

**MINUTES OF MEETING  
BROOKS OF BONITA SPRINGS & BROOKS OF BONITA SPRINGS II  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICTS**

The Boards of Supervisors of the Brooks of Bonita Springs & Brooks of Bonita Springs II Community Development Districts held a Joint Regular Meeting on June 25, 2025 at 1:00 p.m., at the Estero Community Church, 21115 Design Parc Ln., Estero, Florida 33928.

**Present for Brooks CDD:**

James Merritt	Chair
David Garner	Vice Chair
John (Rod) Woolsey	Assistant Secretary
Edward Franklin	Assistant Secretary

**Present for Brooks II CDD:**

Joseph Bartoletti	Chair
Ken D. Gould	Vice Chair
Thomas Bertucci	Assistant Secretary
Mary O'Connor	Assistant Secretary
Lynn Bunting	Assistant Secretary

**Also present:**

Chuck Adams	District Manager
Cleo Adams	District Manager
Shane Willis	Operations Manager
Meagan Magaldi	District Counsel
Mark Zordan	Johnson Engineering, Inc. (JEI)
Ben Steets (via telephone)	Grau & Associates
Blake Grimes	GulfScapes Landscape Mgmt Services
Andy Nott	Superior Waterway Services, Inc.
Bill Kurth	Premier Lakes, Inc. (Premier)
Wayne Adaska	Resident
Other Residents	

**FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Call to Order/Roll Call**

Mr. Adams called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m.

For Brooks of Bonita Springs, Supervisors Woolsey, Garner, Franklin and Merritt were present. Supervisor Varnum was not present.

For Brooks of Bonita Springs II, all Supervisors were present.

Mr. Merritt reminded all attendees to state their name when speaking and to avoid speaking over one another for accurate transcription of the minutes.

**SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Public Comments: Agenda items only [3  
minutes per person]**

Resident Wayne Adaska gave an update regarding Lake 115. He provided pictures of recent littoral removal efforts and voiced his opinion that the fishing area is terrible.

Mr. Kurth stated that treatments were applied; the fishing area meant to be removed is brown. Because he and a Board Member discussed whether that community might seek a reduction of littorals to 8' rather than 15', removal work was delayed to avoid possibly needing to do two removals. Extra Sonar® herbicide was applied on Lake 115 and did not reach Lake 112, and all spatterdock is gone; the herbicide will be reapplied in Lake 112, and removal is scheduled for next week. Due to quickly rising water levels, much of the sprayed area is under water.

Ms. O'Connor discussed her conversation and walkthrough with Mr. Kurth during which Mr. Kurth explained why many littoral areas must be 15' wide. While she initially considered asking the Board to make an exception to the 15' limit set at the last meeting, she now understands that cannot be done without exposing too much dirt and it would not be in the CDD's best interests. She understands that it is a disappointment to many in the neighborhood but that many others understand the decision.

Mr. Kurth stated removal will be done, and he hopes improvements will be visible soon.

**BROOKS OF BONITA SPRINGS ITEMS**

**THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Presentation of Brooks of Bonita Springs  
Community Development District's Audited  
Financial Report for Fiscal Year Ended  
September 30, 2024, Prepared by Grau &  
Associates (to be provided under separate  
cover)**

- A. Consideration of Resolution 2025-05, Hereby Accepting the Audited Financial Report for the Fiscal Year Ended September 30, 2024**

Mr. Steets presented the Audited Financial Report for the Fiscal Year Ended September 30, 2024. There were no findings, recommendations, deficiencies on internal control or instances of non-compliance; it was a clean audit.

Mr. Woolsey asked about Note 10, on Page 19, related to the gain on the sale of land to The Commons Club.

Discussion ensued regarding the net proceeds, cost basis, assignment of value and depreciation of assets on the land.

Mr. Bartoletti noted that the \$19,000 might represent the monies held in Escrow. The purchase price of the land is known because it was purchased in 1998. Mr. Adams stated, as further clarification is needed, Staff will work with the Auditor to clarify the note. It was noted that, if the \$19,000 represents monies in Escrow, a portion should be credited to CDD #1 and a portion to CDD #2, if that is the case.

Discussion ensued regarding whether the “ECONOMIC FACTORS AND NEXT YEAR’S BUDGETS AND OTHER EVENTS” Note, on Page 6, should state that no major projects or changes to the CDD’s infrastructure maintenance program are anticipated for the subsequent fiscal year.

Mr. Adams will work with the Auditors to address this matter.

## **BROOKS OF BONITA SPRINGS II ITEMS**

### **FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Presentation of Brooks of Bonita Springs II Community Development District’s Audited Financial Report for Fiscal Year Ended September 30, 2024, Prepared by Grau & Associates (to be provided under separate cover)**

#### **A. Consideration of Resolution 2025-04, Hereby Accepting the Audited Financial Report for the Fiscal Year Ended September 30, 2024**

Mr. Steets presented the Audited Financial Report for the Fiscal Year Ended September 30, 2024. There were no findings, recommendations, deficiencies on internal control or instances of non-compliance; it was a clean audit.

There were no questions.

It was noted that a revised final Report is not needed. Mr. Adams will work with Mr. Steets to expand on Note 6 and on the narratives on Page 19.

Discussion ensued regarding the amount of the land sale and the need to appropriately distribute the funds held in Escrow between the two CDDs.

**On MOTION for Brooks of Bonita Springs by Mr. Merritt and seconded by Mr. Franklin, with all in favor, Resolution 2025-05, Hereby Accepting the Audited Financial Report for the Fiscal Year Ended September 30, 2024, contingent upon Staff working with the Auditor to enhance the descriptions, was adopted.**

**On MOTION for Brooks of Bonita Springs II by Mr. Bartoletti and seconded by Ms. O'Connor, with all in favor, Resolution 2025-04, Hereby Accepting the Audited Financial Report for the Fiscal Year Ended September 30, 2024, contingent upon Staff working with the Auditor to enhance the descriptions, was adopted.**

Mr. Adams will circulate the final version of the revised notes to the Board.

## **JOINT BUSINESS ITEMS**

### **FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

#### **Discussion: Premier Lakes May 2025 Quality Control Lake Report**

Mr. Kurth presented the May 2025 Quality Control Lake Report.

The Board and Staff discussed submersed weed treatments, shoreline weed treatments and removal of landscape material from Lighthouse Bay.

Mr. Kurth stated that algae has been minimal despite rain. There were some access difficulties due to Shadow Wood golf course construction. A technician sprayed less accessible areas via boat. The lakes are in good condition going into rainy season. Residents have reported more wildlife due to littorals spreading.

Mr. Merritt asked about the best time to plant littorals. Mr. Kurth stated that the lakes are a little low; while now is a good time for planting, excessive rains could be problematic. Mrs. Adams stated that the project will be completed in July and August.

Ms. O'Connor asked if the Lake 115 fishing area will be addressed. Mr. Kurth replied affirmatively; when removal occurs, the spikerush behind the pool area will be removed.

Ms. Bunting stated Mr. Willis reported that the Lake 82 aerator is not working. Mr. Kurth stated he has a detailed list of aerator issues; Mrs. Adams will receive a proposal this week. Asked if Premier treats 100% of the lakes on the golf course side, Mr. Kurth replied affirmatively.

▪ **Discussion: Flow Way Outside CDD Boundaries**

**This item was an addition to the agenda.**

Referring to a map of the CDDs and surrounding areas, the Board and Staff discussed the CDDs' efforts to keep the flow ways clear of debris, an emergency outfall area outside of the CDD boundaries, and potential flooding impacts to Villas Palmas. No response was received from the property owner who was asked to participate in cleaning efforts.

The flow ways, specific areas on the map, responsibilities for clearing vegetation and the probability of flooding were discussed at length.

Mr. Adams stated the area in question is within the Three Oaks right-of-way (ROW). According to the Operating Agreement with Lee County, the CDD has assumed responsibility from its boundary line to the north, back to the emergency outfall structure.

Mr. Adams will contact Transportation and David Willems with the Village of Estero to seek a solution. Mr. Merritt will be included in meetings and/or conversations.

**SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Landscape Report: GulfScapes Landscape  
Management Services**

• **Irrigation Reports**

**A. Meter Usage by Clock**

**B. Year-Over-Year Water Usage**

Mr. Grimes stated the rain has improved the appearance of greenery. Cutbacks were completed and a fertilizer blackout is in effect. Flower beds are tilled and flowers will be installed next week. Vines and weeds are being treated.

Mr. Grimes reviewed the Irrigation Reports and noted that a broken meter was replaced on Clock 2, which reflected some incorrect readings. The April 2025 year-over-year water usage was comparable to April 2024. The March 2025 year-over-year water usage was lower than March 2024. The May reports will be presented at the next meeting.

**SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Update: Lakes Bank Restoration Projects**

Mr. Willis presented reports and photographs related to the Brooks Lake Bank Repairs. Much work was completed over the last two years; the projects were nearly complete and permits close to being closed out when storms caused more damage. Rainfall continues to cause washouts and localized washouts are due to homeowners failing to complete repairs.

Mr. Merritt expressed concern about liability and hazardous walking conditions above the waterline, including at Lake 41. Mr. Willis stated the areas will be repaired.

Discussion ensued regarding the need for homeowners to make repairs to prevent washouts that cause erosion on CDD property, the breadth and depth of the problem, the type of repairs needed, cost to homeowners and the need for permits.

It was noted that the problem has been ongoing for 15 years, beginning in Chartwell and a plan was publicized to the community.

Mr. Merritt thinks the issue is becoming more prevalent and he is unsure if it is due to operator/contractor issues, the weather or drought. He thinks it should be addressed differently. Mr. Adams suggested pinning the sod rather than just setting it in place and noted that, while contractors might install sod past the high-water mark to anchor it, it is not required.

The Board and Staff discussed areas where the 4:1 slope is not maintained.

Mr. Zordan stated similar issues with lake bank restoration occurred in nearby communities; recent rainfalls of 8" to 15" between June 10<sup>th</sup> and June 13<sup>th</sup> caused sheet flow to contribute to erosion problems that must be mitigated by contractors during construction.

Mr. Bartoletti asked what can be done differently if money were no issue and what should be evaluated. Mr. Adams noted that the discussion has been ongoing for 20 years. If the CDDs own a stormwater system, they deal with erosion. He stated that a riprap perimeter could be the best way to protect the lake banks, but that is not a permissible solution, and erosion is not completely preventable. While riprap would harden the lake edge, the CDDs would still need to deal with erosion because, during major storms, damage can occur on the lake side of the riprap and loose soil can be blown out. The most affordable way to harden the bank would be to install riprap vs a retaining wall.

Asked if pinning the sod would help, Mr. Adams stated it would help in localized areas. Mr. Willis stated Mr. Zordan identified that as a quality control issue; sod will be refilled and pinned on several individual repairs.

Mr. Zordan noted that repairing 25 lakes all at once is a big job spanning multiple years and suggested limiting the project to three to five lakes per contractor and engaging multiple contractors so that the job can be completed sooner.

A Board Member asked Staff for their opinions regarding whether the contractor performed satisfactorily. Mr. Zordan replied affirmatively; while the work has been satisfactory, there have been many time gaps and challenges with weather and ongoing erosion. Mr. Willis voiced his agreement regarding the size of the project and challenges and noted that the contractor performed additional “Act of God” repairs that were not included in the contract at his own cost because he appreciates working with the CDDs. At some lake banks \$20,000 or \$30,000 of work was washed out, which the contractor repaired at no cost. There are things the contractor could have done better, such as pinning the sod better; however, Staff communications with property owners should have been better. He does not think the delays and damage are the fault of the contractor; rather, the project has been difficult to control. Mrs. Adams noted that lake bank restoration is generally completed in phases and suggested the project should have been planned in phases rather than embarking on repairing 25 lakes at once.

Discussion ensued regarding past communications to residents about their irrigation, runoff and drainage responsibilities; targeted informational meetings for residents; and making residents aware of the areas their irrigation reaches, like to the water’s edge, to the side line, etc.

Mr. Bartoletti suggested identifying the specific lakes to be remediated in Fiscal Year 2026 and sending letters to affected property owners. Mr. Adams stated that, when irrigation lines were initially installed, the appropriate coverage was set; erosion has since occurred and gaps in coverage would indicate an issue or a homeowner modification.

Discussion ensued regarding property boundaries, adjoining property on lake banks, golf course, common areas, etc., and verbiage in governing documents. It was noted that a Condo Association expended funds to re-bury exposed pipes in the lake bank. The CDDs need to communicate that such projects are not the CDD’s responsibility.

Mr. Woolsey discussed a spreadsheet of affected homes that he compiled. He believes that most of the affected homes are in Shadow Wood, aside from one lake in Copper Leaf, two in Spring Run and maybe one in Lighthouse Bay. He thinks most of the 131 impacted homes are vacant for the summer. He noted that the HOA advised against sending letters.

Discussion ensued regarding sending letters to just the affected property owners.

Mr. Gould asked about the options when drainage from private property damages CDD property. Ms. Adams stated affected homeowners were notified and provided with schematics and proposals. Once the homeowner completes the remediations on their property, the CDDs can repair CDD property.

Discussion ensued regarding costs borne by homeowners, homeowners who fail to make repairs and the CDDs' option to create formal rules to establish a process to enable the CDDs to perform repairs and bill the HOA, which will bill the homeowners, if necessary.

Mr. Bartoletti discussed a list of questions compiled by himself and Mr. Woolsey. Asked which lakes need remediation in 2026, Mrs. Adams suggested Lakes 46 and 130, in Shadow Wood and Copper Leaf, respectively. It was suggested that Board Members from those communities meet with Staff before the July meeting to determine how the lake bank will be viewed and what will be sent to affected property owners in October.

It was noted that Cypress Hammock has already contacted the CDDs regarding the issues. Mr. Merritt and Mr. Gould will work on the communication. Ms. Bunting suggested contacting the President of the Cypress Hammock HOA. Mr. Merritt will invite them to the October meeting.

Mr. Zordan stated that his firm engaged a Public Relations firm to create websites and presentations, implement mailing lists and manage communications for communities based on the size and scope of the issues.

Mr. Merritt thinks HOA managers should be invited to attend CDD meetings and learn the scope and responsibilities.

Mr. Bertucci asked about including homes without gutters. Mr. Adams stated gutters are helpful but, in their absence, the water reshapes the bank. Water is then channeled into the inlet box, then into the lake. It was noted that most homes face the lake and pool cages have gutters.



Homeowners will be made aware that erosion on their property is their responsibility. The CDD will not make repairs at the water's edge unless homeowners first address the source of the erosion.

Mr. Adams stated that the policy and informational presentations can be communicated to affected and adjacent property owners.

Ms. Magaldi stated that, with Board direction, she will prepare a draft of the Rules to be adopted and provided to Boards. While a policy exists, the formal rulemaking process facilitates the HOAs assisting the CDDs with enforcement on noncompliant homeowners.

Mr. Gould asked if the CDDs' erosion repair methods are state of the art, or if there is any better solution. Mr. Adams stated that Lee County is strongly against hardening the lake banks, such as with riprap. Lee County limits the percentage of riprap to 20% of the total linear footage; as a result, soil and turf are the option that will provide some protection but, results are not guaranteed. Asked if there is more that the CDDs can do, Mr. Adams stated, per the cost-benefit analysis, regularly restoring lake banks and maintaining a healthy littoral shelf in front of lake banks are the best, most effective measures. Over the years the CDDs have spent well over \$1 million for supplemental littoral plantings. Mr. Adams stated the presentation should indicate that the homeowners, not the CDDs, are responsible to water newly installed turf, take care of the sod, and pay to replace it if it is not maintained. It was noted that some homeowners might not have irrigation that extends to the water line. Mr. Adams stated the letter can advise that "The CDD is not responsible for mowing, maintaining or irrigating."

Mr. Bartoletti asked how the lake banks adjacent to the golf course are handled, as the GIS map shows that the Copper Leaf Golf Course lake bank is owned by Copper Leaf Master Association, but the Shadow Wood Golf Course is owned by the CDD. Mr. Adams stated that the golf course is responsible for restoring and maintaining its lake bank side.

Discussion ensued regarding determining ownership and easements. It was noted that Copper Leaf is a bundled golf community, but Shadow Wood might have a different structure.

Mr. Adams stated, in both instances, the CDDs would be responsible for areas inside the lake tract below the high-water mark. Mr. Willis stated the permit only addresses areas within the lake tract.

Mr. Bartoletti stated his understanding that the CDD has always avoided remediating any land on the golf course side. It was noted that no golf course lake bank restorations are underway and the Shadow Wood north course is currently being restored.

Mr. Adams stated, if work is needed to repair a washout in the lake tract, it will be coordinated with the Master Association; all communities will be handled in the same manner.

Mr. Merrit stated that he has been working with Mr. Kurth for 25 years and asked if he provides lake bank restoration services. Mr. Kurth replied affirmatively and discussed an example of an extensive erosion repair that failed. To his knowledge, Lee County and the Village of Estero are the only municipalities that require permits. He believes the remediation he provides is much more effective but it is much more expensive per linear foot. He discussed his thoughts regarding why the Village might have a permitting issue. He does not know of any one best technique, as he has seen them all fail. He described his fabric sock erosion remediation, which would cost approximately \$130 per linear foot.

Mr. Willis recalled that Anchor Marine was awarded the geotube contract at a cost of just under \$800,000. LandShore bid approximately \$1.1 million for a similar process. The final proposer bid \$1.8 million for a process similar to what Mr. Kurth described.

Regarding differences in the remediation warranty and longevity, Mr. Kurth stated that his manufacturer offers a five-year warranty on materials and his company offers a lifetime guarantee for large clients, if his company continues managing the lakes. He is unsure how that would work in the CDDs and he would want to meet with the District Engineer at length.

Discussion ensued regarding the aesthetics, warranty and longevity of geotube and fabric sock repairs in other communities; the remaining warranty on the current remediations; planting over geotube repairs; installation of sod between the control level and water line; sod installation to the water's edge at various water levels; effects on littorals and decision to pin the sod.

Asked if this project should be staged over five years, Mr. Adams suggested considering this after the cost of the Street Lighting Project is considered.

## **EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

### **Continued Discussion: Aeration Services**

A Board Member stated, at the last Lighthouse Bay meeting he mentioned a \$1.6 million planned expenditure for lake aeration to eliminate algae and bring fish back.

Ms. Bunting asked if any lakes need to be aerated immediately. It was noted that a list was developed years ago and aeration is being added when necessary. Mr. Kurth stated that right now he does not see any that are emergencies. Aeration is beneficial and he supports it being considered, over time, but the water quality is currently very good. Two lakes in Copper Leaf have a tendency to have algae growth; he predicts those lakes will be among the first areas of concern.

Ms. Bunting asked how many aerators are installed per year. It was noted that depending on budget, three to five aeration systems might be installed in a typical year.

Discussion ensued regarding the aeration bids, the list of aerators to be installed and the plan to repair and replace as needed versus a Capital Improvement project to install the remaining aerators.

Mrs. Adams stated the repairs and replacements planned for 2026 will proceed, because the \$1.6 million estimated project has not been approved.

The Board, Staff and contractors discussed the pros and cons of installing aeration. Mr. Kurth noted that equipment costs increase each year. Mr. Nott stated installing aerators will not prevent or treat submersed weeds, but it might reduce algae at certain times of the year and improve water quality and aesthetics by preventing muck and deterioration.

The consensus was to consider the project when the bond is issued and continue scheduling and completing aerators budgeted for Fiscal Year 2026.

Mr. Adams will present a plan for funding Capital Improvements, including monuments, aeration, street lighting and sidewalk projects with a 20-year bond.

## **NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

### **Discussion: Street Light Project**

Mr. Woolsey provided an update on the project. The consultant was engaged and provided good data; a final report was not provided but a plan to finalize the numbers for budgeting purposes will be discussed.

Mr. Woolsey stated the current lighting system does not meet current photometric code requirements. He presented pictures of the lighting and conceptual drawings of the standard and decorator poles in the three scopes of work, along with the cost proposals. The landscaping bids include tree removals at \$2,500 per tree; the quote for tree removal in conjunction with sidewalk work was \$672 per tree, which is a significant savings. The standard design poles offer the best

value and meet the luminary requirements with fewer poles than if decorator poles are selected. The Landscape costs for Option 3 are high because a \$475,000 charge for a survey of existing utilities in the sidewalk ROW is included, but it would not be required for installation in the median, regardless of which poles and foundations are selected. The expense of the 25% distributor markup for decorator poles and 30% for standard poles, can be avoided by purchasing direct from the manufacturer. Mr. Adams stated sales tax can be avoided, in addition to the markup, as the contractor can act as the CDDs' agent to accept and store the poles; administrative measures must be considered if that option is selected.

Mr. Woolsey suggested retaining Johnson Engineering, Inc. (JEI) or another contractor to be on site to ensure that code requirements of the RFP are met, and adding a 10% to 20% contingency to cover that cost.

Discussion ensued regarding the Engineering Estimate of Probable Costs, associated scopes of work and pros and cons of each option.

Mr. Woolsey stated, depending on what is decided today, it might be wise to pursue grandfathered status. Option 1, with decorative poles, does not meet the standards and would depend on the Village granting the grandfathered request. After reviewing the pros and cons, life expectancy and cost of each option as outlined in the Engineering Estimate of Probable Costs, Mr. Woolsey recommended Option 1 Standard because it is the cheapest option that utilizes current spacing, meets all code requirements and the life expectancy exceeds the term of the bond being considered. He wants to inquire about the possibility of taller poles and suggested the standard poles could be painted a dark color. He suggested upgrading the signage along the sides of the road to better match the poles. He suggested adding a 10% contingency so additional aesthetic features, such as canopies, decorative arms and banner hanging arms can be included. While it is unlikely that the Village or the County will contribute, he will make the request.

Discussion ensued regarding costs for the pole-related electrical work, the previous decision to install new poles rather than repairing existing poles and wiring, how much light Standard 1 would cast on the sidewalks, trees to be removed along the median and the sidewalk, effect on luminosity, the modern aesthetics of the standard poles, the request for taller poles and the light intrusion in their home.

**On MOTION for Brooks of Bonita Springs II by Mr. Bartoletti and seconded by Mr. Gould, with all in favor, directing Mr. Bertucci to review the Standard 1 Option with the various add-ons, was approved.**

**On MOTION for Brooks of Bonita Springs by Mr. Merritt and seconded by Mr. Woolsey, with all in favor, directing Mr. Bertucci to review the Standard 1 Option with the various add-ons, was approved.**

The Board and Staff discussed the bond issuance timeline, interest rates, additional costs related to the bond, difficulties related to conveying roads and bridges, etc.

It was noted that the CDDs would obtain a bond because Bonness was unable to.

Ms. Magaldi has not heard from the individual who requested a fence.

Mr. Adams stated the deadline applicable to the Rails to Trails initiative is March 2026. Some discussions were held and the responsibility might best be passed to local government, as the program would benefit the larger regional area. The \$15,000 annual fees were paid last year.

In response to a question, Mr. Adams stated the outfalls are still under the control of Rails to Trails; Rails to Trails should retain the interest, regardless of who the owner is.

Discussion ensued regarding the border of the Rails to Trails and Shadow Wood.

Ms. Bunting stated a hard wall runs between Shadow Wood to the railroad tracks and some sections are chain link. There are already concerns about egress. Mr. Adams stated that is not included in the Railroad Bed Agreement, as it is outside of the railroad right-of-way.

#### **TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

#### **Discussion: Fence Installation Project**

This item was not addressed.

#### **ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

#### **Acceptance of Unaudited Financial Statements as of May 31, 2025**

Mr. Bartoletti asked if a bill needs to be sent for the "Coconut Road – cost sharing (mall contribution)". Mr. Adams stated a bill was sent. This item will be on the next meeting agenda.

Mr. Bartoletti questioned the \$30 received under "Railroad crossing lease".

Mrs. Adams stated “Insurance” expenditures are at 131% of budget due to a premium increase.

The financials were accepted.

**TWELFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Approval of April 23, 2025 Joint Regular  
Meeting Minutes**

The following changes were made:

Lines 383, 391 and 394: Change “Bartoletti” to “Woolsey”

Line 110: Delete “Gatehouse” and “Golf Course”

Line 184: Delete “partial”

Line 241: Change “CDDs” to “residents”

Line 468: Change “Bunting” to “Varnum”

**On MOTION for Brooks of Bonita Springs II by Mr. Bartoletti and seconded by Ms. Bunting, with all in favor, the April 23, 2025 Joint Regular Meeting Minutes, as amended and to include any additional changes submitted to Management, were approved.**

**On MOTION for Brooks of Bonita Springs by Mr. Franklin and seconded by Mr. Garner, with all in favor, the April 23, 2025 Joint Regular Meeting Minutes, as amended and to include any additional changes submitted to Management, were approved.**

**THIRTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Staff Reports**

**A. District Counsel: Coleman, Yovanovich & Koester, P.A.**

**B. District Engineer: Johnson Engineering, Inc.**

There were no District Counsel or District Engineer reports.

**C. Field Operations: Wrathell, Hunt and Associates, LLC**

- **Monthly Status Report – Field Operations**

The Field Operations Report was included for informational purposes.

Mrs. Adams stated the culvert and pipe cleaning project was approved for pipes with 30% blockages and greater. The expenditure of \$142,600 was approved in April. Copper Leaf was completed on May 28, 2025. Shadow Wood is underway.

**D. District Manager: Wrathell, Hunt and Associates, LLC**

- **NEXT MEETING DATE: July 23, 2025 at 1:00 PM**

- **QUORUM CHECK – BROOKS OF BONITA SPRINGS**

Supervisors Merritt, Varnum, Woolsey and Garner confirmed their attendance at the July 23, 2025 meeting. Supervisor Franklin will not attend.

- **QUORUM CHECK – BROOKS OF BONITA SPRINGS II**

All Supervisors confirmed their attendance at the July 23, 2025 meeting.

It was noted that Supervisor Franklin will fly in for the August 27, 2025 meeting to ensure a quorum and will be reimbursed.

**FOURTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Supervisors' Requests**

Mr. Bartoletti asked for the price difference between Canna Lily and Spikerush. Mrs. Adams thinks the cost is comparable.

**FIFTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Public Comments: Non-Agenda items only  
[3 minutes per person]**

No members of the public spoke.

**SIXTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 4:27 p.m.

[SIGNATURES APPEAR ON THE FOLLOWING PAGE]

**BROOKS OF BONITA SPRINGS &  
BROOKS OF BONITA SPRINGS II CDDS**  
**FOR BROOKS OF BONITA SPRINGS:**

**June 25, 2025**

  
Secretary/Assistant Secretary

  
Chair/Vice Chair

**FOR BROOKS OF BONITA SPRINGS II:**

  
Secretary/Assistant Secretary

  
Chair/Vice Chair