



BLUE LAKE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

**LEE COUNTY
REGULAR BOARD MEETING
JANUARY 13, 2026
3:00 P.M.**

Special District Services, Inc.
The Oaks Center
2501A Burns Road
Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33410

www.bluelakecdd.org
561.630.4922 Telephone
877.SDS.4922 Toll Free
561.630.4923 Facsimile

AGENDA
BLUE LAKE
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT
WildBlue Social Building
18721 WildBlue Boulevard
Fort Myers, Florida 33913
REGULAR BOARD MEETING
January 13, 2026
3:00 P.M.
Call- In: (800) 743-4099 Passcode: 7423990 (for residents)

- A. Call to Order
- B. Proof of Publication.....Page 1
- C. Establish Quorum
- D. Additions or Deletions to Agenda
- E. Approval of Minutes
 - 1. December 9, 2025 Regular Board Meeting.....Page 2
- F. Old Business
 - 1. Update on Lake Bank Repair Project
- G. New Business
 - 1. Update on Bear Fence Damage.....Page 7
- H. Administrative Matters
 - 1. Engineer's Report
 - a. Update on Map of Maintenance Responsibilities/Ownership
 - 2. Attorney's Report
 - 3. Manager's Report
 - a. Financials.....Page 8
 - b. Next Meeting – January 27, 2026 & February 10, 2026
- I. Comments from the Public for Items Not on the Agenda
- J. Board Member Comments
- K. Attorney-Client Session Relative to Settlement Negotiation
- L. Adjourn

**BLUE LAKE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT
REGULAR BOARD MEETING
DECEMBER 9, 2025**

A. CALL TO ORDER

The December 9, 2025, Regular Board Meeting of the Blue Lake Community Development District (the "District") was called to order at 3:00 p.m. in the WildBlue Social Building located at 18721 WildBlue Boulevard, Fort Myers, Florida 33966.

B. PROOF OF PUBLICATION

Proof of publication was presented which showed that notice of the Regular Board Meeting had been published in the *Naples Daily News* on December 1, 2025, as legally required.

C. ESTABLISH A QUORUM

It was determined that the attendance of the following Board Members constituted a quorum:

Chairman	Chris Hasty	Present
Vice Chairman	David Bello	Present
Supervisor	Norbie Larsen	Present
Supervisor	Mark Rapponotti	Present
Supervisor	Terry Vette	Present

Also present were the following Staff Members:

District Manager	Kathleen Meneely	Special District Services, Inc.
District Counsel	Wes Haber (via phone)	Kutak Rock LLP
District Engineer	Frank Savage	Barraco and Associates, Inc.

Also present were the following:

Trudi Bouvia, Jim Spalding, Ted Towgood, John Reis, John & Jeanne Hadginikitas, Dale Branzdis, Martha Harris, Tom & Regina Juszczak, Brett Knickerbacker, Larry Sutherland, Robert Kudlacik, Joe Gates, Gary Martin, Mark Schneider, Al Lamb, Linda Jones (HOA Pres) and others via phone.

D. ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS TO AGENDA

There were no additions or deletions to the agenda.

E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. November 18, 2025, Special Board Meeting

The minutes of the November 18, 2025, Special Board Meeting were presented for consideration.

A **motion** was made by Mr. Rapponotti, seconded by Mr. Vette and passed unanimously approving the minutes of the November 18, 2025, Special Board Meeting, as presented.

F. OLD BUSINESS

1. Update on Lake Bank Repair Project

Mr. Savage advised that the plans were being cued up for initial bidding with Cummins Cederberg maintaining that 90% plans would be completed by the end of the week. Mr. Savage handed out a revised Gantt chart and went over the new schedule. Mr. Rapponotti asked where Wild Blue was in their scheduling with Mr. Savage stating they were on a similar timeline. Mr. Larsen stated that there was an excavation site close to Blue Lake and asked about the possibility of permitting a pathway through to the borrow pit as it would save about an hour of travel time. Mr. Savage indicated he could investigate but it may be a conservation area.

2. Consider Liability Document for Dock Holders

Mr. Haber advised that the letter was on the agenda to be circulated to homeowners with docks. Mr. Hasty asked about the actual document for signing and Mr. Haber said it would be attached. Ms. Meneely noted that the cover letter needed to include where the document is to be returned and Mr. Hasty stated that the letter should also include clear instructions. Mr. Haber indicated that he would edit the letter to include that information and that the returned documents would be recorded. Mr. Larsen asked what would be done with docks that are removed by the homeowner and Mr. Hasty said that could be decided after the District hears from the homeowners.

Mr. Hadginikitas asked who was responsible for common areas and putting greens landward of the repairs and Mr. Larsen expressed that the repairs would be done from the water. A resident asked about the loss of recreational use of the lake during construction and Mr. Vette responded that precautions would be taken but it will be up to the contractor. Mr. Knickerbocker opined that the contractor should follow standard rules for lakes. Mr. Hadginikitas asked who was responsible for the dock removal and the cost and Mr. Hasty responded that it was the homeowner's responsibility and was part of the original agreement when they were put in. Mr. Rapponotti stated that the cost may be able to be part of the lawsuit since the damage caused the problems. Mr. Hasty continued that if the dock is not removed, the owner signs a document that they are responsible for liability. General discussion ensued regarding liability with Mr. Haber stating that litigation counsel reviews, as does an insurance specialist, to make sure the documents protect the District. Mr. Hadginikitas asked about the \$20 Million bond and Mr. Haber explained the difference between validation, payment and performance bonds, original construction bonds and finance bonds, noting that since the validation bond process has been completed, finance bonds will take 45-60 days from the commencement of the process to be issued. Mr. Lamb asked about the process and notice to homeowners for bonding and Mr. Hasty went over the requirements when done outside of the budget cycle, including capitalizing interest payments, notice and public hearings. He also explained that the District has been following two pathways at the same time, which has been figuring out the repair and bonding while negotiating with Lennar and the contractors to offset the costs. He continued that the Board determined waiting for negotiations was not a prudent approach, so the two efforts seeking funding while getting the project done were initiated. He explained that hardening of the shoreline to prevent erosion was a higher level of service than what was there and noted that HOAs are not under the same statutes, financial disclosures, ethics, laws and general election procedures that are the same for cities, counties and the State. He noted that there were a few breaches where emergency repairs were done. Mr. Lamb asked if the repairs would be in full compliance and Mr. Hasty responded that they were and may erode over time but looking at a higher level of service with the rock revetment, the erosion is lessened. Mr. Sutherland asked who was elected and who was appointed to the Board and Mr. Hasty went over the State laws concerning landowner votes on seats

prior to having enough residents and what triggered seats turning over to general elections, where residents were put in seats, noting the process was followed, unless a seat was vacated, where one is appointed by the remaining Board Members to fill out the remainder of the term, per state statutes. Mr. Hadginikitas questioned the permit process and scoping of the work for budgetary planning. Mr. Hasty stated the design came first with six options given and was considered with the order of magnitude budget which led to the validation and the \$20 Million cap. He added that the District was walking through the process and state statute requirements result in it being a maddingly slow process. He explained that if the repairs end up being \$10 Million and that much is received from negotiations, then there will be no assessment. Mr. Vette opined that we are all homeowners and do not want to spend one extra dollar more than we have to. Mr. Rapponotti stated that he did not want to file against Lennar but the engineers have said it was a latent defect in the design that would not hold up to storms. Mr. Hadginikitas indicated that he has known Darin McMurray of Lennar for twenty years and can get the repairs done today, noting that Lennar would bring the wall back to its original state. He also stated that he believes there was no defect before the storm and boat owners should be held responsible for the wall failure. Mr. Larsen stated he would not have voted for the lawsuit unless there was a meeting with Lennar, which was not productive. Mr. Bello told Mr. Hadginikitas that if he can get Lennar to commit to doing the repairs then to get it done. Mr. Rapponotti clarified that such a request would be a Board decision. Mr. Larsen stated that he planned on meeting with Mr. Hadginikitas, but not behind the scenes, but also wants to have his ducks in a row and receive all plans before meeting with Darin McMurray.

Discussion continued regarding the dock owners deciding to remove their docks. Mr. Schneider asked who would reimburse the CDD if the dock owners do not do something properly. Mr. Larsen responded that if dock owners sign the letter and decide not to move their docks, they take ownership for liability.

Mr. Lamb asked about the failure analysis and root cause, stating that boats may have played into it but there is the same damage where there are no boats. Mr. Savage stated that Barraco did not design or certify the original wall and that three engineers – Hans Wilson, Cummins Cederberg and Taylor have all prepared reports. He noted that Barraco did stormwater inspections or inspections in areas that may circumvent the system and not route water the way it is supposed to. He noted that Turrell Hall was the wall's initial designer and Mr. Larsen added that they were part of the lawsuit.

Mr. Sutherland asked if the Board Members receive \$200 per meeting. Mr. Bello advised that Supervisors, per Florida Statutes, could receive \$200 per meeting. He continued that it was up to each Supervisor if they take it, with Messrs. Bello, Rapponotti and Vette stating that they did.

Mr. Juszczak noted that he lives on the NE side and there were no boats but plenty of damage. He further noted that there may be more than one cause as water was the most damaging. Mr. Hasty responded that no one had represented on the Board that they were experts and they rely on the consultants and professional folks who have looked at the project and determined the most appropriate repair. He continued that the Board collectively said that their standard level of service was a 50-year storm and that the wall should be able to withstand that type of storm.

Mr. Knickerbocker stated that the level of service of what was originally built was inadequate. He noted the original wall should have survived more than four years and should be put back above the original design rather than just seeking to put back what was there. Mr. Hasty indicated that these were issues covered in shade sessions and the Board received options from a marine engineer who recommended a level of service we should do if from scratch. Mr. Knickerbocker opined that the service life should be greater than 10 years, which is not unreasonable, and that it was essential that the community get a solution with a 15-20 year service life. Mr. Larsen stated he would have more answers once he sees all

the plans. Mr. Reis expressed that Darrin McMurray should have been brought to the table 16 months ago, and the District could have seen what they wanted to do. Mr. Larsen responded that nothing had been offered and we need to figure it out from here, not go backwards. Mr. Hadginikitas reiterated that Darrin McMurray was willing to fix the wall back to its original level and he would enhance the wall on his own dime. Mr. Reis stated that he did not believe the minutes reflected his comments at a previous meeting and Ms. Meneely stated that they were summary minutes and only the Board's actions are required. Mr. Hadginikitas disagreed and stated he would provide the state statute of what needed to be accurate.

Further discussion took place with Mr. Hasty asking Mr. Larsen to get the plans and then speak with Mr. Hadginikitas. It was the consensus of the Board that Mr. Larsen do so.

3. Discussion Regarding CDD Community-Wide Wall Repair Communication

Mr. Bello noted that the communication was sent to the community, posted to the website and was also included in the agenda packet.

G. NEW BUSINESS

1. Discussion Regarding Participation of Call-In Attendees of Meetings

Ms. Meneely explained the background of the issue stating that when the lines were open and allowed participants to speak at will, it was very disruptive to the meeting. Therefore, the Board made the policy to only allow meeting participants to speak if they were actually present, as they do in City and County meetings. Mr. Larsen stated that he thought we needed to figure out a solution as he believes callers should be able to make comments. Ms. Meneely stated that the current system had the ability to allow participants to "raise their hands" in a Teams meeting fashion to speak if someone would monitor the online system. Mr. Bello volunteered to monitor the system and it was decided to rescind the previous policy and try stated participation at the next meeting.

H. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. Engineer's Report

a. Update on Map of Maintenance Responsibilities/Ownership

Mr. Savage noted that there were no updates on this issue as it was not high on the radar with all the current issues.

2. Attorney's Report

There was no Attorney's Report at this time.

3. Manager's Report

a. Financials

Ms. Meneely presented the financials. The Board Members had no questions.

b. Meeting Schedule

Ms. Meneely announced that the next meetings were scheduled for January 13, 2026, and January 27, 2026.

I. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

Mr. Lamb indicated with the focus on the wall, the weeds on the fence had been neglected and the detention areas needed plants replaced. Mr. Bello stated that the CDD was responsible for keeping the water flowing and aesthetics were the HOA. Mr. Lamb stated he believed the weeds restrict the flow. Mr. Bello stated that if Mr. Lamb provides a location, we can take a look at it, but at this time there are not enough funds for fence treatment. Mr. Towgood asked about grass spraying and Mr. Bello stated that the CDD sprays invasives in the preserves and the big grasses in other areas are HOA responsibility. Mr. Knickerbocker stated that there were some fences that were down and Mr. Bello asked for their addresses, as there have been other reports.

A resident asked about the additional assessment and what the increase was for and Mr. Bello stated that 75% of the increase was due to litigation costs. Discussion ensued regarding litigation with Mr. Reis stating that the mediation was in March and Mr. Rapponotti noted that the date was not carved in stone, so the District is proceeding with its current plans. Mr. Larsen stated that if the District could find out what the costs would be, that may be the answer to any negotiations. Mr. Reis stated that he was concerned about bearing a significant cost of starting with upgrades without mediation. Mr. Rapponotti stated that if they want to settle, they need to know the numbers. Mr. Reis asked about adding the County to the suit and Mr. Rapponotti said that they can subpoena documents, but the District relies on Gurley Fant to tell us who is culpable. Mr. Reis asked about the roads, noting he felt that there was a liability if someone trips and falls. Mr. Bello reiterated that it was an HOA issue and they can pave if they want.

J. BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

There were no further comments from the Board Members.

K. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Board, a **motion** was made by Mr. Bello, seconded by Mr. Larsen and passed unanimously adjourning the Regular Board Meeting at 5:09 p.m.

ATTESTED BY:

Secretary/Assistant Secretary

Chairperson/Vice-Chair



Blue Lake
Community Development District

**Financial Report For
December 2025**

BLUE LAKE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT
MONTHLY FINANCIAL REPORT
DECEMBER 2025

	Annual Budget	Actual Dec-25	Year To Date Actual	10/1/25 - 12/31/25
REVENUES	10/1/25 - 9/30/26			
O & M Assessments	1,260,500	770,766		1,005,272
Debt Assessments	663,697	404,541		527,622
Other Revenues	0	0		0
Interest Income	960	0		16
Line of Credit Assessments	720	0		0
Total Revenues	\$ 1,925,877	\$ 1,175,307		\$ 1,532,910
EXPENDITURES				
Administrative Expenditures				
Supervisor Fees	12,000	600		1,600
Payroll Taxes (Employer)	960	46		122
Management	31,452	2,621		7,863
Legal	40,000	0		16,023
Legal Extraordinary - Retaining Wall, Etc.	500,000	0		36,522
Assessment Roll	4,000	0		0
Audit Fees	5,200	0		0
Arbitrage Rebate Fee	650	0		0
Insurance	14,700	0		12,231
Legal Advertisements	6,000	0		433
Miscellaneous	3,993	171		386
Postage	900	24		-154
Office Supplies	1,250	141		351
Dues & Subscriptions	175	0		175
Trustee Fee	4,050	0		0
Continuing Disclosure Fee	1,000	0		0
Deficit Funding	0	0		0
Capital Outlay - Lake Bank Expenditure	0	0		0
Payroll Processing Fee	0	53		157
Total Administrative Expenditures	626,330	3,656		75,709
Maintenance Expenditures				
Engineering/Inspections	40,000	0		5,206
Engineering Extraordinary - Retaining Wall	125,000	4,339		4,339
Mitigation Monitoring	138,500	0		0
Lake Maintenance	60,000	2,866		11,608
Flow Way Inspection Certification	5,000	0		0
Detention Area Maintenance	36,000	3,011		6,023
Miscellaneous Maintenance (Fence Maintenance, Etc.)	100,000	5,080		15,326
Maintenance Reserve	55,000	0		0
Lake Bank Repair Project - Interest Payment	677	0		0
Capital Outlay - Lake Bank	0	0		0
Construction Costs	0	0		0
Total Maintenance Expenditures	560,177	15,296		42,502
Total Expenditures	\$ 1,186,507	\$ 18,952		\$ 118,211
REVENUES LESS EXPENDITURES	\$ 739,370	\$ 1,156,355		\$ 1,414,699
Bond Payments	(623,875)	(388,359)		(506,052)
BALANCE	\$ 115,495	\$ 767,996		\$ 908,647
County Appraiser & Tax Collector Fee	(38,498)	0		(1,201)
Discounts For Early Payments	(76,997)	(47,012)		(61,465)
EXCESS/ (SHORTFALL)	\$ -	\$ 720,984		\$ 845,981
Carryover From Prior Year	0	0		0
NET EXCESS/ (SHORTFALL)	\$ -	\$ 720,984		\$ 845,981

Note - Draw In 24/25 From Lake Bank Repair Project Line Of Credit: \$133,400.

Bank Balance As Of 12/31/25	\$ 1,346,990.78
Accounts Payable As Of 12/31/25	\$ 408,612.50
Line of Credit As Of 12/31/25	\$ 133,400.00
Accounts Receivable As Of 12/31/25	\$ -
Available Funds As Of 12/31/25	\$ 804,978.28

**BLUE LAKE CDD
TAX COLLECTIONS
2025/2026**

#	ID#	PAYMENT FROM	DATE	FOR	Tax Collect Receipts	Interest Received	Commissions Paid	Discount	Net From Tax Collector	O & M Assessment Income (Before Discounts & Fee)	Debt Assessment Income (Before Discounts & Fee)	O & M Assessment Income (After Discounts & Fee)	Debt Assessment Income (After Discounts & Fee)	Debt Assessments Paid to Trustee
									\$1,923,166.00	\$1,261,225.00	\$ 661,941.00	\$1,261,225.00	\$ 661,941.00	
									\$1,809,422.00	\$1,185,547.00	\$ 623,875.00	\$1,185,547.00	\$ 623,875.00	\$ 623,875.00
1		Paid to Lee County Prop Appraiser	11/04/25	Fees			\$ (423.00)		\$ (423.00)			\$ (277.00)	\$ (146.00)	
2	1	Lee County Tax Collector	11/12/25	NAV Taxes	\$ 11,948.93		\$ (778.32)	\$ (627.32)	\$ 10,543.29	\$ 7,836.08	\$ 4,112.85	\$ 6,914.24	\$ 3,629.05	\$ 3,483.05
3	2	Lee County Tax Collector	11/21/25	NAV Taxes	\$ 345,638.12			\$ (13,825.45)	\$ 331,812.67	\$ 226,669.47	\$ 118,968.65	\$ 217,602.72	\$ 114,209.95	\$ 114,209.95
4	3	Lee County Tax Collector	12/11/25	NAV Taxes	\$ 1,175,306.96			\$ (47,011.95)	\$ 1,128,295.01	\$ 770,766.26	\$ 404,540.70	\$ 739,935.81	\$ 388,359.20	\$ 388,359.20
5									\$ -					\$ -
6									\$ -					\$ -
7									\$ -					\$ -
8									\$ -					\$ -
9									\$ -					\$ -
10									\$ -					\$ -
11									\$ -					\$ -
12									\$ -					\$ -
13									\$ -					\$ -
14									\$ -					\$ -
15									\$ -					\$ -
					\$ 1,532,894.01	\$ -	\$ (1,201.32)	\$ (61,464.72)	\$ 1,470,227.97	\$ 1,005,271.81	\$ 527,622.20	\$ 964,175.77	\$ 506,052.20	\$ 506,052.20

Assessment Roll

O&M	1,261,225.26
Debt	661,941.00
	<hr/>
	1,923,166.26

Collections

79.71%

Note: \$1,923,166, \$1,261,225 and \$661,941 are 2025/2026 Budgeted assessments before discounts and fees.

\$1,809,422, \$1,185,547 and \$623,875 are 2025/2026 Budgeted assessments after discounts and fees.

\$ 1,532,894.01		
\$ -	\$ 1,470,227.97	
\$ (1,005,271.81)	\$ (964,175.77)	
\$ (527,622.20)	\$ (506,052.20)	
\$ -	\$ -	