Botaniko
Community Development District

http://www.botanikocdd.com

Antonio Fernandez, Chairman

Jai Kumar Lachu Nandwani, Vice Chairman

Tony Sanchez, Assistant Secretary

Michael Piazza, Assistant Secretary

Heberto Del Rio, Assistant Secretary

July 7, 2026

GMS
Governmental Management Services

Botaniko

Community Development District

Agenda

Seat 3: Antonio Fernandez (C.)	
Seat 4: Jai Kumar Lachu Nandwani (V.C.)	
Seat 2: Tony Sanchez (A. S.)	
Seat 1: Michael Piazza (A.S.)	
Seat 5: Heberto Del Rio (A.S.)	

Tuesday
July 7, 2026
1:00 p.m.

2900 Glades Circle, Suite 325, Weston FL 33327
Join the meeting now
Meeting ID: 218 895 102 063 and Passcode: 9Eo6Ww9Z
1 872-240-4685 and Phone conference ID: 779 862 712#

1. Roll Call

2. Approval of Minutes of the May 5, 2026 Meetings **– Page 3**

3. Discussion of:
   A. Fiscal Year 2027 Budget Line Items

   B. Status of District Lakes **– Page 29**

   C. Status of Developer Overpayment and Reimbursement

   D. Status of Water Management Project Approval with Developer

4. Staff Reports
   A. Attorney – Memorandum – 2026 Legislative Update **– Page 35**

   B. Engineer

   C. Manager

5. Financial Reports
   A. Approval of Check Register **– Page 41**

   B. Approval of Unaudited Financials **– Page 44**

6. Supervisors Requests and Audience Comments

7. Adjournment

Meetings are open to the public and may be continued to a time, date and place certain. For more information regarding this CDD please visit the website: http://www.botanikocdd.com

MINUTES OF MEETING
BOTANIKO
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

The regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Botaniko Community Development District was held on Tuesday, May 5, 2026, at 1:00 p.m. at 2900 Glades Circle, Suite 325, Weston, Florida

Present and constituting a quorum were:

Antonio Fernandez	Chairman
Jai Nandwani	Vice Chairman
Tony Sanchez	Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

Andrew Gill	District Manager
Paul Winkeljohn	Governmental Management Services
Ginger Wald	District Counsel
Angel Camacho	District Engineer
Several residents	

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS — Roll Call

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

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS — Approval of Minutes of February 3, 2026 and April 7, 2026 Meetings

Mr. Gill: Included in your packet were the minutes of the April 7, 2026 meeting and if there are any changes or edits to those minutes please let me know, and if not, I'm just looking for a motion to approve those.

Mr. Fernandez: You mean February 3rd and April 7th.

Mr. Gill: Yes, so February 3rd, I just handed out hard copies of those minutes, and we'll put them back on the agenda again. As I mentioned before we had a partial recording so the first part of the minutes are not verbatim, they're just a summary, and then the remainder where the audio picked up we have those verbatim minutes. I can provide soft copies of this as well if you them but, these are hard copies and they will be on the next agenda for approval.

Mr. Fernandez: I read it, it's not complete but, I'm ok with it. The only thing is the yellow highlights where it says Mr. Sanchez, I think it was Mr. Nandwani instead of Mr. Sanchez.

Mr. Nandwani: Yes, exactly, that's the only correction I found as well.

Mr. Gill: So, with those changes, changing the yellow highlights from Mr. Sanchez to Mr. Nandwani for the February 3, 2026 minutes I'm just looking for a motion to approve those.

> On MOTION by Mr. Fernandez seconded by Mr. Nandwani with all in favor, the Minutes of the February 3, 2026 Meeting with the highlighted changes were approved.

Mr. Gill: Then we can jump down to the April 7, 2026 minutes, those minutes were included in your packet as well.

Mr. Fernandez: And I also read them, so I approve them.

Mr. Gill: Ok.

> On MOTION by Mr. Fernandez seconded by Mr. Nandwani with all in favor, the Minutes of the April 7, 2026 Meeting were approved.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS Consideration of:

A. Resolution #2026-03 Approving the Proposed Fiscal Year 2027 Budget and Setting the Public Hearing

Mr. Gill: So, let's jump down to item No. 3, this is resolution #2026-03, and we're bringing this back again, and this is your proposed fiscal year 2027 budget and it will also set the public hearing to adopt that budget. I provided you each with a hard copy of the budget right under the agenda page. So, at the last meeting the Board had asked for a couple changes to reduce a few line items with engineering and the attorney and so forth, and also to remove the carry forward surplus which removed as well, and edited most of the line items, we removed the contingency and so forth. If you jump down to the last page of the budget you'll see there's no assessment increase per unit for the maintenance assessment and the debt assessment will remain the same with no increase as usual. What we'd like to do at this point approve this budget as a cap and then between now and the date of the public hearing there may be a couple of line item changes moving things to contingencies just to show that because if you look at the projections for some of the line items, the projections are lower than what the actual amounts are, so we want to sort of fine tooth comb each of those and then provide that to the Board but, at this meeting we'd like to keep the budget set as is so that we can set that date for the public hearing and then at the next meeting to adopt the budget we would move these line items down to contingencies, tweak them a little bit.

Mr. Winkeljohn: I know we have a few months of activity that could still trickle into it so it will be more accurate but, the assessment doesn't change.

Mr. Ferandez: And the public hearing will be when?

Mr. Gill: That's what you're going to decide now, so we have to do it before the September meeting, this also needs to get approved before June 15th, so that's what we're doing now.

Mr. Fernandez: But we're approving just the total amount, not the line items.

Mr. Gill: The total cap, correct.

Mr. Winkeljohn: You're putting a ceiling on it.

Ms. Wald: To be fair, you are approving a proposed budget but, your adoption of the final budget, what we're talking about now is choosing a date, you can't choose it earlier than 60 days from today but, you can choose it as late as the beginning for September. You still have to advertise for the public hearing for the final budget, so you don't have to take it on the date you normally have your meetings if you want to change it. If you adopt this proposed budget as Andrew was saying, there's no increase, it's the same as you paid last year, so no letters have to go out to any of the residents, any of the homeowners within the District because it's flat, that doesn't mean they can't come and speak just like any of the Board meetings, what is being proposed is to leave it as is, as the proposed, and then you'll have a few more months to see where you are and then change those line items at you deem necessary in the final public hearing on the final budget.

Mr. Fernandez: And the public hearing is 60 days from now.

Ms. Wald: At least 60 days, you can more, and most of mine are setting them in August but, you can go to the beginning of September, I don't know the deadline date, and there's some that we can't have it because the School Board is busy on those dates.

Mr. Fernandez: What I would like to do, and I will make it very explicit, if we say that we are approving the budget what we are approving is just the total amount of the budget, the $75,000.

Ms. Wald: Well no, you're approving this budget, I don't want you to have a misnomer, you're approving this budget, if you decide to, as is but, you're only approving it as a proposed so you can have, because you have to do it before June 15th but, knowing that you still have to adopt a final budget. At that time if you want to change what's being proposed, if you want changes being made to each line item, which will change the overall amount, that would be the time to do it, that's what's being proposed.

Mr. Fernandez: That won't change the total amount.

Mr. Winkeljohn: Correct.

Ms. Wald: Right.

Mr. Winkeljohn: So today's action freezes the amount you can assess next year.

Ms. Wald: Right.

Mr. Winkeljohn: It puts a cap on it, you can't go up, and the way it's designed is you would be able to lower it if you chose to which you're probably not going to, you're just going to shuffle the line items around. As a Board you can shuffle the line items around all you want, any meeting, and adopt by one motion but, the problem is this one requires the two separate meetings for the assessment level, so that they're together, you do have to have a budget to reflect the assessment level but, that can move at any time, as long as you don't push your assessment up, and that's it.

Mr. Fernandez: Of course.

Ms. Wald: And shuffle, since we're making a record, and you do it by the ending of the year anyway, it is making a determination under the general fund because that's what we're talking about here, of changing an amount of a line item from one line item to another. As long as you're doing it from the same fund, which is what we're discussing, the general fund, a lot of cities and a lot of towns have multiple funds, so they can't move from one fund to another fund without going through a process because you're only dealing with one fund, the general fund, you can take money from one of the line items because it's really just doing it as an accounting basis, and they do it, and moving it to another.

Mr. Fernandez: Ok, now what we have been working on one hour before we meet and basically we haven't finished, so the question is what happens, I want to be practical but at the same time I want to be clear that what they are approving, if we do not approve the budget as it is right now today, what happens, what are the consequences of that?

Mr. Gill: So, the June meeting, which is the first Tuesday of June.

Mr. Fernandez: I'm not going to be here, I mean you can have the meeting but, I'm not going to be here, I'm traveling that same day, I'm going to be on a plane at the time of the meeting, so I will not be able to attend.

Mr. Winkeljohn: So, you'd run the risk of not having quorum potentially, and you can't do it in July.

Mr. Fernandez: Why not?

Mr. Winkeljohn: It's due by June 15th, this first step, it's a two step process, step one, you decide your assessment level in the proposed budget, that will look like it. Step two is you adopt your assessment level, or a lower number, and you pick your final budget at that point but, like I said, that final budget line items, the Board has the discretion to move those at any time, at any meeting.

Ms. Wald: For instance, let's do where we are now, see where it says adopted budget fiscal year 2026 on that first line item, and you have those certain amounts listed there, you could today, you could do by motion, and say I want to move, and I'm just going to pick on both of us because we're the first two line items, I want to move that $14,000 from attorney into the $5,000 of engineer, I want to take $2,000 out of the attorney line item and put that into engineer, just making that as an example, not saying it needs to be done. You can do that right now by motion, that's what I'm saying, so the line items themselves.

Mr. Fernandez: You can change them along the year.

Ms. Wald: Yes, at any time.

Mr. Winkeljohn: And I had this conversation with you before the meeting that at the end of the year, if you do have a lot of that happening, all you do is you adopt the final version as your final budget and it makes your audit good, and that's normal accounting, so the line items are not as concrete.

Mr. Fernandez: And at the same time you're explaining something about the payment process that could be stopped if the budget line was too small?

Mr. Winkeljohn: Yes, so if the accountant gets an invoice for the engineer, for example, way past the budget amount, they'll get in touch with the manager right away but, we would come back to the meeting, and say, hey we're $10,000 over in engineering and you need to adopt an amendment pulling that from your reserves, so you have to show how you're paying for everything in this business, you can never overpay, it's just not allowed and so the Board would be told what happened and we might not even pay the invoice, we may bring it to the meeting and have the engineer explain himself, that's never happened in my lifetime because I know it would come to us way before they ever go over a budget but, as an example, and that all takes place. So, no matter what you do, it's the assessment, the assessment is the parameter that dictates this process and also the function of the District. So, you're clearly not choosing to reduce or increase your assessment so this is pretty administrative.

Mr. Fernandez: So, let me explain to Tony and Jai for them to be aware because they had not been in that meeting with this conversation, so the way that this budget is, as I understand is built from the bottom up, all the specific amounts are added up and then you get to the final number, and that's divided among the homes, and that represents the assessment. So, I was proposing to do a little bit of changes, and do a top down, and say we have $75,000 how do we spend that or even less of that, and see what's the reasonable amount to spend in each of the lines, so we were doing that exercise but we haven't finished. So, right now we're sitting in a situation that the time comes that we're required to at least from what I understand from Ginger and Paul and Andrew is that we need to approve the total amount and then we can change the lines specifically for the amounts that we finally find that are the adopted, so is that a fair summary?

Mr. Winkeljohn: Yes.

Mr. Nandwani: So the amount could go down as well, the total could even go down.

Mr. Winkeljohn: If it worked out that way, and I wouldn't recommend it.

Mr. Fernandez: If it goes down do we need to mail out anything?

Mr. Winkeljohn: So, if you lowered the assessment, let's imagine, hey we only need $70,000 next year, and like I just said, I wouldn't want you to do that but you could, then a year from now if you say we have to go back up to $75,000 for that $5,000 you have to invite every resident to a public hearing by mail, you send them a mailed notice when you go up, so if you went down a dollar, the year after to get that dollar back you'd have to have that huge public hearing, and I wouldn't recommend that.

Mr. Fernandez: My idea was to continue to generate a surplus, or a fund that we could use for some other type of investment for the District because people are accustomed to pay that amount, and that is the easiest path right now but, it's up to you guys, this is the vote that we would need to do it, but it's up to you.

Mr. Winkeljohn: And I know it's on the agenda in a little bit, we still don't have the answer of the disposition of those funds from what we approached the developer about, so that's another piece of the equation.

Mr. Fernandez: Right.

Ms. Wald: But that's on the debt side.

Mr. Winkeljohn: Not necessarily.

Ms. Wald: I thought it was.

Mr. Winkeljohn: Yes, I guess it was.

Ms. Wald: So, that doesn't affect this, that's on the debt side.

Mr. Fernandez: And actually that's something that needs to go back to the debt of the 79 homes.

Ms. Wald: And we'll talk about that, but let's talk about the general fund and what we're dealing with here. So, if you adopt this proposed budget as is, what is in front of us where the total amount, regardless of what the line items are is $75,000, you do not have the increase. So the secondary part is setting the public hearing and when everyone is around and available, and like I said, most of mine set them in August.

Mr. Fernandez: What's the hearing, is it the same meeting as this?

Ms. Wald: Yes, the same meeting as this but, we actually open it up as a public hearing.

Mr. Fernandez: But right now it's only to the public, right?

Mr. Gill: It is but there's a newspaper advertisement that will say this is a public hearing to adopt the budget.

Mr. Fernandez: Ok.

Ms. Wald: And let me tell you the difference, and again because we're so small as a government, it really doesn't make a difference especially since we don't have lots of people showing up but, some of the items that you have on your agenda, they're not open to the public to provide information and comment or questions upon, so you don't have to listen to them. When it's a public hearing then you have to open it up to the public, provide any member of the public, anybody, let's say someone came off the street in this parking lot and says, hey that looks interesting an opportunity to speak for 3 minutes on the budget. So, that's the difference, I know with you folks if anyone showed up you would give them an opportunity to speak on any item but, if you had a very long agenda such as you were the city, and you needed to get through these things, you're only going to have certain areas where the public gets to speak, that's the difference but, we do have to advertise it as a public hearing because we follow the same procedures as cities do and counties do.

Mr. Fernandez: Got it.

Ms. Wald: So it's really just picking a date that everybody is going to be around, I don't know when our date is but you can provide them those dates.

Mr. Gill: Yes, it's generally the first Tuesday of the month, and that would be August 4th, and I may have a conflict then.

Mr. Fernandez: What about July, the first meeting in July?

Mr. Winkeljohn: That would be July 4th.

Mr. Fernandez: Oh, ok.

Mr. Gill: The first Tuesday is actually July 7th, so it is close to the holiday and we need to make sure we have quorum.

Ms. Wald: I would recommend for you folks doing it later versus earlier because you'll have a better idea of where you are for every single one of these line items that you have.

Mr. Fernandez: And it doesn't make any difference.

Ms. Wald: Exactly.

Mr. Fernandez: What do you guys think?

Mr. Nandwani: I'm ok with August.

Mr. Fernandez: It doesn't have to be in July, in can be in August.

Mr. Gill: Yes.

Mr. Sanchez: That would be my recommendation too August.

Mr. Gill: Good.

Mr. Nandwani: That would be the same meeting that we have, it would be like a normal meeting.

Mr. Gill: Yes.

Mr. Fernandez: So August 4th you said.

Ms. Wald: A regular Board meeting at 1:00 p.m.?

Mr. Fernandez: Yes, I'm supposed to be here, yes, I'm going to be here.

Mr. Gill: Alright, so this resolution #2026-03 approving the proposed fiscal year 2027 budget and setting the public hearing for August 4th at 1:00 p.m. in this location 2900 Glades Circle, Suite 325, Weston, Florida 33327. Do I have a motion?

On MOTION by Mr. Fernandez seconded by Mr. Nandwani with all in favor, Resolution #2026-03 approving the proposed Fisal Year 2027 Budget and setting the Public Hearing on August 4, 2026 at 1:00 p.m. at 2900 Glades Circle, Suite 325, Weston, Florida was approved.

B. Template License Agreement with city of Weston for Fountains within Retaining Ponds

Mr. Gill: If you all will jump down to page 56 of your packet, this is that revocable license agreement with the City of Weston for potentially putting fountains, I think the Board at a prior meeting had asked what the possibility was for having fountains within your lakes. Paul, reached out to Weston, and they provided this template that they use to allow communities to place fountains within their lakes, it's a license agreement.

Mr. Fernandez: But explain this license agreement, the fountains are provided by the city, that's what I understand.

Mr. Winkeljohn: I don't know who provides them.

Mr. Fernandez: Well, that's what I understood.

Mr. Winkeljohn: It could be.

Mr. Fernandez: But we're responsible for the maintenance but, they are the ones that are funding the fountain.

Mr. Winkeljohn: That's perfect.

Mr. Fernandez: Ok.

Mr. Winkeljohn: It was silent, it was tied to somewhere, or Savana was putting a fountain in, you saw it on the agenda.

Mr. Fernandez: Yes.

Mr. Winkeljohn: So, however that was funded that's probably their precedent, I don't know the details but, this is the city's template and if you wanted to have it you could, and you don't have to act on it today but, you could approve this for execution and when you figure out the pieces you'd have the authority to do it or you can just table it until you get the details, because it was the HOA that's wants the fountains technically, you're just the vehicle.

Ms. Wald: Well, do you need to be the vehicle, so here's my question, and that's what I was going to ask about this since we didn't get to talk. If the city is the one, or Bonaventure Development District, technically, is the one that is going to actually put in the fountain because it's their lakes, this is an agreement if you want that then you're going to maintain it. We have the association maintaining our portion, the CDD's portion of the stormwater management system wouldn't this be the association entering into this agreement, not the CDD, I'm not saying we can't do it.

Mr. Winkeljohn: Yes, either one makes sense to me.

Mr. Fernandez: I don't know, I don't have the answer to that. So, first of all, this is something that is provided the City of Weston to the HOA, that's what I understand.

Mr. Winkeljohn: Any party that wants to be involved in it, yes.

Mr. Fernandez: And right now this is an example of Savana with the City of Weston.

Mr. Winkeljohn: Right.

Mr. Fernandez: And this is something that we are allowed to use, or this is something that we need to start a procedure with the city?

Mr. Winkeljohn: So, typically what a template does that you would provide them your part of it and they would say, yes or no, you wouldn't edit the document you would only add in the blanks, so you could change the entity that you want, the HOA, or CDD or whatever, and what types of features, that type of thing and then the city would approve it if they're accepting it.

Mr. Fernandez: And to Ginger's point, this is not a CDD, the District is not participating in this deal, right?

Mr. Winkeljohn: They don't have to, and remind me, your lakes, the operating permit will go into the District's name or the Bonaventure's name, do you know, I don't know, it's a little bit weird.

Mr. Nandwani: I know they're still working on that portion.

Ms. Wald: It hasn't been completed.

Mr. Winkeljohn: So it depends who the permit holder is, that might be a piece of it.

Mr. Nandwani: I thought the lakes were it was licensed to the Bonaventure.

Ms. Wald: The lakes are Bonaventure.

Mr. Nandwani: Does the Bonaventure have a license?

Mr. Sanchez: No, Bonaventure is maintaining them too.

Ms. Wald: No, so the lakes themselves are Bonaventure, the ownership is Bonaventure, they're dedicated, they're part of the development agreement. There are different portions of the entire stormwater management system, the secondary portions, that are owned and maintained by the CDD and that's part of the interlocal agreement that Bonaventure and the CDD has. Since we're talking about places and going back to my point of placing potentially fountains or aerators, or whatever you're going to have, within the lake, Bonaventure, hence the city, has to provide that for somebody to do that. To me it doesn't really make too much sense for the CDD to be involved if number one, it's not CDD's lakes, which it isn't, and then two, the CDD is not providing any maintenance right now of anything, the association is, and not to push it on the association but, it does make more sense to me from a practical standpoint that it would be the association and the city/Bonaventure and it would seem that the association would have to say to the city we are interested in having a fountain, and we are willing to provide that maintenance what do we need to do as a next step.

Mr. Fernandez: Well, this is in the context of the lakes held in view of them, so we probably will need first to clean the lakes to have them better before putting the fountain.

Mr. Winkeljohn: Yes, anywhere you put your fountain you want it to be free of growth.

Mr. Fernandez: And it will be retrofitted probably because the circulation might help a little bit but, I don't know, those are things I don't know, I mean the water management may need to participate.

Mr. Winkeljohn: I mean in the construction phase the lake contractor will tell you if you have a good spot for it, if the bottom of it needs to flow, or you set off the bottom to aerate and all those options, all those pieces are over the horizon but, yes, they dictate what you decide to do, and if the lake is a good candidate.

Mr. Fernandez: Well we don't need to approve anything here.

Ms. Wald: No.

Mr. Winkeljohn: But it's there, and I think the takeaway is that they have a system of how to do it, that they're used to approving it, it's not very difficult, so that's good that you don't have to win the argument with them.

Mr. Fernandez: There's a precedent that the city has given to another association.

Mr. Winkeljohn: Exactly.

Mr. Nandwani: Should this be presented to the association as well?

Mr. Winkeljohn: It sounds like it, yes.

Ms. Wald: If you're interested in doing it I would say take it back to the association.

Mr. Nandwani: Ok.

Mr. Winkeljohn: And then down the road if there's a funding decision.

Mr. Fernandez: And plenty associations have that.

Mr. Winkeljohn: And I was under the impression that ultimately the District might help fund it at some point, I don't know that but, if they were to with capital or with some participation so they'd want to be a party to it probably.

Mr. Fernandez: This might be part of the task force that we have been constructing for landscape and irrigation. Ok, so thank you for the information.

Mr. Winkeljohn: It's in the record, so you have it, and as these play out just let me know and I'll liaise with the city.

Mr. Fernandez: Good, I appreciate that.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Updates on:

A. Developer Reimbursement of $159K Overpayment

Mr. Gill: Ok, moving down to item No. 4, just a couple of updates. We talked at the last meeting about the potential reimbursement for that overpayment to the developer for the amount of roughly $159,000. We reached back out to the developer they're still working on it, we haven't gotten a final resolution on their review of the numbers.

Mr. Fernandez: Last time you said that they responded the first time.

Mr. Gill: Yes, and they backed down and I got in touch with them last week, just asking for an update and I haven't received one yet but, I know they're working through it.

Mr. Fernandez: Are you aware of any details Tony on it?

Mr. Sanchez: No, I haven't been involved in that part of it.

Mr. Fernandez: Is Michael the person that we need to make the call, or somebody else?

Mr. Gill: I believe that's who was on the call with us was Michael.

Mr. Fernandez: Ok, could you touch base with Michael please and see what's going on with that?

Mr. Gill: Ok.

Mr. Sanchez: Any ideas when the developer would repay the CDD, who would repay the original homeowners?

Ms. Wald: It would go back to trustee, so it would be back into the bond funds.

Mr. Sanchez: And then the credit would be given back to the 79 homeowners that are funding that?

Mr. Winkeljohn: Well, I had a different take on it, that's why I'm reacting the way I am, it would go into a construction fund and it could be, many times these things can be used for an acceptable expenditure, meaning something that was anticipated, so if some landscaping needed something, so there's a potential where you may chose to use it for capital, or infrastructure improvements versus like $9.00 back to each person, it would be a really some amount.

Mr. Fernandez: No, it would be $2,000.

Ms. Wald: Well, it doesn't work that way, so it goes back into, you're correct, it goes back into that acquisition and construction account, which is the bonds, from there the determination would have to be made, how can that fund be utilized for anything else, and you really do have to go back through the bond documents themselves to make that determination and also have the conversations with bond counsel and trustee's counsel, like ok do these have to be redeemed because there might be a redemption requirement too, so it's not just black and white.

Mr. Fernandez: I'm sorry to interrupt Ginger but, if we go back to the original discussion and I was stating that there was a disparity among the amount of the 79 homes paid, and the contribution of the developer, and the developer was underfunded in that amount, so that means that the 79 homes that were funding the bonds overpaid that amount. So, with that logic what makes sense is that this amount is returned from the developer into the CDD, this needs to go back to those 79 homes.

Ms. Wald: I know you're saying that but, it's the bond docs that control.

Mr. Winkeljohn: Yes.

Ms. Wald: They are two separate things in my opinion.

Mr. Sanchez: Because unlike most other CDDs I would imagine, not 100% of the residents of the CDD have paid for the debt.

Mr. Winkeljohn: Right.

Ms. Wald: Not all of them, I mean we do have some with a contribution, this is just one aspect of it, is if there was an overpayment as the accounting was done, and I don't do math, but as the accounting was done and provided to the developer, you were overpaying from that construction account, it goes back into there, where it goes from there, that's what are the next steps that have to be made, and would have to show to the trustee, the trustee's counsel, this is how it should have occurred, so it would have to take each one of those steps.

Mr. Fernandez: Ok.

Ms. Wald: So, it's a step by step process.

Mr. Fernandez: Well, let's do it.

Ms. Wald: So, step one, the money has to go back.

Mr. Fernandez: And that's going to be my position, and I'm not going to change my position.

Ms. Wald: No, I'm not changing anything because I don't make that decision, so again, without the money coming back from the developer into the construction and acquisition account, there's no process, that's step one.

Mr. Nandwani: I guess the only chance is if anyone of those 79 homes have sold their home since then, then we would get that back, I don't know.

Mr. Winkeljohn: And what the trustees usually do is they put it at the back.

Mr. Fernandez: Or make a credit to the debt of those 79 homes.

Mr. Winkeljohn: And they put the credit at the back, at the end of the payments of the bonds, and then you readvertise it and then you'd have to lower it.

Mr. Fernandez: And we can have that discussion as long as it goes back to who overpaid, that's the right thing to do because we overpaid that amount, so we deserve to get that money back.

B. Lakes Works to Enhance Appearance and Health

Mr. Gill: Next up is item 4B, and this is just a discussion of the current appearance of the lakes.

Mr. Winkeljohn: Yes, so the city update was they did double the treatment cycle which is allowable under the permit. I think I might have mentioned to you that you can only treat twice a month chemically, so they're on that schedule, they confirmed to me that it got the extra treatment since we asked for it and they're going to start sending us the lake reports, so we have them as well.

Mr. Fernandez: Yes, that was my next question, how are we looking with improvements that they have.

Mr. Winkeljohn: I haven't looked at them but, we'll get the report.

Mr. Fernandez: Because I see them every single day and it's the same.

Mr. Winkeljohn: So, your eyes will start to see any benefit in the next cycle of the lake, so middle summer, you'll see the efforts today, and they'll start to show up then, that's the way the lake treatments play out because you put chemical and then it dies but it's still there so until it sinks and becomes part of the ego process that's when you'll start to see the results.

Mr. Fernandez: And this is taken care of by the City of Weston.

Mr. Winkeljohn: Yes, and they'll look at some mechanical treatments to see what isn't working, and they've been really cooperative.

Mr. Fernandez: Alright, ok, thank you.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Staff Reports

Mr. Gill: Alright, moving on to staff report, Ginger.

A. Attorney

Ms. Wald: We should have our memorandum for the next meeting, I just wanted able to get it out this early in May and that's the legislative session memo. So, at the end of every legislative session we put together a memorandum that does a summary of the different bills that were past that are now laws, and not all have been signed by the Governor just yet, and how it could affect CDDs. So, it's usually just two or three pages, depending on the number of bills, and we put that together and then I'll go over that, and every month we'll have a copy it is a record and part of the agenda.

Mr. Fernandez: Ok.

B. Engineer

Mr. Gill: Ok, anything for District engineer?

Mr. Camacho: No updates on today.

Mr. Gill: Any questions for the engineer?

Mr. Fernandez: No.

C. Manager

Mr. Gill: Moving on to District manager, I don't have anything and I'll confirm quorum but, the June meeting I know you won't be present for.

Mr. Fernandez: I won't.

Mr. Gill: So between now and the potential July meeting, we will circulate this updated budget, and I'll include just a line showing how items moved down to the contingency or wherever they move but, it will remain at the $75,000, other than that, I don't have anything else.

Mr. Fernandez: So, going back to the meetings, the next meeting in June is canceled right now, or we're still going to have it because I'm not going to be but that doesn't mean you're not having the meeting, right?

Ms. Wald: Right.

Mr. Gill: Yes, so probably two weeks before the meeting my office will start circulating agenda requests and if there's nothing that needs to go on the agenda they'll say, they'll say we don't have a need for the June meeting, and then the next meeting would be scheduled for July, and at that point the remaining Board members can reach out and say, we do need to have a meeting.

Mr. Fernandez: When do we need to define the meetings for the next fiscal year?

Ms. Wald: We'll probably do that at the next meeting.

Mr. Winkeljohn: Wasn't it on the last agenda?

Ms. Wald: No.

Mr. Gill: No it wasn't but probably the public hearing that we have, we'll have the proposed meeting schedule and that will likely be the last meeting of this fiscal year, and we'll have on there the proposed meeting schedule for the coming fiscal year, so it likely would be in August.

Mr. Fernandez: What do you think we need to do, we keep the CDD monthly meetings, and then just do the ones we need or just reduce it to 4 meetings for the whole year?

Mr. Gill: So, my office will generally advertise every month because it saves on advertising costs, if we do quarterly or maybe 4 meetings and you're wrong, then we have to readvertise.

Mr. Fernandez: Right, that's my question, so we can initially advertise every single month that we have been doing it, and then if it's not done, we just cancel it.

Mr. Gill: Correct.

Mr. Nandwani: So, if it's advertised monthly and you cancel, does that advertisement go out that it's been canceled.

Ms. Wald: It's on the website.

Mr. Winkeljohn: It goes on the website.

Mr. Fernandez: So you just cancel on the website.

Mr. Winkeljohn: And what groups like yours do is you sort of have two sets of expectations, one in case I have a meeting every month let's advertise every month, then you put on your website the meetings that you're going to hold, most likely, so you're not communicating on your website one set of information but, advertising another.

Mr. Fernandez: I so you cancel that.

Mr. Winkeljohn: Right, and it looks bad, so like on the website we can put is, the Board typically meets quarterly and these are the available dates, it's just a way to communicate that.

Ms. Wald: And you're not going to have it until August anyway you can make that decision then.

Mr. Fernandez: Ok.

Mr. Gill: That's all I have on that.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Financial Reports

A. Approval of Check Register

B. Approval of Unaudited Financials

Mr. Gill: Moving down to financials reports, we have the check register on page 67 of your packet.

Mr. Fernandez: Yes, I went through them.

Mr. Gill: And also the audited financials. If there are no questions on those I'm just looking for a motion to approve both.

Mr. Fernandez: I make a motion.

> On MOTION by Mr. Fernandez seconded by Mr. Sanchez with all in favor, the Check Run Summary and the Unaudited Financials were approved.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Supervisors Requests and Audience Comments

Mr. Gill: We do have a couple members present on the phone, do you have anything for the Board, we're at Supervisor's requests and audience comments portion of the meeting?

A resident: Nothing here.

Mr. Gill: Ok, I know that we have a Supervisor's request.

Mr. Fernandez: Yes, based on the news that we received this weekend about the development across the District, I might have a chance to speak on behalf of the District officially. So, I would like to request the Board to provide that authorization, and it depends on the wording. So, the wording is more appropriate coming from Ginger, but actually to be able or going into the CDD or talking to the developers and so forth, being the representative for the whole District. So, what would be the best approach for that?

Ms. Wald: First I would give a little bit of background on the record as to the development itself, just a little summary from what you read and the information that you've already received so we can put that on the record, and then we can do the motion.

Mr. Fernandez: Ok. So, there are several Community Development Districts that are happening around our Botaniko District, one is north of the District, which was the former Bonaventure Hotel, and there's a new one that we learned during the weekend that is east of Bonaventure Boulevard which is where the golf range is and the golf clubhouse, so the two last ones are the ones that were announced during the weekend, and we were trying to understand what was going on there and stopped to see. The details are that these new developments the one that is east of Bonaventure Boulevard is proposing an increase of the density, 6 times the current density, and that implies a lot of consequences into the District in terms of traffic and public schools and transit and so forth, even lakes I understand might be impacted and water and sewer. So, in order to have those discussions I spoke with Ginger yesterday, and without the authorization from the complete Board I'm not authorized to talk on behalf of the District unless you provide that authorization, so that's my request if we can vote on that.

Ms. Wald: So, it would be a motion to authorize the chairman to be the representative on behalf of Botaniko CDD in discussions with the developers themselves of these projects and also with city personnel and to speak on behalf of the CDD at any of the public meetings.

Mr. Fernandez: Correct.

Mr. Nandwani: Just a question for my knowledge, what would be the difference between representation from the CDD versus homeowners?

Ms. Wald: So, as the discussion that Antonio and I had yesterday because it was on a city commission meeting last night, and it was pulled so it didn't happen, and he said can I say that I'm the chairman of the CDD and I represent the CDD, and so on, and I said, unfortunately no because the CDD hasn't given you that authority yet. I said, you can stand there and say, I reside at, and provide your address and it's located within Botaniko CDD, and I am a Board member but I don't have authority to speak on behalf of the CDD. So, by appointing someone from one of you, or one of these guys to speak on behalf of the CDD, you're representing the CDD as an individual for the CDD as a governmental entity, similar to the mayor who is given that authority for the city to go speak on behalf of the city in front of the county, it's the same concept. So, that's what we're talking about, without it that's what I was saying, Antonio can basically just say I am a resident at this address but, I'm not representing the CDD here tonight, that's the discussion that we had.

Mr. Nandwani: And is there any potential legal repercussion against the CDD if something is said that they take and use it against the CDD, saying a representative from the CDD made these statements and they come after us, like that?

Ms. Wald: It's going to be in the public and it's going to be, let's say it was at the city commission meeting, for example, so just like here, it's recorded and it's going to be typed up, it's going to be a statement, so whatever happened that's what the CDD is saying, so that's the flipside of it is the concern. Normally, what I would have is we know exactly what's happening, and I'll just give you an example, we had one many years ago down in Miami-Dade County where there was going to be an expansion of the quarry and this community that is a CDD already was having enough issues with last thing, knowing that Miam-Dade County couldn't do anything about it because it's all by the state but, they wanted to be able to do something. So, we actually put together a resolution, the resolution said that the CDD was 100% against this because it affects the CDD, directly affects CDD property, and the protection of the CDD, and also gave the authority to one of the Board members to show up at those public meetings and basically state this is the CDD's position. If the CDD doesn't have a position yet, which is doesn't sound necessarily that we're at that position yet, it's really providing that authority which is what we're talking about to Antonio as the chairman to have those discussions with a CDD hat on. So, he can obtain that information, provide it back to the CDD, and the recommendation. Knowing that in these instances this CDD does have limited things, number one limited powers, ownership of limited things, stormwater management is a bit different, which we've talked about many of times, especially here in this meeting, and if there is going to be these developments, there will be more likely than not, I would say 99% there's going to be an impact on the stormwater management which includes the stormwater management system, that is 100% something that the CDD would be concerned about and want the information to be able to take a position one way or another.

Mr. Fernandez: Ok, so in that regard, looking at you, can you provide us your view on the implications of the development to the District in terms of stormwater?

Mr. Camacho: Technically they would have to provide their own onsite stormwater management system, so a review of that, the calculations, and is there any set of plans?

Ms. Wald: No, it's just getting the zoning.

Mr. Winkeljohn: But there is a plat to reshape the stormwater system and move the lake, they want to do that.

Mr. Fernandez: Not in Botaniko it's the lake that's on the other side, they're going to move it?

Mr. Winkeljohn: Yes, they're going to fill half of it in and rebuild a new part of it, and they're going to fix the geography.

Mr. Nandwani: And what impact would that have on the lake?

Ms. Wald: We don't know yet.

Mr. Fernandez: So, what do we do?

Mr. Winkeljohn: Well, that gets you in the room, so to speak, and then I think your other comments, you know the secondary affects of it like, just traffic volume, more infrastructure, more pavement, the demands on the whole system.

Mr. Nandwani: Education system I imagine.

Ms. Wald: Education has nothing to do with CDD, that's more of you as residents and being in there because CDD doesn't have any educational powers or anything along those lines, roadways do fall into stormwater management, so that is a thing, security is a power that we have, and you have authorized providing that license agreement for security cameras, that is at least something that you can utilize. So, those are the things that would be an interest for the CDD to take that position and then going back to, are you responsible, well each one of your has insurance as you know, so the decisions that you make as a legislative body, you're protected individually. Now, they're going to after to see whose going to go after an actual CDD for saying we're trying to protect our Community Development District, which is a Special Purpose Local Government, good luck with that but, that's what that is and that would be the motion, and request, it's really being that spokesperson for the CDD and ensuring that the CDD is well protected after being able to obtain that information and take that position.

Mr. Fernandez: And thank you Ginger for that, yes, that's one motion but, now based on the conversation that we had I'm staring to get concerned about implications in the stormwater management system and the lake and so forth, so how can we tackle that because you have some part of the information, the engineer is going to have some part of the information, water management or the manager of the District has another part of the information, so how do we get an impact analysis into the District of this new development because that's something that I would need to know.

Mr. Winkeljohn: Yes, so the zoning process, whatever is required you can get a copy of that, whatever part it is, if it's required it's public and you'll get access to it.

Mr. Fernandez: Right, but I'm talking about the other things.

Mr. Winkeljohn: Like what you might evaluate how the impact would be.

Mr. Fernandez: Exactly.

Mr. Winkeljohn: I mean the process will say that it does that, it will say the traffic study did A, it will say the density, it will have A, B, and C, and this is the calculation for stormwater, all of those pieces of it.

Mr. Fernandez: But that's the developer version.

Mr. Winkeljohn: Right, and there's some independence in it, like environmental studies and things like that do have to be by license independent folks, how independent is subjective probably but, that's the process, and Weston is one of the better ones in the state of Florida at this, they are very thorough, so you'll get a really good study by comparison of other jurisdictions, it's way too early for that but, that will happen, you'll be part of that, you'll get a copy of it, you'll be invited to any meetings, and if it gets really thick there will be special hearings for certain aspects.

Mr. Fernandez: But in the general picture, I mean what could be the implications into the District, I'm not clear because if we don't calculate it's outside of knowledge.

Mr. Winkeljohn: Right, so it's all systems so you can always argue that.

Mr. Fernandez: They are communicated because they are connected, that's the reason?

Mr. Winkeljohn: Right, that's the first one.

Mr. Fernandez: What else could be an indication?

Mr. Winkeljohn: Well, I like the security angle is where I would put my hat.

Mr. Fernandez: I'm referring to the lakes or to the water management, I'm clear with the others.

Mr. Winkeljohn: So, more traffic does get into it.

Mr. Fernandez: And I'm clear with that, water management is something I was not totally conscious about and I'm trying to understand, the sewer system for instance could be saturated.

Mr. Winkeljohn: Well, we'll see what they do, we'll look at what the plan is, when you go to density like that obviously the infrastructure won't match.

Mr. Fernandez: Yes, 6 times the density is too much.

Mr. Winkeljohn: And does the process force them to really do a good job correcting the infrastructure and we know this is over a 60 year old infrastructure around here, there's going to be a lot of hard work on their part to bring it up to that kind of density I think.

Mr. Fernandez: But the components will be the lakes, the sewer water, and the stormwater.

Mr. Winkeljohn: Right, the lakes, water and sewer, stormwater, those are the parts where you have a foot in the door.

Mr. Fernandez: What about drinkable water?

Mr. Winkeljohn: That's the City of Sunrise, it comes from the City of Sunrise so if they have capacity, they have capacity but, that's a good one, I would be curious about that myself knowing how the water works here.

Ms. Wald: And the City of Sunrise will have to approve it, the City of Weston's approval, each department, the City of Sunrise is going to have to do its separate approval, they are painstakingly slow in everything they do, so all of those entities do have to provide their approvals as well.

Mr. Winkeljohn: I'd be really interested in the capacity to see how they deal with that because it is a big number.

Mr. Fernandez: Yes.

Mr. Winkeljohn: But it has to go through all those entities that we just threw out, they're each going to have a cut at it and you'll see, and I can look at it, our engineers can look at it, legal obviously, and most of it you'll see where there's something that might be helpful to you like that, but they usually stick out.

Mr. Fernandez: Any other comments?

Ms. Wald: So, if you're interested in doing that someone would need to make that motion.

> On MOTION by Mr. Nandwani seconded by Mr. Sanchez with all in favor, authorizing the Chairman, Antonio Fernandez, to be the representative on behalf of Botaniko CDD in discussions with developers of these projects and also with city personnel to speak on behalf of the CDD at any of the public meetings was approved.

Mr. Gill: Anything else under Supervisor's requests?

Mr. Fernandez: I'm just thinking on the stormwater and management and what we just spoke about the lake implication, I don't know how to proceed, how would you suggest?

Mr. Gill: I think information gathering would be good.

Mr. Winkeljohn: Yes, we need to see a site plan and how they plan to solve and reconfiguration.

Mr. Fernandez: And study that.

Mr. Winkeljohn: Yes, just to what a logical impact would be, I mean if they're reshaping a lake that's silt, and there's a lot of direct construction things that can harm your lake, and the industry is full of answers to that but, they're rarely sufficient, and most people know they can argue that, so your at the table and so that's the CDD saying we want the best not the least.

Mr. Fernandez: Of course but, do we have any official version right now regarding changes in the lakes?

Mr. Winkeljohn: No, it was all verbal, they told me they were redoing it and they're filling in part of the lake and rebuilding it.

Mr. Fernandez: Ok, so it's an area that we're not having into consideration, so that's an angle we need to look at.

Mr. Winkeljohn: Yes, I'm curious.

Ms. Wald: And staying in contact with the city because each department of the city has to review and they will have those plans and it's them saying, well what about this and what about that, and it's being able to get that review as part of it.

Mr. Winkeljohn: Right, and the tone from the planning and zoning attorney is that the city hasn't even started with this, like they know it has to go through a lot of their normal reviews and procedures and it will be excruciating.

Mr. Fernandez: And this discussion brings me to the other development and the Bonaventure Hotel which is north of us and since a week ago or probably two weeks ago, suddenly all the trees were being cut or taken down and we were concerned because part of them from my understanding were within the District or the HOA property, and they're in the gray zone because they're right there. So, I went to the city and I think I spoke with you, I went with you and you obtain the authorization from the city.

Mr. Gill: It was sent to us, yes.

Mr. Fernandez: So, I talked to the lady of the landscaping in the City of Weston and she said they got the authorization to take down the trees, and that was surprising to me because I never heard that the city could have approved taking down the trees because right now neighbors are asking me and saying, how can they be doing this with the approval of the city and I say, I don't know.

Mr. Winkeljohn: Right, and it happens as part of a larger permit it would have been vetted out but, it's not a public discussion.

Mr. Fernandez: And they're starting at 7:00 in the morning on a Sunday, and the impression the residents are getting.

Mr. Winkeljohn: They usually do it in the middle of the night when nobody can see it.

Ms. Wald: That's a code enforcement, contact the City of Weston Code Enforcement and tell everybody to keep contacting them, everybody, multiple times.

Mr. Fernandez: Ok, alright.

Ms. Wald: My understanding is from brief conversations they were not within the boundaries of the CDD, and if it's not their property, they have a problem.

Mr. Fernandez: How do we determine that?

Ms. Wald: Through a survey but, it should be part of their permit.

Mr. Fernandez: The email that the city sent us said that those trees were marked, the ones that were to be able to taken down were marked as that, so I assume the city had checked that those are within the property.

Ms. Wald: And that's what I'm saying, there should be a permit for that to happen because they're taking down healthy trees so there's got to be a permit.

Mr. Winkeljohn: Yes, some approval.

Mr. Fernandez: So we can request the permit as the HOA?

Mr. Winkeljohn: Yes.

Ms. Wald: Anybody can, it's a public record.

Mr. Fernandez: Ok, alright.

Ms. Wald: Right, because the CDD doesn't have police powers you have to go the City of Weston to get that information because it has to be part of a permit.

Mr. Fernandez: Alright.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Adjournment

Mr. Gill: Ok we're just looking for a motion to adjourn.

> On MOTION by Mr. Fernandez seconded by Mr. Nandwani with all in favor, the meeting was adjourned.

______________________________	______________________________
Secretary /Assistant Secretary	Chairman / Vice Chairman

A visual inspection of the Botaniko CDD lakes was conducted on June 24, 2026, to evaluate shoreline vegetation conditions following recent aquatic maintenance treatments. Inspection photographs were provided to the City of Weston for review. Based on the City's assessment, the majority of the treated shoreline vegetation is either turning brown or has already turned brown, indicating that the treatment is having the intended effect. However, several areas of vegetation remain present and will require an additional treatment application to achieve the desired level of control. As a result, the City of Weston has directed its lake maintenance contractor to schedule an additional round of treatment for the Botaniko lakes.

Aquatic Vegetation and Shoreline Conditions

Aquatic Vegetation and Shoreline Conditions

Aquatic Vegetation and Shoreline Conditions

Aquatic Vegetation and Shoreline Conditions


Aquatic Vegetation and Shoreline Conditions

MEMORANDUM

TO: District Manager

FROM: Billing Cochran, P.A.
District Counsel

DATE: June 11, 2026

RE: 2026 Legislative Update

As District Counsel, throughout the year we continuously monitor pending legislation that may be applicable to the governance and operation of our Community Development District and other Special District clients. It is at this time of year that we summarize those legislative acts that have become law during the most recent legislative session, as follows:

1. Chapter [TBD], Laws of Florida (HB 0145). This legislation amends the sovereign-immunity statute to raise liability caps and change tort-claim procedures for government entities. The bill revises Section 768.28, Florida Statutes, increasing the statutory limits on damages recoverable against the state and its agencies/subdivisions (including special districts). For causes of action accruing on or after October 1, 2026, the liability caps increase from $200,000 to $350,000 per person and from $300,000 to $500,000 per incident. The bill also authorizes state agencies and subdivisions to settle claims or judgments in excess of those caps, up to available insurance limits, without requiring a legislative claims bill.

The bill authorizes a state subdivision (e.g. counties, municipalities, special districts including CDDs) to settle a claim or judgment in excess of the statutory cap without requiring a separate legislative claim bill, so long as settlement is within insurance coverage limits. The bill prohibits any insurance policy issued on or after October 1, 2026, from conditioning liability coverage or payment on the later enactment of a legislative claim bill.

In addition, the bill shortens the pre-suit notice period by requiring claimants to present a claim to the appropriate agency within 18 months after accrual of the claim, rather than the current three-year period. It also revises the statute of limitations by requiring most negligence actions against governmental entities to be filed within two (2) years, while maintaining existing limitations periods for medical malpractice, wrongful death, and contribution claims. The bill also reduces the time for an agency or the Department of Financial Services to make a final disposition of a claim before it is deemed denied, from six (6) months to four (4) months.

This law applies directly to CDDs because CDDs are among the “subdivisions” of state government covered by section 768.28, Florida Statutes. As such CDDs may now be subject to higher damage awards for tort claims.

2. Chapter [TBD], Laws of Florida (HB 273). This legislation revises Florida law governing state financial assistance and rural economic development programs to include certain special districts and improve payment processing for eligible rural entities. The bill amends Section 215.971, Florida Statutes to allow state agencies, under certain conditions, to directly facilitate or expedite payment of invoices for counties, municipalities, and qualifying special districts, particularly those located in rural areas or designated rural areas of opportunity. It authorizes agencies to structure agreements so that eligible rural governments and certain special districts, especially those providing water and wastewater services, receive faster payment processing for verified, completed work. The intent is to reduce financial strain and cash flow challenges that rural entities often face when administering state-funded projects, while preserving existing legal and regulatory requirements. The legislation also amends Section 288.0656, Florida Statutes to expand the definition of "rural community" to explicitly include independent special districts that provide water and wastewater services within rural areas of opportunity. This expansion makes those districts eligible for rural economic development support programs and related state assistance. The act takes effect July 1, 2026.

This legislation applies CDDs in a limited and conditional way, depending on the type of CDD and the services it provides. CDDs that are involved in state-funded infrastructure projects, such as water, wastewater, drainage, or utility improvements, may benefit from the amendment to Section 215.971, Florida Statutes. If a CDD is acting as a recipient or sub recipient of state financial assistance, the law allows state agencies to structure agreements so that invoices can be processed and paid more quickly for verified work. This can improve cash flow for CDDs building infrastructure, particularly smaller or rural CDDs that rely on this type of reimbursement funding. Second, the bill's expansion of the definition of "rural community" under Section 288.0656, Florida Statutes generally does not directly include most CDDs, because eligibility is tied primarily to counties, municipalities, and independent special districts providing water and wastewater services in rural areas of opportunity. A typical CDD would only benefit if it meets those narrow conditions, meaning it operates in a qualifying rural area and functions in a way that aligns with the statutory definition (or is structured similarly to an independent utility-focused district).

3. Chapter [TBD], Laws of Florida (HB 0655). This legislation creates a new exemption under Florida law (Section 70.90, Florida Statutes) that allows agencies to hold closed attorney-client meetings during the 90-day notice period for claims brought under the Bert J. Harris, Jr., Private Property Rights Protection Act. These closed meetings are limited to discussions between the agency and its attorney for purposes of settlement strategy or negotiation of private property rights claims. While the meetings are exempt from Florida's Sunshine Law, they must still be recorded by a certified court reporter, fully transcribed, and later released as a public record once the claim is resolved or the statute of limitations expires if no settlement or litigation occurs.

The law also creates a temporary public records exemption for the transcripts, recordings, minutes, and related materials generated during these closed sessions, ensuring confidentiality during active negotiations. However, this exemption is not permanent; it is subject to future legislative review and sunsets in 2031 unless reenacted. The act takes effect July 1, 2026.

The law allows a CDD Board of Supervisors to hold closed attorney-client sessions when the CDD is facing a pre-suit claim under the Bert J. Harris, Jr., Private Property Rights Protection Act regarding topics such as land use impacts, infrastructure construction, easement disputes, and development-related claims that can trigger property rights assertions under the Bert Harris Act.

During these closed sessions, the CDD can privately discuss settlement strategy with its attorney without public disclosure of sensitive legal positions. However, the exemption is narrow and procedural. The CDD must still provide public notice of the meeting, the session must begin and end in an open meeting, and a certified court reporter must record everything discussed. Although the discussion is confidential at the time, the transcript becomes a public record once the claim is resolved or the statutory timeframe expires if no settlement or lawsuit is filed.

4. Chapter 2026-115, Laws of Florida (HB 1085). This legislation creates the Local Government Cybersecurity Protection Program within the Florida Digital Service to assist local governments in strengthening cybersecurity defenses, particularly against threats such as ransomware. It establishes a statewide grant and procurement program that allows eligible local governments to access cybersecurity-related information technology commodities and services through contracts managed by the Florida Digital Service, with a preference for fiscally constrained counties. The program also requires data-sharing agreements between the state and participating local governments to support threat detection, prevention, and incident response.

Local governments may either apply for grants or independently purchase cybersecurity services through state-negotiated contracts, though the local government remains responsible for any associated costs. The law further requires annual reporting to the Governor and Legislature on program participation, funding, and outcomes, ensuring oversight and transparency. The program is set to operate through 2031 unless reenacted. The act takes effect July 1, 2026.

This law applies to CDDs because CDDs are local governments for many operational purposes, including infrastructure, procurement, and administrative functions, and therefore fall within the category of eligible participants under the Local Government Cybersecurity Protection Program. CDDs would be able to access state-negotiated cybersecurity contracts and services through the Florida Digital Service to improve protection of district systems. Even if a CDD does not apply for a cybersecurity grant, it may still purchase cybersecurity commodities and services through the state contracts, which could help reduce costs and improve security standards. However, participation is optional rather than mandatory, and CDDs remain responsible for all costs associated with any purchases or services obtained under the program.

5. Chapter [TBD], Laws of Florida (SB 1180). This legislation makes several targeted but significant changes to the law governing CDDs under Chapter 190, Florida Statutes, with the most important impact being the creation of a formal recall process for elected board members. The bill's primary feature is the creation of a new statutory section establishing a detailed procedure that allows qualified electors within a CDD to remove elected members of the board of supervisors through a recall process. The law limits recall to specific grounds such as malfeasance, misfeasance, neglect of duty, incompetence, drunkenness, permanent inability to perform duties, or conviction of certain felonies. It sets out a structured, multi-step process that begins with a petition signed by at least 10 percent of eligible voters, followed by verification of signatures, the preparation of a formal record of recall proceedings, and then a second petition requiring 15 percent of electors to trigger a recall referendum. If the referendum proceeds, a majority vote determines whether the board member is removed from office, and any resulting vacancy is filled according to existing statutory procedures. The legislation also imposes campaign finance requirements on recall efforts, establishes timelines, governs petition form and verification, allows limited withdrawal of signatures, and creates penalties for fraud or misconduct in the petition process. In addition to the recall framework, the bill clarifies that CDD board members elected by residents are subject to recall, aligning CDD governance more closely with other forms of local government accountability. It also provides that individuals removed by recall, or who resign after a recall petition is filed, are ineligible for reappointment to the board for two years.

The legislation further revises the definition of "compact, urban, mixed-use district" under Section 190.003, Florida Statutes. The revised definition applies to districts consisting of a maximum of 75 acres located within a municipality and within either a qualified opportunity zone or a community redevelopment area. The amendment clarifies qualifying development thresholds by providing that such districts must include either at least 400,000 square feet of retail development and 500 residential units, or at least 250,000 square feet of commercial development and 500 affordable residential rental units for very-low-income, low-income, or moderate-income persons. This revision is significant for developers because it affects eligibility and structuring considerations for the creation of certain community development districts.

The legislation clarifies that restrictions on local regulation of synthetic turf do not prevent a CDD from enforcing private deed restrictions, preserving a CDD's ability to uphold community standards through covenants. The act takes effect July 1, 2026.

This law applies directly to CDDs because it creates, for the first time, a formal statutory process that allows residents to recall elected members of a CDD board of supervisors. It introduces clear procedures, thresholds, and legal standards for removal, thereby increasing accountability of board members to district electors. The law also clarifies that CDDs may continue enforcing deed restrictions despite broader limits on local regulation of synthetic turf and updates certain statutory definitions affecting district formation and development. Overall, the most significant impact is the shift toward greater resident oversight and governance accountability within CDDs.

5. Chapter 2026-3, Laws of Florida (SB 290). This legislation revises multiple areas of state law, with a primary focus on agriculture, public safety, contractor regulation, and consumer protection. A significant component of the legislation strengthens contractor and vendor accountability by requiring contractors to pay subcontractors and suppliers within 45 days of receiving payment, or in accordance with contractual terms, and authorizing disciplinary action for noncompliance. Additionally, vendors that default on contracts, fail to pay subcontractors, or demonstrate repeated poor performance may be suspended or barred from public contracting for up to five years.

The bill further clarifies and reinforces how public entities may lawfully spend funds and administer contracts for public purposes. The legislation affirms that public funds may be used for core governmental infrastructure and improvements, such as public buildings, emergency shelters, affordable housing, and energy efficiency projects, thereby helping to define the scope of permissible capital projects and expenditures. At the same time, it places limitations on the use of public funds for certain privately owned facilities, reinforcing the principle that expenditures must primarily serve a valid public purpose rather than confer a disproportionate private benefit. The act takes effect July 1, 2026.

This law applies directly to CDDs because CDDs function as local units of special-purpose government that procure services, manage infrastructure, and enter into public contracts. Since a CDD regularly contracts for construction, maintenance, and infrastructure improvements, the new requirement that contractors timely pay subcontractors and suppliers directly affects how a CDD administers its contracts. In addition, the provisions allowing suspension or disqualification of nonperforming vendors from public contracting are relevant to CDD procurement practices, especially where the district adopts or mirrors state purchasing standards. CDDs routinely finance and construct infrastructure such as roadways, utilities, stormwater systems, and public facilities. Clarifications regarding allowable public expenditures, such as for government buildings, emergency shelters, and infrastructure, help define the scope of permissible CDD projects and may influence how CDDs' structure future capital plans and bond-funded improvements.

Portions of the bill related to consumer protection and fraud prevention, including prohibitions on misrepresentation (such as impersonating officials), have indirect relevance. CDDs and District Management interact with residents, property owners, and contractors, so these provisions reinforce broader legal standards around transparency, proper representation, and avoidance of deceptive practices in district operations.

6. Chapter 2026-7, Laws of Florida (HB 399). This legislation is a comprehensive land use and development reform measure that primarily limits local government discretion in permitting, zoning, and development regulation while promoting consistency, affordability, and predictability in the development process. A central component of the legislation requires that application fees for development permits and orders imposed by counties and municipalities must be directly tied to the actual costs of reviewing and processing applications, must be publicly listed, and may not be based on construction value or project cost, thereby preventing fee structures that scale with development size rather than administrative expense. The act takes effect upon becoming law.

Even though CDDs do not exercise zoning or land use regulatory authority, the law applies to CDDs as infrastructure and service providers within the framework established by counties and municipalities. As a result, the bill's restrictions on local governments, particularly those related to development permitting, zoning, and land development regulations, will shape the regulatory environment in which CDDs plan, finance, and construct infrastructure.

The provisions limiting development application fees to actual administrative costs may reduce overall project costs for developments within CDD boundaries, which can influence the scope and timing of infrastructure financed by the CDD, including roads, utilities, and stormwater systems. Similarly, the requirement for more objective and clearly defined compatibility standards, along with limits on discretionary denials, may create a more predictable entitlement process, allowing CDDs to better coordinate infrastructure planning with approved development timelines and reduce delays that can affect bond issuances or capital improvement programs.

Although Chapter 2026-7 does not directly regulate CDD powers or governance, it significantly affects the local government land use framework that CDDs rely on, thereby affecting development timing, infrastructure planning, financing, and overall project feasibility within district boundaries.

7. Chapter [TBD], Laws of Florida (HB 967). This legislation establishes a clear legislative intent that local governments must accept electronic forms of payment, including credit cards, debit cards, charge cards, and electronic funds transfers, and specifically requires units of local government to offer online payment options. This applies broadly to counties, municipalities, special districts, and other local government entities, as well as constitutional officers such as clerks of court and tax collectors, unless another form of payment is required by law.

The legislation also preserves existing authority allowing local governments to pass along processing fees to users who choose electronic payment methods and confirms that governments are not liable for verifying card validity or available funds when processing such transactions. Importantly, it mandates that if a local government accepts electronic payments, it must also maintain an online system for doing so, reinforcing a statewide push toward digital accessibility and standardized payment options.

This legislation requires CDDs that collect any type of payment, such as fees, user charges, amenity payments, permit-related charges, or other CDD revenues, to offer electronic payment options, including credit cards, debit cards, and electronic funds transfers. It also specifically requires that if a CDD accepts electronic payments at all, it must maintain a system for accepting those payments online, which may require updates to CDD websites, billing platforms, or third-party payment processors. The legislation also allows CDDs to continue passing through processing fees associated with electronic payments (such as credit card convenience fees), and it preserves their ability to require verification of payment validity and sufficient funds. However, it removes discretion in practice by making online payment capability a mandatory feature for any CDD that accepts electronic payments in any form.

For convenience, we have included copies of the legislation referenced in this memorandum. We request that you include this memorandum as part of the agenda packages for upcoming meetings of the governing boards of those special districts in which you serve as the District Manager and this firm serves as District Counsel. For purposes of the agenda package, it is not necessary to include the attached legislation, as we can provide copies to anyone requesting the same. Copies of the referenced legislation are also accessible by visiting this link: http://laws.flrules.org/.

Botaniko

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

Fiscal Year 2026

Check Register

4/1/26 - 5/31/26

Date	*check #'s*	*Amount*
4/1 - 4/30	*257 - 262*	$15,057.91
5/1 - 5/31	*263 -266*	$123,281.59
	TOTAL	**$138,339.50**

CHECK DATE	VEND#	INVOICE DATE	INVOICE	EXPENSED TO... YRMO	DPT ACCT# SUB SUBCLASS	VENDOR NAME	STATUS	AMOUNT	CHECK AMOUNT	#
4/02/26	00013	4/02/26	04022026	202604	300-20700-10100		*	5,666.48		
			TRANSFER OF TAX RECEIPTS							
						BOTANIKO CDD			5,666.48	000257
4/02/26	00001	4/01/26	84	202604	310-51300-34000		*	2,101.75		
			APR 26 - MGMT FEES							
		4/01/26	84	202604	310-51300-31300		*	220.83		
			APR 26 - DISSEMINATION							
		4/01/26	84	202604	310-51300-49500		*	153.08		
			APR 26 - WEBSITE ADMIN							
		4/01/26	84	202604	310-51300-42000		*	3.70		
			APR 26 - POSTAGE							
		4/01/26	84	202604	310-51300-42500		*	11.70		
			APR 26 - COPIES							
						GMS-SF, LLC			2,491.06	000258
4/09/26	00012	3/25/26	8125363	202603	310-51300-32300		*	4,444.69		
			TRUSTEE FEES SER 20							
						US BANK			4,444.69	000259
4/16/26	00007	4/08/26	9124	202603	310-51300-31100		*	515.00		
			ENGINEER SVC 3/1-3/31/26							
						ALVAREZ ENGINEERS, INC.			515.00	000260
4/16/26	00003	3/31/26	198121	202603	310-51300-31500		*	1,890.00		
			MAR 26 - GENERAL COUNSEL							
						BILLING COCHRAN, P.A.			1,890.00	000261
4/23/26	00014	4/14/26	9-254-65	202604	310-51300-42000		*	50.68		
			SERVICES THRU 4/6/26							
						FEDEX			50.68	000262
5/07/26	00013	5/07/26	05072026	202605	300-20700-10100		*	119,133.71		
			TRANSFER OF TAX RECEIPTS							
						BOTANIKO CDD			119,133.71	000263
5/07/26	00001	5/01/26	85	202605	310-51300-34000		*	2,101.75		
			MAY 26 - MGMT FEES							
		5/01/26	85	202605	310-51300-31300		*	220.83		
			MAY 26 - DISSEMINATION							
		5/01/26	85	202605	310-51300-49500		*	153.08		
			MAY 26 - WEBSITE ADMIN							
		5/01/26	85	202605	310-51300-42000		*	2.22		
			MAY 26 - POSTAGE							
						GMS-SF, LLC			2,477.88	000264

*** CHECK DATES 04/01/2026 - 05/31/2026 *** BOTANIKO CDD - GENERAL FUND
BANK A BOTANIKO CDD

CHECK DATE	VEND#	.....INVOICE..... DATE	INVOICE	...EXPENSED TO... YRMO	DPT ACCT# SUB SUBCLASS	VENDOR NAME	STATUS	AMOUNT	....CHECK..... AMOUNT	#
5/21/26	00007	5/06/26	9178	202604	310-51300-31100		*	410.00		
			ENGINEER SVC 4/1-4/30/26							
						ALVAREZ ENGINEERS, INC.			410.00	000265
5/21/26	00003	4/30/26	198511	202604	310-51300-31500		*	1,260.00		
			APR 26 - GENERAL COUNSEL							
						BILLING COCHRAN, P.A.			1,260.00	000266

TOTAL FOR BANK A 138,339.50

TOTAL FOR REGISTER 138,339.50

Botaniko

Community Development District

Unaudited Financial Reporting

May 31, 2026

Table of Contents

Botaniko

Community Development District

Combined Balance Sheet

May 31, 2026

	General Fund	Debt Service Fund	Capital Project Fund	Totals Governmental Funds
Assets:				
Cash:				
Operating Account	$ 134,933	$ -	$ -	$ 134,933
Investments:				
Series 2020				-
Reserve	-	214,669	-	214,669
Revenue	-	272,253	-	272,253
Acq & Construction	-	-	1,663	1,663
Due from General	-	-	-	-
Total Assets	**$ 134,933**	**$ 486,921**	**$ 1,663**	**$ 623,518**
Liabilities:				
Accounts Payable	$ 1,200	$ -	$ -	$ 1,200
Due to Debt Service	-	-	-	-
Total Liabilites	**$ 1,200**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ 1,200**
Fund Balance:				
Nonspendable:				
Prepaid Items	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
Restricted for:				
Debt Service - Series	-	486,921	-	486,921
Capital Project - Series			1,663	1,663
Unassigned	$133,733	-	-	133,733
Total Fund Balances	**$ 133,733**	**$ 486,921**	**$ 1,663**	**$ 622,318**
Total Liabilities & Fund Balance	$ 134,933	$ 486,921	$ 1,663	$ 623,518

Botaniko

Community Development District

General Fund

Statement of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance

For The Period Ending May 31, 2026

	Adopted Budget	Prorated Budget Thru 05/31/26	Actual Thru 05/31/26	Variance
Revenues:				
Special Assessments - On Roll	$ 75,000	$ 75,000	$ 73,901	$ (1,099)
Misc Income	-	-	533	533
Total Revenues	**$ 75,000**	**$ 75,000**	**$ 74,435**	**$ (565)**
Expenditures:				
General & Administrative:				
Engineering	$ 5,000	$ 3,333	$ 9,284	$ (5,951)
Attorney	14,000	9,333	14,040	(4,707)
Annual Audit	4,700	4,700	4,700	-
Assessment Roll	400	400	400	-
Arbitrage Rebate	550	550	550	-
Dissemination Agent	2,650	1,767	1,767	-
Trustee Fees	4,434	4,445	4,445	-
Management Fees	25,221	16,814	16,814	-
Property Appraiser	400	400	400	-
Website Maintenance	1,837	1,225	1,225	-
Telephone	150	100	-	100
Postage & Delivery	400	267	70	196
Insurance General Liability	6,619	6,619	6,378	241
Printing & Binding	700	467	35	432
Legal Advertising	2,500	1,667	490	1,177
Other Current Charges	1,500	1,000	846	154
Property Taxes	1,050	1,050	1,110	(60)
Office Supplies	149	99	0	99
Dues, Licenses & Subscriptions	175	175	175	-
Contingency	2,565	1,710	-	1,710
Total Expenditures	**$ 75,000**	**$ 56,120**	**$ 62,727**	**$ (6,607)**
Excess (Deficiency) of Revenues over Expendi	$ -	$ 18,880	$ 11,708	$ (7,173)
Net Change in Fund Balance	**$ -**	**$ 18,880**	**$ 11,708**	**$ (7,173)**
Fund Balance - Beginning	$ -		$ 122,026	
Fund Balance - Ending	$ -		$ 133,733	

Botaniko

Community Development District

Debt Service Fund Series 2020

Statement of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance

For The Period Ending May 31, 2026

	Adopted Budget	Prorated Budget Thru 05/31/26	Actual Thru 05/31/26	Variance
Revenues:				
Special Assessments - On Roll	$ 429,337	$ 429,337	$ 406,880	$ (22,457)
Interest Income	5,000	5,000	11,751	6,751
Total Revenues	**$ 434,337**	**$ 434,337**	**$ 418,631**	**$ (15,707)**
Expenditures:				
Interest Expense - 11/01	$ 128,447	$ 128,447	$ 128,447	$ -
Interest Expense - 05/01	128,447	175,000	175,000	-
Principal Expense - 05/01	175,000	128,447	128,447	-
Total Expenditures	**$ 431,894**	**$ 431,894**	**$ 431,894**	**$ -**
Excess (Deficiency) of Revenues over Expendi	$ 2,443	$ 2,444	$ (13,263)	$ (15,707)
Net Change in Fund Balance	**$ 2,443**	**$ 2,444**	**$ (13,263)**	**$ (15,707)**
Fund Balance - Beginning	$ 199,039		$ 500,184	
Fund Balance - Ending	$ 201,482		$ 486,921	

Botaniko

Community Development District

Capital Projects Fund Series 2020

Statement of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance

For The Period Ending May 31, 2026

	Adopted Budget	Prorated Budget Thru 05/31/26	Actual Thru 05/31/26	Variance
Revenues				
Interest Income	$ -	$ -	$ 36	$ 36
Total Revenues	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ 36**	**$ 36**
Expenditures:				
Capital Outlay	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
Total Expenditures	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**
Excess (Deficiency) of Revenues over Expendi	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ 36**	**$ 36**
Net Change in Fund Balance	**$ -**		**$ 36**	**$ 36**
Fund Balance - Beginning			$ 1,627	
Fund Balance - Ending	$ -		$ 1,663	

Botaniko

Community Development District

Month to Month

	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	March	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Total
Revenues:													
Special Assessments - On Roll	$ 177	$ 10,389	$ 40,809	$ 5,716	$ 2,019	$ 626	$ 14,166	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 73,901
Misc. Income	533	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	533
Total Revenues	**$ 710**	**$ 10,389**	**$ 40,809**	**$ 5,716**	**$ 2,019**	**$ 626**	**$ 14,166**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ 74,435**
Expenditures:													
General & Administrative:													
Engineering	$ -	$ -	$ 1,103	$ 4,457	$ 2,800	$ 515	$ 410	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 9,284
Attorney	780	1,170	690	4,650	2,400	1,890	1,260	1,200	-	-	-	-	14,040
Annual Audit	-	-	-	4,700	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4,700
Assessment Roll	400	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	400
Arbitrage Rebate	-	-	-	-	-	550	-	-	-	-	-	-	550
Dissemination Agent	221	221	221	221	221	221	221	221	-	-	-	-	1,767
Trustee Fees	-	-	-	-	-	4,445	-	-	-	-	-	-	4,445
Management Fees	2,102	2,102	2,102	2,102	2,102	2,102	2,102	2,102	-	-	-	-	16,814
Property Appraiser	-	-	400	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	400
Website Maintenance	153	153	153	153	153	153	153	153	-	-	-	-	1,225
Telephone	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Postage & Delivery	2	1	1	2	2	5	54	2	-	-	-	-	70
Insurance General Liability	6,378	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6,378
Printing & Binding	-	-	13	-	10	-	12	-	-	-	-	-	35
Legal Advertising	-	-	-	89	401	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	490
Other Current Charges	114	94	154	132	142	120	(105)	195	-	-	-	-	846
Property Taxes	-	1,110	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,110
Office Supplies	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Dues, Licenses & Subscriptions	175	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	175
Contingency	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Expenditures	**$ 10,325**	**$ 4,850**	**$ 4,836**	**$ 16,505**	**$ 8,231**	**$ 10,000**	**$ 4,106**	**$ 3,873**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ 62,727**
Excess (Deficiency) of Revenues o	$ (9,615)	$ 5,539	$ 35,972	$ (10,789)	$ (6,212)	$ (9,375)	$ 10,060	$ (3,873)	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 11,708
Net Change in Fund Balance	**$ (9,615)**	**$ 5,539**	**$ 35,972**	**$ (10,789)**	**$ (6,212)**	**$ (9,375)**	**$ 10,060**	**$ (3,873)**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ 11,708**

Botaniko

Community Development District

Long Term Debt Report

Special Assessment Bonds, Series 2020		
Original Issue Amount:		$7,640,000.00
Term 1:	$800,000.00	
Interest Rate:	2.88%	
Maturity Date:	May 1, 2025	
Term 2:	$1,130,000.00	
Interest Rate:	3.25%	
Maturity Date:	May 1, 2031	
Term 3:	$2,195,000.00	
Interest Rate:	3.63%	
Maturity Date:	May 1, 2040	
Term 4:	$3,515,000.00	
Interest Rate:	4.00%	
Maturity Date:	May 1, 2050	
Reserve Fund Definition	50% of Maximum Annual Debt Service	
Reserve Fund Requirement	$214,669	
Reserve Fund Balance	214,669	
Bonds Outstanding - 2/14/2020		$7,640,000
Less: Principal Payment - 5/1/21		($150,000)
Less: Principal Payment - 5/1/22		($155,000)
Less: Principal Payment - 5/1/23		($160,000)
Less: Principal Payment - 5/1/24		($165,000)
Less: Principal Payment - 5/1/25		($170,000)
Less: Principal Payment - 5/1/26		($175,000)
Current Bonds Outstanding		**$6,665,000**

Botaniko

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

Special Assessment Receipts - Broward County

Fiscal Year 2026

Summary

Gross Assessments	$ 79,787.50	$ 456,741.66	$ 536,529.16
Net Assessments	$ 75,000.25	$ 429,337.16	$ 504,337.41

ON ROLL ASSESSMENTS

Date	Gross Amount	Discount/ (Penalty)	Commission	Interest	Net Receipts	O&M Portion	2020 Debt Service	Total
					allocation in %	14.87%	85.13%	100.00%
10/24/25	-	-	-	177.15	177.15	177.15	-	177.15
11/21/25	40,715.69	1,564.57	391.51	-	38,759.61	10,389.07	28,370.54	38,759.61
12/05/25	94,345.86	3,773.78	905.71	-	89,666.37	12,739.47	76,926.90	89,666.37
12/19/25	162,500.98	6,434.09	1,560.68	-	154,506.21	28,069.07	126,437.14	154,506.21
01/02/26	24,552.47	704.64	238.48	-	23,609.35	4,143.15	19,466.20	23,609.35
01/16/26	14,555.89	436.68	141.19	-	13,978.02	1,389.78	12,588.24	13,978.02
01/23/26	-	-	-	182.84	182.84	182.84	-	182.84
02/13/26	20,900.62	385.19	205.15	-	20,310.28	2,019.37	18,290.91	20,310.28
03/13/26	6,419.84	64.20	63.56	-	6,292.08	625.60	5,666.48	6,292.08
04/10/26	134,018.77	64.20	1,339.55	-	132,615.02	13,481.31	119,133.71	132,615.02
04/24/26	-	-	-	684.50	684.50	684.50	-	684.50
TOTAL	**$ 498,010.12**	**$ 13,427.35**	**$ 4,845.83**	**$ 1,044.49**	**$ 480,781.43**	**$ 73,901.31**	**$ 406,880.12**	**$ 480,781.43**

95.21%	**Percent Collected**
$ 25,679.36	**Balance Remaining to Collect**