MINUTES OF MEETING TESORO COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

The regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Tesoro Community Development District was held Tuesday, **September 30, 2025** at 11:07 a.m. at the Tesoro Club, 3rd Floor, 2000 S.E. Via Tesoro, Port St. Lucie, Florida.

Present and constituting a quorum were:

John VogtChairmanAllen BordenVice ChairmanRosemary JonesAssistant SecretaryEmily JonesAssistant secretaryMichael FerrucciAssistant Secretary

Also present were:

Andressa Hinz-Philippi District Manager Lindsay Moczynski District Attorney

Roberto Cabrero Culpepper & Terpening by phone

Matt Hans Field Manager
Anne Vogt Resident
Zach Higginbotham Wellington

Valentina -----

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

Roll Call

Ms. Hinz-Philippi called the meeting to order at 11:07 a.m. and called the roll.

Ms. Hinz Philippi stated that since we are discussing our rules today, we would like to put public comments before the board discusses the issues we are going to vote on. We changed the public comments to the beginning.

Ms. Moczynski stated that because the agenda did not originally have the two items in red, which are the public comments and discussion for possible board action on the Wellington contract, what I look for is a motion to modify the agenda to include those two items.

There were no comments from the public as to modifying the agenda.

On MOTION by Mr. Ferrucci seconded by Mr. Vogt with all in favor the agenda was amended to include public comments and possible board action on the Wellington contract.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS Public Comments

Ms. Vogt stated I would like to thank you very much for cutting back the fire flags in front of hole 3 lady's tee.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS Approval of Minutes of the July 31, 2025 Meeting

Mr. Ferrucci stated let the record reflect on the July 31 minutes that I did not approve Resolution 2025-11 as it is written and I'm adamantly opposed to the way it is written. It is very vague with no backup. Put that on the record.

Ms. Hinz-Philippi asked Lindsay do you want to explain this motion?

Ms. Moczynski stated Supervisor Ferrucci if you are able to clarify the wording, are you objecting to the wording of the resolution or the wording of the minutes or both and are you asking for an amendment to the minutes?

Mr. Ferrucci stated I am asking for an amendment to the minutes.

Ms. Moczynski stated, after I received your email, I did listen to the recording and as it relates to 2025-11 resolution, there was a motion and a second with all including to pass that resolution. Obviously, I was just listening to an audio recording so I was going by whoever, I believe it was Andressa was stating that it was maybe you who made the first motion and then I think it might have been Allen who did the second, but I did listen to the actual audio recording that reflected that.

Ms. Hinz-Philippi stated there was no opposition.

Mr. Ferrucci stated it appears the way it is written to be in perpetuity, not specific to anything.

Ms. Moczynski stated right now this will be a motion on whether or not the minutes should be approved and whether or not you are going to request amendments during discussion but not as to the actual content of the resolution which passed at the last meeting.

Mr. Ferrucci stated just that one point, just for it to have a closed end to it or to have it relate to something or a date or specific contract, plats, permits or conveyances not an openended flow into perpetuity.

Ms. Moczynski stated okay it is something related to the resolution, maybe we can talk about that during supervisor requests in case you wanted to revisit that resolution because right now we just want to talk about the minutes.

Ms. Rosemary Jones stated I thought that 2025-11 was all about giving him permission so that he could take care of it and do it without us being here and we trust him.

Ms. Moczynski stated the 2025-11 resolution has to do with the execution of documents that may relate to plats, permits, conveyances that might need to be executed in between meetings.

Ms. Rosemary Jones stated right and we gave him our permission, we trusted him that we wouldn't have to meet to do that. I don't see why we would put a limit on it but we will talk about it when we come to it.

Mr. Vogt stated there were two people here but not reflected as being in the agenda, one was Wallace Riveira and Anne Vogt.

Ms. Emily Jones stated there was a motion that I was included in but I don't remember so maybe I can just resolve it with you too with the recording. Somebody picked up my voice somewhere where it wasn't.

Ms. Hinz-Philippi asked which one?

Ms. Emily Jones stated the agenda I read yesterday seems different than this.

Ms. Hinz-Philippi stated of yes, I revised it.

Ms. Emily Jones stated my second on the financials I wasn't sure about that and I remember authorizing the chair that the shade session so I didn't take that.

Ms. Hinz-Philippi stated so I will just look back on the recording and then make sure it was you. That's what I'm going to do I'm going to talk to my people there that give the minutes to me and I was commenting with Michael that I want somebody that does word by word for us here. There are districts that we don't need to do word by word but this one I wanted to be sure that we do so I will see if we change our person because there are people who do word by word and others that just do like a resume of what is being said. I will ask for somebody that is going

to do word by word. I will get back to you on that one, if it was picked up that it was somebody else then it will be reflected on the minutes.

On MOTION by Mr. Rosemary Jones seconded by Ms. Emily Jones with all in favor the minutes were approved as amended to include Anne Vogt as a resident and Wallace Riveira as security being in attendance and checking that Emily made the motion regarding the budget.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Public Hearing to Adopt the Rules

A. Motion to Open the Public Hearing

On MOTION by Mr. Ferrucci seconded by Mr. Borden with all in favor the public hearing was opened.

B. Public Comment and Discussion

There being no public comments, the board had the following discussion.

Ms. Hinz-Philippi stated they are extensive rules. Most of it is just standard for us to protect the district but there are a lot of items that we don't really use because the district does not own the clubhouse. There are things such as sharing space that will not apply to this district. There are general rules for all the districts and there are parts that are there to protect us, public decorum, three-minute rule for residents to speak and all the consequences we can give if people don't behave in a certain way. This is important to protect this board of a situation that gets out of hand. I think that is important to have in our rules so we have the mechanism to enforce a certain decorum a certain treatment with this board.

Ms. Moczynski stated they are voluminous but a lot of them just follow the Florida Statutes and what is in there, what you are allowed to do and what you are not allowed to do and it expands a little bit on that. Then in addition it has the suspension and disciplinary rules or policies that can be followed if there is any type of violation and then if you have non-residents and establishing a range for user fees for them. It is basic and we do it for all our districts and we have presented these to our districts because of the recent legislative changes as it relates to timing and how much notice needs to be given when you have to publish for hearings and so on.

Ms. Emily Jones stated I am more interested in the modifications to the old rules.

Ms. Moczynski stated I would have to look at your old rules to see what exactly was different. I apologize because I was not part of when these were prepared for your particular district. Typically, if the districts had rules that might have gone into effect around 2021 or 2022 there is only a handful of things that might have been changed or updated. As it relates to the public comment it is a reasonable time and the chair or the person who runs the meeting still has the discretion in case there is a large amount of people or groups that want to speak to be able to modify the time limit from the three minutes to something else. Instead of 25 and 30 days for published notices when you do change rules and rates and things that might affect privileges of residents it is now 35 days out that you have to publish so you take action two meetings out depending on your schedule. Also just to make sure in case yours were older the more up to date as it relates to the competitive consultants negotiations act, that is where you are doing bidding for bigger projects, there are different statutory requirements and thresholds of what you are supposed to do depending on how big a vendor contract might be. If yours were older than 5+ years then we just wanted to make sure you are up to date in reflecting those statutes. I can go through and if we are able to find your other rules I can provide a redline if you didn't have one at your last meeting that might have shown what the differences were.

Ms. Emily Jones stated that would be great.

Ms. Moczynski stated I will make a note of that.

Ms. Hinz-Philippi stated I think they are really old and are probably from the beginning of the district. I don't think Capko ever updated them.

Ms. Moczynski stated I will do my best to try to find it and show you but otherwise we can kind of at least give you an idea of the recent changes in the last five years.

Ms. Hinz-Philippi stated we have records.

Mr. Vogt stated I read the rules word for word and I think a lot of what it pertains to the biggest CDDs which do construction, etc. However, whatever is in there did not raise any eyebrows to me for what we have been behaving under as in we have been performing to these rules. There might be a tweak there might be a little something but we have done everything within the rules that are there. Worthwhile having a little summary and review but I'm not sure that we have adhered that we have not modified the rules as GMS has been managing meetings.

Ms. Hinz-Philippi stated we will bring back something.

Mr. Ferrucci stated there was one done somewhere along the line and there were statutory changes that were added.

- Ms. Hinz-Philippi stated if you do have it will you send it to me?
- Mr. Ferrucci stated yes. We can send it to the whole board. We can do a redline.
- Ms. Moczynski stated I can try to do a redline.

A. Consideration of Resolution 2025-12 Adopting the Rules

- Ms. Emily Jones stated I would like to see the redline before we adopt the rules.
- Mr. Vogt stated I would approve the rules as they stand.
- Ms. Hinz-Philippi stated we had to update the rules to conform with Florida Law.

On MOTION by Ms. Rosemary Jones seconded by Mr. Vogt with all in favor Resolution 2025-12 Adopting the Rules was approved.

B. Motion to Close the Public Hearing

On MOTION by Mr. Vogt seconded by Ms. Rosemary Jones with all in favor the public hearing was closed.

Ms. Moczynski stated I just did find in our file one from 2005 and Mr. Ferrucci stated there should be one in-between.

Mr. Vogt stated I think they were modified in 2019. At the end of the day this is a formal codified set of rules. I love the way it has been done with the statute attached to it. It needs to be modified regularly, which is something we have not done before. We need to do once a year any changes that are necessary.

- Ms. Hinz-Philippi stated the attorneys will let us know when they need to be updated.
- Ms. Rosemary Jones stated I agree with what he is saying not just because of legislative reasons but because of our own that something comes us that we discuss.

Mr. Vogt stated I think what I'm really saying is we need to face the fact that this will get modified and stay current forever. That means we need to on occasion review or add to it. I suggest the occasion is as little as possible in a year we don't want to have to put all these open

public meetings into it and there are certain board meetings we want to get through with other things like budgets. I appreciate everybody's taking the positive attitude.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Ratification of Proposal for Permit Modification with Hobe Sound Environmental Consultants, Inc.

Ms. Hinz-Philippi stated at the last meeting we talked about our permits with South Florida Water Management District and we have a grievance with the developer and HOA that we service these easements or the permits so the CDD is responsible for the whole service that is presented there. Our vendors and anything like field manager to inspect anything that is regarding the permits. We are responsible to take care and to make sure everything is good there. What happened is we have the agreements but the permits are not in CDD's name. We talked to Jennifer and Lindsay that we wanted to clear up to reflect our agreements. We talked to Hobe Sound if there was any way we could adjust that so the permits also reflect the agreements that we have. I think this is a very reasonable proposal of \$960 to change the permits into the CDD's name so when you look at the agreement and permit they match. We talked about changing he entity and just putting the name of the CDD but that is much more costly and would take a lot of time. They suggested including the name of the CDD on the permit.

Mr. Vogt stated we have two documents sitting here signed in 2019, one of which is a reciprocal easement document which says that the three parties, golf club, POA and the CDD have separate entities and the second one is a permit recognition between all three parties again, which says that the CDD runs all the permits. All the permits are signed 2010 or earlier in the name of Ginn, WCI or both. What we are really trying to do, the two legal documents overarch this but we are trying to do to make sure that if anybody questions a permit or anybody wants to raise an issue with a permit one of the current entities is named on the permit, Tesoro CDD, so they know who to contact. If they contact Ginn that isn't going to make much difference and if they contact WCI the only WCI today is the builders. We need to put our name on those permits to they know who to contact.

Ms. Emily Jones stated it sounds like the other two need to be updated as well Ginn and WCI.

Mr. Ferrucci asked updated for removal?

Ms. Emily Jones stated or updated to the current owners.

Mr. Vogt stated we just say that the primary one is the Tesoro CDD. If we want to change it, it becomes an enormously complex thing that they reissue the permits and revisit them whereas this is a name added to a permit which is simpler.

Ms. Hinz-Philippi stated we maintain all these easements, that is our responsibility anyway and the only thing we reviewed it with Jennifer it was not clean because our name was not on there. We want to make sure we have the legal side matching what we already do.

Ms. Jones asked was there an issue that prompted this with a contact name?

Ms. Moczynski stated it is a way to make sure that the CDD's name is on the document with the enforcement special district so they know we are the ones who are responsible for the operations and maintenance as it relates to our easement agreement. It is basically dotting your i's and crossing your t's and making sure we have this one agreement that has been in place but we need to make sure that everyone else is properly informed and that their records are updated.

Mr. Vogt stated in essence those two legal documents are sitting there unless you want to publish them to the whole community every time anybody was to ask. The thing is if any of the enforcement agencies wish to contact anybody right at the top it is Tesoro CDD we will know about it.

Ms. Emily Jones stated the publishing isn't so bad but I can understand it just makes it easier to

Mr. Vogt stated nobody can claim ignorance if the name is there.

Ms. Moczynski stated it is also if anything is not in compliance then we as the ones responsible, the district, will get notice and not go to someone who may never forward to us and then fines could be assessed if something were to happen if there is a non-compliance.

Ms. Hinz-Philippi stated I'm looking for a motion to approve the proposal for \$960 for Hobe Sound to make the permit modifications.

On MOTION by Mr. Ferrucci seconded by Ms. Rosemary Jones with all in favor the Proposal from Hobe Sound Environmental Consultants, Inc. for permit modification in the amount of \$960 was ratified.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Staff Reports

A. Attorney

Ms. Moczynski stated currently what I'm going to do since we are in a normal open meeting right now what I would like to do is let you know that I am going to request a shade session to occur during our next regular meeting. We can have it at the conclusion or at the beginning we can figure that out once we figure out when our next meeting is. I am requesting a shade session so that I may discuss with the supervisors and the applicable district staff litigation strategy and expenditures as it relates to the pending lawsuit we have and I apologize but I have to get the whole spiel out formally in the matter of Tesoro CDD versus Douglas Dagle as trustee and individually of the trust, which is a pending case in St. Lucie County. The people I expect to be present would be supervisors Jones, Jones, Vogt, Ferrucci and Borden. I also expect the district manager, Andressa Philippi to be present as well as myself, Lindsay Moczynski and Jennifer Kilinski as district counsel. A court reporter will also be there to transcribe the shade session and it is expected approximately 30 minutes but it may take more or less depending on how long discussion may ensue. Then for the purposes of the case no. we have pending because we did just get it transferred over to circuit court, it is case no. 2025CA1892. I'm requesting a motion to approve a shade session for the pending litigation.

On MOTION by Ms. Rosemary Jones seconded by Ms. Emily Jones with all in favor staff was authorized to notice a shade session to be held during the next regular meeting.

Ms. Moczynski stated once we figure out the date we will make sure it is confirmed at the end of the meeting.

We did the rules; we will make sure that we can try to get you the earlier rules between 2005 and now to point out the differences for you in case there is anything else that needs to be updated. I know we were getting the permit changes so that should work for that.

Ms. Hinz-Philippi asked what are we on our litigation?

Ms. Moczynski stated I will give you limited information on litigation, it is not going to be much different than what was sent in the email. We did get the case transferred to circuit court, which is where it needs to be since we are looking for injunctive and declaratory relief. Currently, what that means is that all the documents that were in the county court case have now

moved into the circuit court case, we just have new judge, a new case number. I'm almost done with that amended petition, I was hoping to get it done by this last week unfortunately, I just wasn't able to so hopefully we will get that wrapped up tomorrow so Jennifer can do any final edits she might have and what that will do is resolve the motion to dismiss that was filed in the county court. Typically when someone files a motion to dismiss you either have to have it set for hearing and the judge will decide whether or not to grant it or deny it or you can file an amended petition, which gets rid of it because I wasn't on the case originally when it was filed and making sure we had the permits, with the right numbers, etc. making sure we have everything we want attached just going ahead and amending it and so that will be filed and that will give 10 days for him to file a response to that. We are also working on what is called initial disclosure, it is something that is required in the circuit court a semi-new rule that came down from the courts where we have to write down anyone's names, documents or anything we might have, basically like here is our initial what we think there might be about discovery, they have to do the same thing. Once that is done we can actually file our own discovery separate from that so we can do any requests for production or interrogatories or anything else that we might want to do. That is almost done as well. After they file their response if they file an answer to it then that means we can start working on any type of motion we might want to do to get it to a final hearing. We will continue to give you bi-weekly updates unless something else comes up in the meantime if we are able to get that amended petition finalized and filed, we will send you a copy of that as well via email so you can review that if you want.

Ms. Hinz-Philippi asked timewise what do you think is a good timeframe for us because if we are going to look to a new meeting and a shade session this board doesn't meet regularly because we don't have much business to attend. We have now to do this for two main reasons and the rules today but for now we would not have.

Ms. Moczynski asked do you need to amend the budget because that would require a hearing. We are going to need to meet by early November to amend the budget. If there is to be a budget amendment we have to do that by early November and you will need to meet in order to do that.

Mr. Vogt asked why would we be amending the budget?

Ms. Hinz-Philippi stated because the budget always has to match dollar by dollar even if you have the money it needs to be from the line item that you were talking about. If you used the

money and it came from reserves or any other place the number needs to match exactly so you have to amend even though you didn't go over budget you have to just put the same line items the same amount so that is why you amend so the numbers go exactly as it was on the budget and you show where the amounts go.

Ms. Emily Jones asked so it is not for the permit?

Ms. Hinz-Philippi stated no, this is the budget amendment.

Ms. Moczynski stated this is your annual budget that you have all your line items as it relates to the revenue you bring in from your assessments and how you pay your bonds and then all of your operation and maintenance expenditures.

Ms. Hinz-Philippi stated we are going to need an amendment I already spoke with Patti. It is not about spending over the budget it is about the predictions that we do need to match exactly to close that budget year. What we do is if we spent more on one line item we go back and review that and make them match 100% and the budget is closed for that year.

Ms. Rosemary Jones stated we need to have it at the end of October or beginning of November.

Ms. Moczynski stated yes working around your schedule, we just have to make sure that it is done by mid-November. We will do the shade session the same day and at the beginning or at the end.

On MOTION by Ms. Rosemary Jones seconded by Mr. Vogt with all in favor the motion setting the shade session for the pending litigation was amended to reflect November 4, 2025 at 11:00 a.m. with the shade session to be held immediately following the business portion of the meeting for supervisors, staff and counsel to discuss litigation strategy and related expenditures.

B. Engineer

Mr. Cabrero stated I believe the permit modification approach to those permits is the way to go, that is a great idea. I also want to follow-up on the 825 structure that the city is designing and constructing here. I had the meeting that stopped me from going to this, involved John Dutton at the city and he has confirmed once again that they are wrapping up their plans and their permitting on their base and structure. The fence will be done by the end of the year and

I'm trying to get the fence structure built during the upcoming dry season. He has confirmed that the construction will happen in 2025/2026 fiscal year.

C. Field – Report

Mr. Hans stated on the field side on the maintenance of the wetlands and lakes they are doing pretty good. Ronni's crew is actually ahead of schedule for this time of year than they would normally be. We had some issues with Lake 14's water lettuce but that is this time of year every year occurrence for us. Lake 6 has algae but outside those two lakes everything is pretty good. There are some minor weed issues on the east side but it is very minor. Only two lakes have that going on.

Outside the maintenance we have sent some letters to a few homes to remove stuff that had draining into the lakes and both homes have complied. We have another home we sent a couple letters to and they have not complied yet but they are pretty close. I want to put on the record that we had multiple homes that we have been sending letters to. Most people have complied and corrected the violations they had.

Mr. Vogt stated it is very nice to know the homeowners are contributing.

D. Manager

Ms. Hinz-Philippi stated I just want to bring it up to discuss the Wellington Landscape contract. The agreement is expiring today with them and multiple board members reached out to me about their service. At this point I want to open the conversation for the board to express their thoughts and we can decide what route to go. We can continue and renew the agreement, we can go month to month and see if the services are what is expected by the board, and if that doesn't work we can go for a bid and bring other options.

- Mr. Ferrucci stated I think we should go month to month.
- Ms. Emily Jones stated that is a great idea.
- Mr. Ferrucci stated we should also look into other options.
- Ms. Rosemary Jones asked do we have more than one contract with Wellington? Is the homeowners a separate one?
 - Mr. Hans stated yes.
 - Ms. Rosemary Jones asked what is it of the CDD that they are doing exactly at this point?
 - Mr. Hans stated they take care of lake banks for us, some of our upland buffers.

Ms. Rosemary Jones stated I read about the one problem they have done more than once. Is that one of the issue or has there been other things?

Mr. Vogt stated over the last year there have been some miscellaneous. I think at this point in time in fairness we should go month by month, asses it and see if we are happy or not. It was down to a small portion of the totality of Wellington. You don't want to not renew, that is not the right way. I think for the next months see what happens go month to month and assess. We have a board meeting in November we can look at what we believe at that point.

Mr. Ferrucci asked do we agree we are going to speak to Ronni and ask him for a recommendation or are we going to that on our own?

Mr. Vogt stated I believe we will explore alternatives so that should the service not be what we require we may choose to alter it.

Ms. Rosemary Jones stated information is always a good thing.

Ms. Hinz-Philippi stated I can ask Matt to get some proposals so we can see what is out there pricing wise and service. We can explore our options and we can get a proposal from Wellington too for the next meeting and we have this time to work on their services and present their best case. At the next meeting we can evaluate all the possibilities.

Mr. Ferrucci asked is Matt okay with that?

Mr. Hans stated I'm good with that.

Mr. Higginbotham stated I rode around with Matt today there is one pond that you have some spots on and if there is anything outside that specific area that we can work on please let me know. As far as I know that is the only thing I will get them to follow-up on. If there is anything outside of that, please let us know and we will do our best to take care of it.

Ms. Hinz-Philippi stated I think that is a good compromise. We can evaluate at the next meeting.

Ms. Moczynski stated since you are here, do you know whether or not you can speak on behalf of Wellington that you are open to going month to month and executing a document that reflects that?

Mr. Higginbotham stated yes I would say we are comfortable doing that until the end of the calendar year. I think that should give you time for whatever route you take and give everybody time.

Ms. Moczynski asked is it you or someone else in your company that would receive the document to countersign?

Mr. Higginbotham stated that would be me.

Ms. Moczynski stated if the board wants to move forward with month to month we will need to have a document evidencing that agreement in writing between the parties. That is what your current contract dictates if you go renewal, month to month or terminate it all has to be done in writing. Because this wasn't on the agenda previously we will need to open up for public comment if anyone in the audience has comments relating to moving forward on a month-to-month agreement for services with Wellington.

There were no comments from the public

On MOTION by Mr. Ferrucci seconded by Ms. Emily Jones with all in favor Wellington will be on a month-to-month basis until the end of the calendar year and district counsel was authorized to prepare the document to go month to month until terminated.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Financial Reports

- A. Approval of Check Register
- **B.** Acceptance of Unaudited Financials

On MOTION by Mr. Vogt seconded by Ms. Rosemary Jones with all in favor the check register was approved and the unaudited financials were accepted.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Supervisor's Requests and Audience Comments

- Ms. Hinz-Philippi stated Michael you wanted to bring up the resolution to talk about it.
- Mr. Ferrucci stated just to go back to my issue at the beginning.
- Ms. Hinz-Philippi stated I think we can clarify a little bit what the resolution is about. We talked on the phone and Michael had the impression that the resolution was too open.
 - Mr. Ferrucci stated yes.

Ms. Moczynski stated my understanding is the resolution speaks to documents that may need to be executed and due to the sporadic nature of your meetings they might need to be executed between meetings and they would only be documents that would relate to the capital

improvement plan and that are within the budget and are also subject to district staff, engineer, management and counsel approval if necessary. Typically, it is going to be things that you have already seen or might have discussed at some length whether it is brief or extended at a board meeting but the document just might need to get finalized between and you might not see that finalized document at a board meeting before it gets signed but it would be reviewed by the manager, the engineer legal counsel to make sure you are good and you are not risking and everything is in line with what it needs to be and it would still be brought back at the next meeting for ratification. That is the time the board can review it and see if everything is line. Of course, if something comes up and it is going to be close in time to a meeting and it is not urgent we will probably just time it to happen during a meeting similar to the updated Hobe Sound proposal because the engineer wanted a slight revision to it. It is limited to things that are in your line-item budget and related to the operations and maintenance that is already approved within your capital improvement plan. It is not extraneous things you have never heard of before and just relates to permits or plans or those types of conveyances it is not a random vendor contract.

Ms. Rosemary Jones stated he is not making decision that we are not a part of. It is all about timeliness.

Ms. Moczynski stated if it is a disputed thing or we might need some feedback from all of you then we will call a meeting. I think it has come up recently because of the current situations we are dealing with.

Ms. Hinz-Philippi stated we were working on transferring the permits, this conversation was at the last meeting and we went to Hobe Sound and it took a while for them to give us the proposal we went to the city and we got this back this week and we could approve it if we were not meeting for 30-days and \$960 was not an absurd amount and it could have been executed and brought back to the board and at that point if the bord didn't agree they could express their concern but at the same time we moved things along. Since we had this meeting scheduled, we brought it to the meeting.

Ms. Rosemary Jones stated I'm comfortable. How do you feel?

Mr. Ferrucci stated I don't like anybody having authorization to sign anything without us seeing it. It seems like an impossibility. I think anything that is done or signed or takes place we should be copied on because I think I knew more about the CDD before I got on the board than I

do now. I don't know what is going on. I never talk to Matt. I have no idea what is going on anywhere but maybe that is the way the program works.

Ms. Moczynski stated it is hard because it is so different when you are in this world of CDDs, because it doesn't work like a private company. We have to do everything open. You, individually as supervisors, can communicate with district staff when you would like to between meetings and we can send an email out to all of you, but you can't engage in conversations together outside of meetings. Every conversation you have that relates to the district you can play golf or have lunch together outside meetings but you can't discuss district business outside of meetings. That includes phone calls, text messages, emails sitting across at the bar, talk about the weather, politics, golf and the lady's tee that was done but not as it relates to your vendors. As long as it is not district business, you can talk outside meeting but if you want to discuss district business with other supervisors, it has to be at something that we publicly notice whether it be a meeting like this or a workshop.

Mr. Ferrucci stated it takes a lot to get over that and it doesn't make logical sense any way a person would run a company.

Ms. Moczynski stated typically districts meeting monthly.

Mr. Ferrucci asked is it out of the question that anything that gets signed off on that we get copied or is that against the rules?

Ms. Moczynski stated it is not against the rules. Anything that would get signed off between meetings would come to the next meeting for ratification so you would see it then. But if you wanted to see a document after it has been signed between meetings that is something that the district management team would work out with you because they are the ones, I don't see half the things that get signed between meetings. The district management team might be able to set up a system with you as to providing documents.

Ms. Hinz-Philippi stated we don't sign many things between meetings but if we do I can send it to you.

Mr. Ferrucci stated god forbid something happens to John and he can't see or write nobody has any idea of what is going on.

Ms. Hinz-Philippi stated if John cannot sign a document Allen would be responsible to do that. If we do sign something between meetings I can send it to the whole board.

Mr. Ferruci stated yes.

Mr. Vogt stated I think that there is a very simple thing we need to do, any document I sign copy it to the board. A lot of CDDs basically take the job that this CDD has as well as the POA and combine it under a CDD. That means they are dealing with a plethora of bits and pieces of day-to-day issues and they have board meetings every month. This one normally has three meetings a year, it helps in our fees and in the costs from district staff and legal staff. We are trying hard not to spend money just to have meetings. The logic to that is to allow the chairman to sign documents. I agree with Mike, let's put it out if any document gets signed send it to the board and ratify it at the next meeting.

Ms. Hinz-Philippi stated this district is more about the field and my work is mostly documentation and the budget. We can send a note to the board every month saying this is what is happening or we have an issue to communicate.

Mr. Vogt stated as soon as Mike became a board member I couldn't talk to him. We had an amendment written for the permit and the reciprocal easement documents to replace exhibit C, which is a drawing in 2019 produced by Culpepper of which was the three exhibits, A, B, and C, which reflect the three entities that are part of these agreements responsibilities. They are very high level and it took four years apparently to get these two documents approved and I have taken the colored drawing, which is the layers which is now the most manageable information all on one drawing that is used by Culpepper and had their amended to replace exhibit C. We are taking an old drawing and putting the most up to date drawing. I had it signed by both of the other entities then we had a snag in that to get it registered with the county they can't take a colored drawing and they want it notarized and in a specific format. That is sitting with the other two owners and I hope we can get that done. I spent time with one owner talking through the principle and the other is very happy but I'm going to get the two together and sign it.

I see photographs and you can see what Ronni has achieved and Matt has achieved in the field. The quality of the field has progressed over the last three and a half years from jungle to spectacularly beautiful places. If you go back three and a half years ago it is chalk and cheese.

When I started on this board four years ago the non-ad valorem tax was \$44 per lot and that was primarily because Mr. Stroud didn't want to pay any money on the majority of the property. We moved it to \$311 which is the 2009 number and we managed to survive with that. I have to give credit to all the people working on this business this is spectacularly good when you go back and take inflation. Inflation would put the \$311 to \$469. We may someday have to

raise the fees. Every lot pays and the city pays us some money and all the mitigation area, which is the waterway that runs up to the structure 825 from the east side all the way to that U shape that is nearly paid by the owners of the community. A house pays \$311, a lot pays 3/4 of that.

Ms. Rosemary Jones stated we will increase our amount as we build more homes.

Mr. Vogt stated in rough numbers if you go back the city pays us a third, the houses pay about a third and the owners pay us about a third because of the wetlands and preserve that do not belong to the community homes.

I have and did not issue a work order to Wellington to remove any item from the lot adjacent to Mr. Diggles house. GMS has been asked to double check it and they have confirmed it.

Ms. Hinz-Philippi stated we don't have anything on our records that reflect that.

Ms. Moczynski stated I do not recommend any further discussion on the record for this. If you have questions outside the meeting you can reach out to me individually.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Adjournment

On MOTION by Ms. Rosemary Jones seconded by Mr. Vogt with all in favor the meeting adjourned at 12:35 p.m.

-DocuSigned by:

Secretary/Assistant Secretary

Chairman/Vice Chairman



Certificate Of Completion

Envelope Id: 7DA2257E-F527-473C-903A-E5EF171A56F6 Status: Completed

Subject: Tesoro: Complete with Docusign: Resolution 2026-01.pdf, 9-30-25 Minutes.pdf, Engagement Letter.pdf,

Source Envelope:

Document Pages: 33 Signatures: 7 **Envelope Originator:** Initials: 0 Certificate Pages: 2 Ellen Acosta 1001 Bradford Way

AutoNav: Enabled

Envelopeld Stamping: Enabled Kingston, TN 37763 Time Zone: (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada) eacosta@gmssf.com

IP Address: 162.199.192.217

Sent: 11/6/2025 9:17:32 AM

Sent: 11/6/2025 9:17:31 AM

Timestamp

Viewed: 11/6/2025 12:06:24 PM

Signed: 11/10/2025 3:20:43 PM

Resent: 11/20/2025 12:42:03 PM

Record Tracking

Status: Original Holder: Ellen Acosta Location: DocuSign

11/6/2025 9:12:37 AM eacosta@gmssf.com

Signer Events Signature **Timestamp** DocuSigned by:

Using IP Address:

Andressa Hinz Philippi AHPhilippi@gmssf.com **Assistant Secretary**

(None)

2601:58b:c00:4380:c55f:a961:9d19:f26e

Viewed: 11/21/2025 6:03:27 AM Security Level: Email, Account Authentication Signed: 11/21/2025 6:03:38 AM Signature Adoption: Pre-selected Style

andressa Hinz Pplyga

Electronic Record and Signature Disclosure:

Not Offered via Docusign

Editor Delivery Events

John Vogt vogtj2v@gmail.com Chairman

Security Level: Email, Account Authentication

(None)

Signature Adoption: Drawn on Device

Using IP Address:

2601:58a:8201:1ab0:d0a3:e013:98c3:d30b

Signed using mobile

Electronic Record and Signature Disclosure: Not Offered via Docusign

In Person Signer Events Signature **Timestamp**

Status

Agent Delivery Events Status Timestamp

Intermediary Delivery Events Status Timestamp

Certified Delivery Events Status Timestamp

Carbon Copy Events Status Timestamp

Witness Events Signature **Timestamp**

Notary Events Signature **Timestamp**

Envelope Summary Events Status Timestamps

Envelope Sent Hashed/Encrypted 11/6/2025 9:17:32 AM

Envelope Summary Events	Status	Timestamps
Envelope Updated	Security Checked	11/10/2025 7:58:54 AM
Certified Delivered	Security Checked	11/6/2025 12:06:24 PM
Signing Complete	Security Checked	11/10/2025 3:20:43 PM
Completed	Security Checked	11/21/2025 6:03:38 AM
Payment Events	Status	Timestamps