krause stated that the District was well under the limit for allowable positive arbitrage, and Mr. Neal suggested that this may be due to low interest rates.

On a MOTION by Mr. Daux, SECONDED by Mr. Crespo, WITH ALL IN FAVOR, the Board accepted the FY 2021 LLS Tax Solutions Arbitrage Report, for the Waterleaf Community Development District.
--

14. Discussion of Update on New Fire Extinguishers & Boxes for Amenity Center

Mr. Stafford stated that the boxes had been installed. Mr. Stafford acknowledged that the new boxes were a slightly different shape than the previous boxes, and that there were some wall markings as a result that would be fixed when the CDD proceeded with painting as planned. Mr. Neal additionally noted that the new boxes were plastic and would not have rust issues.

15. Discussion of Removal of Crosswalk on Frost Aster

Mr. Stafford stated that the recommendation was to use a seal coating. Mr. Stafford asked for Board input as to whether they wished to paint over the crosswalk or the full area that had been coated previously. Mr. Stafford noted that the scope of the full area would be about five times the size of just the crosswalk, but commented that the appearance may be uneven otherwise. The Board requested for Mr. Stafford to bring back a proposal at the next meeting.

B. New Business

1. Discussion of Pool Heating Options

This item was tabled to the next meeting.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS – Staff Reports

A. Amenity & Field Management Services Report

1. Field Operations & Amenity Management Report – Breeze

Mr. Stafford stated that he had nothing further to present from his report. Mr. Stafford noted that he had received an email response from Fireman Tom's Pressure Washing during the meeting, detailing work that had been done on November 20.

2. Exhibit 5: Pond Report

Mr. Neal briefly reviewed the Pond Report, commenting positively that only one pond had been evaluated as "bad". Mr. Neal requested clarification on whether Sitex had independently decided to start rotating the algaecide used for treatments or if this had been per the request of a resident. Mr. Neal additionally noted that the report referenced the name of the District Manager prior to Mr. Krause.

3. Landscape Report – BrightView

B. District Manager

1. Discussion of Update on TECO Lights

Mr. Krause stated that he had reached out to a representative with TECO, who had indicated that there had been no changes in their level of service. Mr. Neal commented on the proportion that the District was spending on maintenance compared to the actual electric costs, additionally noting plans for third-party maintenance that other Districts had employed.

2. Discussion of Update on False Alarms #4 & #5

Mr. Krause stated that he had been successful on appealing the last few reported false alarms. Mr. Krause noted that the calls to the Hillsborough County Sheriff's Office had been conducted by the security company in a way where the level of the call was being mistakenly increased to a home invasion or intrusion tier, which then led to the report being filed as a false alarm once officers were on site. Mr. Daux stated that he had also previously discussed the matter with an officer on site, who had relayed similar information to him. Mr. Neal expressed doubts that this would solve the false alarm issue, suggesting that lower-level priority calls would take longer response times from officers, and by the time one might arrive, any potential trespasser may have left the premises. Mr. Krause indicated that he had passed along information about the appropriate verbiage to use for calls, and provided information on a submitted trespass agreement with the Sheriff's Office.

3. Discussion of Update on Late Fees to Insurance Company

Mr. Krause stated that DPFG would be issuing a credit to Waterleaf for late fees, and that management would continue to work with the insurance provider to switch to an electronic invoice system for the future.

4. Exhibit 6: Discussion of New Contract Boiler Plate

Ms. Smith noted that language in Section (3)(a) needed to be corrected to indicate that the payment was to the District for the Services performed under the Agreement, rather than the Vendor. Ms. Smith also indicated a spelling error in Section (9) regarding persons directly or indirectly employed.

Mr. Neal stated that DPFG's address needed to be updated, as the offices were now located at a different suite number. Mr. Neal asked how the District could ensure a release from the subcontractors upon final payment, and whether an additional boilerplate contract

would be needed once the CDD was informed that a vendor would be using subcontractors. Mr. Daux indicated that the language of the boilerplate contract being presented required for vendors to ensure that all subcontractors performing any services under the agreement also needed to comply with the agreement's terms and conditions. Mr. Daux asked whether stronger language was possible and/or needed. Ms. Borkert stated that the intent of the language was to pass down the requirements from the vendor to the subcontractor.

C. District Counsel

Ms. Borkert distributed a document with information regarding Sunshine Law and Supervisor responsibility to the Board. Ms. Borkert advised that she would be presenting an ethics training for the Board at the January 10, 2022 regular meeting, and stated that if the Board had any questions on the information given, that she could address them as part of the training.

D. District Engineer

There being none, the next item followed.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS – Audience Comments - New Business

There being none, the next item followed.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS – Administrative Matters

A. Exhibit 7: Consideration & Approval – The November 22, 2021, Regular Meeting Minutes

Mr. Neal commented on Line 31, clarifying that the intent was to repairing and replacing truncated domes, rather than exploring different options as the wording appeared to imply.

On a MOTION by Mr. Neal, SECONDED by Ms. Smith, WITH ALL IN FAVOR, the Board approved the November 22, 2021 Regular Meeting Minutes, as amended, for the Waterleaf Community Development District.

B. Exhibit 8: Consideration & Acceptance – The October 2021 Unaudited Financial Statements

Mr. Neal asked whether the general fund and reserve fund accounts were held separately, which Mr. Krause confirmed. Mr. Neal expressed concerns about potentially overdrawing an account for the \$107,863 amount due to the reserve fund. Mr. Neal additionally suggested that the YTD amount for insurance on the statement of revenues may be distorting monthly variances.

On a MOTION by Mr. Neal, SECONDED by Mr. Crespo, WITH ALL IN FAVOR, the Board accepted the October 2021 Unaudited Financial Statements for the Waterleaf Community Development District.

C. Exhibit 9: Consideration & Acceptance – The November 2021 Operations & Maintenance Expenditures

Mr. Neal asked Mr. Krause whether the DPFPG invoices would be corrected, which Mr. Krause confirmed.

On a MOTION by Mr. Daux, SECONDED by Ms. Smith, WITH ALL IN FAVOR, the Board accepted the November 2021 Operations & Maintenance Expenditures, for the Waterleaf Community Development District.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS – Supervisor Requests

Mr. Neal stated that he had sent Mr. Stafford a picture of the gate operating arms. Mr. Neal stated that he felt there needed to be a specific policy in place in the District for large events at the amenity

center, and asked whether Mr. Krause would be coming back with a discussion item on this for the next meeting. Mr. Krause stated that he would need to get with Ms. Dann, and had begun to reach out to the insurance company. Mr. Neal suggested that the Board should consider what constituted a large event. Ms. Smith additionally expressed concerns about amenity area usage for events without a reservation. The Board discussed gate operations for construction truck ingress and egress, with Supervisor comments expressing support for gates to be closed off more often.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS – Adjournment

Mr. Krause asked for final questions, comments, or corrections before adjourning the meeting. There being none, Mr. Neal made a motion to adjourn the meeting.

On a MOTION by Mr. Neal, SECONDED by Ms. Smith, WITH ALL IN FAVOR, the Board adjourned the meeting for the Waterleaf Community Development District.

**Each person who decides to appeal any decision made by the Board with respect to any matter considered at the meeting is advised that person may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, including the testimony and evidence upon which such appeal is to be based.*

Meeting minutes were approved at a meeting by vote of the Board of Supervisors at a publicly noticed meeting held on February 7, 2022.

Signature

Signature

Printed Name

Printed Name

Title: ☒ Secretary ☐ Assistant Secretary

Title: ☒ Chairman ☐ Vice Chairman