



# SweetBay

### RESIDENTIAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT 1

Advanced Meeting Package

**Regular Meeting** 

Friday June 20, 2025 10:00 A.M., C.D.T

*Location:* 3204 Heartleaf Ave. E. Panama City, FL 32405

*Note: The Advanced Meeting Package is a working document and thus all materials are considered <u>DRAFTS</u> prior to presentation and Board acceptance, approval, or adoption.* 

#### **SweetBay Residential Community Development District 1**

250 International Parkway, Suite 208 Lake Mary FL 32746 321-263-0132

Board of Supervisors SweetBay Residential Community Development District 1

Dear Board Members:

The Regular Meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the SweetBay Residential Community Development District 1 is scheduled for Friday, June 20, 2025, at 10:00 a.m., C.D.T. at 3204 Heartleaf Ave. E., Panama City, FL 32405.

An advanced copy of the agenda for the meeting is attached along with associated documentation for your review and consideration. Any additional support material will be distributed at the meeting.

Should you have any questions regarding the agenda, please contact me at (321) 263-0132 X-193 or <u>dmcinnes@vestapropertyservices.com</u>. We look forward to seeing you at the meeting.

Sincerely,

David Melnnes

David McInnes District Manager

# SweetBay

#### **RESIDENTIAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT 1**

Meeting Date:

Friday, June 20, 2025

Teams Link:

Time: Location: 10:00 AM, C.D.T 3204 Heartleaf Ave. E., Panama City, FL 32405 Meeting ID: Passcode: Microsoft Teams Meeting 243 954 129 225 HMWBbV

#### Agenda

#### I. Roll Call

#### II. Consent Agenda

	A. Consideration for Approval – The Minutes of the Board of	Exhibit 1
	Supervisors Regular Meeting Held on May 16, 2025	<u>Pgs. 5-6</u>
III.	Business Matters	
	A. Consideration & Adoption of Resolution 2025-02, Declaring	Exhibit 2
	Assessments	<u>Pgs. 8-33</u>
	B. Consideration & Adoption of Resolution 2025-03, Setting	Exhibit 3
	Assessment Public Hearing	<u>Pgs. 35-36</u>
TX7	A diaman and	

#### IV. Adjournment

### EXHIBIT 1

1

2

21

#### **MINUTES OF MEETING**

#### SWEETBAY RESIDENTIAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT 1

The Regular Meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the SweetBay Residential Community
Development District 1 was held on Friday, May 16, 2025 at 10:20 a.m. CDT, at 3204 Heartleaf Ave., E.,
Panama City, FL 32405.

#### 6 FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS – Roll Call

7 Mr. McInnes called the meeting to order and conducted roll call.

8 Present and constituting a quorum were:

9	Will Randle	Board Supervisor, Chairman
10	Melissa Lupton	Board Supervisor, Vice Chairwoman
11	Mark Moody	Board Supervisor, Assistant Secretary
12	Also, present were:	
13	David McInnes (via phone)	District Manager, Vesta District Services
14	Carol Watson	Association Manager, Burg Management Company, Inc.
15	Wes Haber (via phone)	District Counsel, Kutak Rock
16	Kyle Magee (via phone)	Kutak Rock

17 The following is a summary of the discussions and actions taken at the May 16, 2025 SweetBay Residential

18 Community Development District 1 Board of Supervisors Regular Meeting. Audio for this meeting is

19 available upon public records request by emailing <u>PublicRecords@vestapropertyservices.com</u>.

20 SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS – Consent Agenda

- A. Exhibit 1: Consideration for Acceptance The March 2025 Unaudited Financial Statements
- On a MOTION by Mr. Randle, SECONDED by Ms. Lupton, WITH ALL IN FAVOR, the Board approved
   the Consent agenda as presented, for the SweetBay Residential Community Development District 1.

#### 24 THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS – Business Matters

A. Exhibit 2: Consideration & Adoption of Resolution 2025-01, Approving Proposed FY 2026
 Budget & Setting Public Hearing

On a MOTION by Mr. Randle, SECONDED by Ms. Lupton, WITH ALL IN FAVOR, the Board adopted
 **Resolution 2025-01**, Approving Proposed FY 2026 Budget & Setting Public Hearing for Friday, August
 15 at 10 a.m. CDT, in substantial form, for the SweetBay Residential Community Development District 1.

#### 30 FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS – Adjournment

- Mr. McInnes asked for final questions, comments, or corrections before requesting a motion to adjourn the meeting. There being none, Mr. Randle made a motion to adjourn the meeting.
- On a MOTION by Mr. Randle, SECONDED by Ms. Lupton, WITH ALL IN FAVOR, the Board adjourned
   the meeting at 10:22 a.m. CDT for the SweetBay Residential Community Development District 1.

35 \*Each person who decides to appeal any decision made by the Board with respect to any matter considered

- at the meeting is advised that person may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made,
- 37 *including the testimony and evidence upon which such appeal is to be based.*

- 38 Meeting minutes were approved at a meeting by vote of the Board of Supervisors at a publicly noticed
- 39 meeting held on <u>June 20, 2025</u>.
- 40 41 42 43 Signature Signature

**Printed Name** 

Printed Name

44 Title: 
□ Secretary 
□ Assistant Secretary

Title: 
Chairman 
Vice Chairman

## EXHIBIT 2

#### **RESOLUTION 2025-02**

A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE SWEETBAY RESIDENTIAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT 1 DECLARING SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS; INDICATING THE LOCATION, NATURE AND ESTIMATED COST OF THOSE INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS WHOSE COST IS TO BE DEFRAYED BY THE SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS; PROVIDING THE PORTION OF THE ESTIMATED COST OF THE IMPROVEMENTS TO BE DEFRAYED BY THE SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS; PROVIDING THE MANNER IN WHICH SUCH SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS SHALL BE MADE; PROVIDING WHEN SUCH SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS SHALL BE PAID; DESIGNATING LANDS UPON WHICH THE SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS SHALL BE LEVIED; PROVIDING FOR AN ASSESSMENT PLAT; ADOPTING A PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT ROLL; PROVIDING FOR PUBLICATION OF THIS RESOLUTION.

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors (the "Board") of the Sweetbay Residential Community Development District 1 (the "District") hereby determines to undertake, install, plan, establish, construct or reconstruct, enlarge or extend, equip, acquire, operate, and/or maintain the infrastructure improvements (the "Improvements") described in the District's *Engineer's Report*, dated September 2024, attached hereto as **Exhibit A** and incorporated herein by reference; and

**WHEREAS,** it is in the best interest of the District to pay the cost of the Improvements by special assessments pursuant to Chapter 190, Florida Statutes (the "Assessments"); and

WHEREAS, the District is empowered by Chapter 190, the Uniform Community Development District Act, Chapter 170, Supplemental and Alternative Method of Making Local Municipal Improvements, and Chapter 197, the Uniform Method for the Levy, Collection and Enforcement of Non-Ad Valorem Assessments, Florida Statutes, to finance, fund, plan, establish, acquire, construct or reconstruct, enlarge or extend, equip, operate, and maintain the Improvements and to impose, levy and collect the Assessments; and

WHEREAS, the District hereby determines that benefits will accrue to the property improved, the amount of those benefits, and that special assessments will be made in proportion to the benefits received as set forth in the *Master Special Assessment Methodology Report*, dated June 16, 2025, attached hereto as **Exhibit B** and incorporated herein by reference and on file at 250 International Parkway, Suite 208, Lake Mary FL 32746 (the "District Records Office"); and

**WHEREAS,** the District hereby determines that the Assessments to be levied will not exceed the benefit to the property improved.

# NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE SWEETBAY RESIDENTIAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT 1:

**1.** Assessments shall be levied to defray a portion of the cost of the Improvements.

2. The nature and general location of, and plans and specifications for, the Improvements are described in **Exhibit A**, which is on file at the District Records Office. **Exhibit B** is also on file and available for public inspection at the same location.

**3.** The total estimated cost of the Improvements is \$195,829,140 (the "Estimated Cost").

**4.** The Assessments will defray approximately \$404,820,000, which amounts include the Estimated Costs, plus financing-related costs, capitalized interest and a debt service reserve.

**5.** The manner in which the Assessments shall be apportioned and paid is set forth in **Exhibit B**, including provisions for supplemental assessment resolutions.

**6.** The Assessments shall be levied, within the District, on all lots and lands adjoining and contiguous or bounding and abutting upon the Improvements or specially benefitted thereby and further designated by the assessment plat hereinafter provided for.

**7.** There is on file, at the District Records Office, an assessment plat showing the area to be assessed, with certain plans and specifications describing the Improvements and the estimated cost of the Improvements, all of which shall be open to inspection by the public.

8. Commencing with the year in which the Assessments are levied and confirmed, the Assessments shall be paid in not more than (30) thirty annual installments. The Assessments may be payable at the same time and in the same manner as are ad-valorem taxes and collected pursuant to Chapter 197, Florida Statutes; provided, however, that in the event the uniform non ad-valorem assessment method of collecting the Assessments is not available to the District in any year, or if determined by the District to be in its best interest, the Assessments may be collected as is otherwise permitted by law.

**9.** The District Manager has caused to be made a preliminary assessment roll, in accordance with the method of assessment described in **Exhibit B** hereto, which shows the lots and lands assessed, the amount of benefit to and the assessment against each lot or parcel of land and the number of annual installments into which the assessment may be divided, which assessment roll is hereby adopted and approved as the District's preliminary assessment roll.

**10.** The Board shall adopt a subsequent resolution to fix a time and place at which the owners of property to be assessed or any other persons interested therein may appear before the Board and be heard as to the propriety and advisability of the assessments or the making of the Improvements, the cost thereof, the manner of payment therefore, or the amount thereof to be assessed against each property as improved.

**11.** The District Manager is hereby directed to cause this Resolution to be published twice (once a week for two (2) consecutive weeks) in a newspaper of general circulation within Bay County and to provide such other notice as may be required by law or desired in the best interests of the District.

**12.** This Resolution shall become effective upon its passage.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED** this 20th day of June, 2025.

ATTEST:

### SWEETBAY RESIDENTIAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT 1

Secretary/Assistant Secretary

Chair/Vice Chair, Board of Supervisors

Exhibit A:Engineer's Report, dated \_\_\_\_\_, 202\_\_\_Exhibit B:Master Special Assessment Methodology Report, dated June 16, 2025

### MASTER ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY REPORT SWEETBAY STEWARDSHIP DISTRICTS

June 16, 2025

**Prepared for** 

Board of Supervisors SweetBay Stewardship Districts

**Prepared by** 

Fishkind Litigation Services, Inc. 3504 Lake Lynda Drive, Suite 107 Orlando, Florida 32817 407-382-3256 WWW.Fishkindls.com

#### Master Assessment Methodology Report SweetBay Stewardship District

#### 1.0 Introduction

#### 1.1 Purpose

This Master Assessment Methodology, ("Methodology") provides a system to allocate non-ad valorem special assessments securing the repayment of bond debt to be issued by the SweetBay Residential Community Development Districts 1-7 and the SweetBay Non-Residential Districts 1-2 (collectively the "Districts"). Residential Community Development District 7 is in the process of being approved. For the purposes of this report this area and its proposed residential units are included for informational purposes and expected to be assessed at a later date when that area is validly established by Panama City.

The Methodology has two goals: (1) quantifying the special benefits received by properties within the Districts from the construction of the Districts' improvements and facilities, and (2) equitably allocating the costs incurred by the Districts to provide the improvements to properties in the Districts.

The Districts plan to implement a capital improvement program ("CIP") that will allow the development of property within the Districts. The Districts plan to fund most of the CIP through bond debt financing. This bond debt will be repaid from the proceeds of non-ad valorem special assessments levied by the Districts. These special assessments will serve as liens against properties within the boundaries of the Districts that receive a special benefit from the CIP. This Methodology is designed to conform to the requirements of Chapters 170, 190, and 197 of the Florida Statutes with respect to special assessments and is consistent with our understanding of the case law on this subject.<sup>1</sup>

#### 1.2 Background

The Districts were created by the city of Panama City on May 23, 2023, by Ordinance 3155 except for Residential District 7 which is in formation. The districts comprise +/- 542 acres in Panama City, Florida. The "SweetBay CDD Engineer's Report" dated April 2024 provides a description of the Districts and a location map.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> City of Winter Springs v. State, 776 So.2d 255 (Fla 2003) and City of Boca Raton, v. State, 595 So.2d 25 (Fla 1992)



This Methodology outlines the method to allocate the debt incurred by the Districts to fund the CIP over the approximately 542 acres in the Districts that will receive a special benefit from the installation of the CIP. It is the Districts' debt-funded capital infrastructure improvements that will allow the development of the lands within the Districts. By making development of the lands within the Districts create special benefits to the lands within the Districts.

#### **1.3 Projected Land Use Plan for the Districts**

Table 1 summarizes the land use development plan for the SweetBay development. The land use plan envisions 2,671 single-family homes, townhomes, and condominiums; 1,329 rental apartments; and 344,719 square feet of commercial and retail space, a marina, a bayfront trail system, and extensive public amenities. Prior to the formation of the Districts, 486 single-family homes were developed and are outside of the boundaries of the Districts.

Land Uses	CDD	Non	Total
		CDD	
Single/Multifamily units	2,185	486	2,671
Apartment units	1,329	0	1,329
Commercial/retail/marina sqft	344,719	0	344,719

#### Table 1. Development Plan Summary

Source: St. Andrews Bay, LLC ("Developer")

At the outset, the <u>CIP</u> is based on the land uses the Developer plans for the property in the Districts as shown in Table 1. However, until either: (a) parcels of land along with their development entitlements are sold by the Developer to a new landowner and entitlements conveyed or (b) plats are filed; the precise land uses are unknown. At this time 110 lots are platted. These lots will be allocated assessments based on the Methodology in this report. The balance of the property in the Districts' will be initially assessed on a gross acre. When properties are sold and entitlements conveyed or plats are filed, the precise land uses will be known on these properties. At that time the Districts will refine the assessment on the property from the amount based on acreage to the amount specified in the Methodology for the actual land uses.



There is one important provision. The debt per acre on the <u>properties</u> that remain unplatted in the Districts is not allowed to increase above its debt Ceiling Amount. The Ceiling Amount is set whenever the Districts issues debt. It is calculated by dividing the unplatted acres of the properties in the Districts into the debt allocated to the unplatted properties. In addition, this requirement will be tested at four intervals based upon the percentage of total acres that are developed. The intervals are at 25%, 50%, 75%, 90% and 100% of the gross acres.

#### 1.4 CIP - Infrastructure Installation

The Districts will construct public infrastructure and improvements as outlined in the Engineer's Report. The Districts' CIP is summarized in Table 2 with an estimated cost of \$195,829,140. This estimate is in constant 2024 dollars and does not include an allowance for cost escalation over time.

	0 1 1 1	<b>D</b> · ·	
Capital Improvement Plan	Completed	Remaining	Total
Spine Road (60+- ROW)	\$0	\$5,976,000	\$5,976,000
Spine Road (100+- ROW)	\$3,938,000	\$2,926,000	\$6,864,000
Trunkline (Electric)	\$1,578,780	\$1,706,670	\$3,285,450
Subdivision Improvements	\$20,183,333	\$105,046,667	\$125,230,000
Boardwalk	\$0	\$1,800,000	\$1,800,000
Frankford Ave. Wastewater Improvements	\$0	\$935,500	\$935,500
Forest Park Mobility Plan	\$0	\$3,100,000	\$3,100,000
Culvert/Bridge Crossing	\$0	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000
Basin Excavation and Seawall			
Construction	\$0	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000
Spine Drainage Outflow	\$0	\$4,500,000	\$4,500,000
	==========	==========	==========
Subtotal Construction	\$25,700,113	\$137,490,837	\$163,190,950
	, -, -, -, -	Ŧ - ) )	· , ,
Engineering and Legal @ 10%	\$2,570,011	\$13,749,084	\$16,319,095
Contingency @ 10%	\$2,570,011	\$13,749,084	\$16,319,095
	===========	============	===========
Total	\$30,840,136	\$164,989,004	\$195,829,140
			,

#### Table 2. Summary of CIP Cost Estimates (\$2024) (1)

Source: "SweetBay CDD Engineer's Report", Dewberry Engineering, P.A., April 2024.

(1) Any costs outlined in the Engineer's Report not funded with bond proceeds will be funded via Developer's Agreement with the District



The CIP is usefully divided into two parts: (1) master infrastructure that benefits all of the developable property in the Districts that is currently under construction, and (2) subdivision improvements that only benefit residential properties and are installed in phases over time. The master infrastructure includes all of the items listed in Table 2 except for the subdivision improvements. The estimated cost of the master infrastructure, including its share of engineering, legal, and contingencies totals \$45,553,140. The subdivision improvements are estimated to cost \$150,276,000.

The Developer plans to develop the property in ten phases over a twenty year period. Table 3 shows the estimated cost of the CIP over the 20 year development period including an inflation allowance of 5% per year. The master infrastructure is currently under construction along with the initial phase of the subdivision improvements.

Phase	Master Infrastructure	Subdivision Improvements	Total	Bond Amounts
1	\$45,553,140	\$16,567,929	\$62,121,069	\$80,990,000
2	\$0	\$18,266,142	\$18,266,142	\$23,510,000
3	\$0	\$20,138,421	\$20,138,421	\$25,940,000
4	\$0	\$22,202,609	\$22,202,609	\$28,620,000
5	\$0	\$24,478,377	\$24,478,377	\$31,580,000
6	\$0	\$26,987,411	\$26,987,411	\$34,840,000
7	\$0	\$29,753,620	\$29,753,620	\$38,450,000
8	\$0	\$32,803,366	\$32,803,366	\$42,420,000
9	\$0	\$36,165,711	\$36,165,711	\$46,810,000
10	\$0	\$39,872,697	\$39,872,697	\$51,660,000
	=========	==========	=========	=========
Total	\$45,553,140	\$267,236,283	\$312,789,423	\$404,820,000

#### Table 3. Estimated Cost of the CIP Including 5% Annual Inflation

#### **1.5** Requirements of a Valid Assessment Methodology

Valid special assessments under Florida law require two things. First, the properties assessed must receive a special benefit from the improvements paid for via the assessments that exceeds the burden of the debt placed upon them. Second, the assessments must be fairly and reasonably allocated to the properties being assessed.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> City of Boca Raton v. State, 595 So.2<sup>nd</sup> 25,30 (Fla. 1992), Sarasota Cnty. v. Sarasota Church of Christ, Inc., 667 So.2<sup>nd</sup> 180, 183 (Fla. 1995).



If these two characteristics of valid special assessments are adhered to, Florida law provides wide latitude to legislative bodies, such as the Districts' Board of Supervisors in approving special assessments. Indeed, Florida courts have found that mathematical perfection is probably impossible, but if reasonable people disagree the assessment will be upheld. Only if the Board was to act in an arbitrary, capricious, or grossly unfair fashion would its assessment method be overturned.<sup>3</sup>

#### **1.6** Special Benefits and General Benefits

New capital Infrastructure improvements included in the CIP create both: (1) special benefits to the properties in the Districts and (2) general benefits to properties outside the Districts. However, as discussed below, these general benefits are incidental in nature and are readily distinguishable from the special benefits which accrue to properties in the Districts. The CIP described in the District Engineer's Report is designed to enable properties in the Districts to be developed. Without the CIP there would be no infrastructure to support development of the properties in the Districts. There is no doubt that the general public, and property owners outside the Districts, will benefit from the provision of the CIP. However, these benefits are incidental to the CIP, which is designed solely to meet the needs of the Districts. Lands outside the Districts do not depend upon the CIP to obtain, or to maintain, their development entitlements. This fact alone clearly distinguishes the special benefits which developable property in the Districts receive compared to those lying outside of the boundaries of the Districts.

#### 1.7 Demonstration of Benefit

As shown in Table 2, the estimated cost of the CIP is \$195,829,140. The Districts plan to issue bonds to fund these costs, with total bond principal estimated at \$254,200,000 without inflation (Table 6). The development plan for properties in the Districts includes 3,514 residential units and 344,719 square feet of nonresidential space within the Districts. For ease of discussion in this section of the report only the 3,514 residential units are considered. Therefore, the average cost per unit for the CIP without inflation is \$72,339.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> City of Winter Springs v. State, 766 So.2<sup>nd</sup> 255,258 (Fla. 2001).



As discussed in more detail below, when the properties are developed according to the land plan in Table 1, the developed properties will have absorbed all of the debt that was initially allocated on a gross acre basis. Therefore, the proper analysis of the special benefit to the properties in the Districts planned for development is to compare the current value of the property to be developed to the expected future value of the property after the CIP is installed.

Table 4 displays the calculations estimating the value of the residential properties in the District when they are fully improved and platted, along with the estimated value of the land for those properties on an improved basis. The figures are all in 2024 dollars without inflation, based on the Developer's current pricing schedule. The 2,185 single-family, townhomes, and condominiums have a projected sell out value of \$1.2 billion. The rental apartments are valued at \$313 million. The total sell out value of the residential real estate is projected at 1.5 billion. Using the market standard relationship between the sales price of residential real estate (land and buildings) to the value of the developed building pad of 25% generates the estimated value of the residential property in the Districts at \$375 million or \$106,715 per residential unit.

Residential Units	Single Family	Multifamily	Total
Units	2,185	1,329	3,514
Total Value	\$1,186,348,000	\$313,644,000	\$1,499,992,000
Value/Unit	\$542,951	\$236,000	\$426,862
Land Value/Unit	\$135,738	\$59,000	\$106,715

Table 4. Residential Land Values for Residential Properties in theDistricts as Improved by the CIP (\$2024)

As demonstrated in Table 5, the installation of the infrastructure will generate benefits more than its cost of \$72,339 per residential unit by boosting the market value of the now undeveloped property well above the current land value (as described below) at \$106,715 per lot. Deducting the cost to produce the finished building pads of \$72,339 from the value of the lots as improved of \$106,715 results in a net value per unit of \$34,376. The SweetBay property was purchased by the Developer for \$6 million. The cost per residential lot is \$1,500 for the original total of 4,000 lots. Thus, the special benefit from the installation of the CIP is the difference between the net value of the lots at the net value of \$34,376 per unit and the cost of the land of \$1,500 per unit, or \$32,876. This estimate of special benefit is conservative, because it did not take into account the value of the improved nonresidential property.



Category	Amount
Total Bond Debt \$2024	\$254,200,000
Residential Units	3,514
	==========
Cost Unit	\$72,339
Land Value/Unit	\$106,715
	===========
Gross Value of District	
Infrastructure/Unit	\$34,376
Cost of Land	\$6,000,000
Residential Units	4,000
Cost/Unit	\$1,500
Gross Value of District	
Infrastructure/Unit	\$34,376
	===========
Special Benefit	\$32,876

#### Table 5. Demonstration of Special Benefit

#### 2.0 CIP Plan of Finance

The Districts intend to finance the CIP costs shown in Table 2 by issuing bonds. These bonds will be issued in several series, as development progresses within the Districts. A number of component funds comprise the total principal of the bonds to be issued by the Districts. These funds may include, but are not limited to, construction, capitalized interest, debt service reserve, underwriter's discount, and issuance costs. The debt service. The bond sizing includes 36 months of capitalized interest. The underwriter's discount is estimated at 2.0% of par. This allowance pays the underwriter for taking the risks involved in purchasing the District's bonds. The cost of issuance pays for the trustee, financial advisor, District counsel, and other costs associated with issuing the District's bonds.

An estimate of the bond issuance required to fund the District's CIP without inflation is found in Table 6. The construction/acquisition funds raised by the Districts' bonds may fund only a portion of the District's CIP. The balance of any remaining CIP costs will be funded by one or more landowners in the Districts or by the Developer. As bonds are issued by the Districts over time, the Districts will adopt supplemental assessment methodology reports detailing the particulars of each specific bond issue with respect to bond pricing. The ultimate timing of the bond issuances will be based on market demand.



Category	Amount
Construction Fund	\$195,829,140
Capitalized Interest	\$34,317,000
Debt Service Reserve	\$18,467,353
Under Writer's Discount	\$5,084,000
Cost Of Issuance	\$500,000
Rounding	\$2,507
	==========
Bond Issuance	\$254,200,000

#### Table 6. Estimated Bond for CIP without Inflation

The Developer plans to develop and sell the improved building pads over a twenty year period with the exact timing of the phasing dependent on market conditions. As noted previously, construction of the master infrastructure benefitting all the properties in the Districts is underway along with the first phase of the subdivision improvements. The projected cost for each phase of the CIP and the bonds needed to fund each phase were estimated using a 5% per year cost escalator and the twenty year development horizon. Table 7 shows the projected costs by phase including the inflation allowance.

The total bonds needed to fund the CIP with cost escalation is \$404,820,000 as shown above. The initial bond issue is estimated at \$80,990,000. It includes all of the master infrastructure and the initial phase of the subdivision improvements. The future bond issues are smaller because they only fund subdivision improvements.



Bond Issues	Phase 1 Master	Phase 1 Subdivision	Phase 2	Phase 3
Construction Fund	\$45,553,140	\$16,567,929	\$18,266,142	\$20,138,421
Capitalized Interest	\$8,050,050	\$2,643,300	\$2,909,363	\$3,210,075
Debt Service Reserve	\$4,332,055	\$1,469,683	\$1,617,615	\$1,784,812
Under Writer's Discount	\$1,192,600	\$427,200	\$470,200	\$518,800
Cost Of Issuance	\$500,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$289,406
Rounding	\$2,155 =======	\$1,888 =======	-\$3,319	-\$1,514 =======
Bond Issuance	\$59,630,000	\$21,360,000	\$23,510,000	\$25,940,000
Bond Issues	Phase 4	Phase 5	Phase 6	Phase 7
Construction Fund	\$22,202,609	\$24,478,377	\$26,987,411	\$29,753,620
Capitalized Interest	\$3,541,725	\$3,908,025	\$4,311,450	\$4,758,188
, Debt Service Reserve	\$1,969,210	\$2,172,874	\$2,397,180	\$2,645,567
Under Writer's Discount	\$572,400	\$631,600	\$696,800	\$769,000
Cost Of Issuance	\$335,024	\$387,832	\$448,964	\$519,732
Rounding	-\$969	\$1,292	-\$1,804	\$3,893
Bond Issuance	======== \$28,620,000	\$31,580,000	\$34,840,000	======= \$38,450,000
Bond Issues	Phase 8	Phase 9	Phase 10	Total
Construction Fund	\$32,803,366	\$36,165,711	\$39,872,697	\$312,789,423
Capitalized Interest	\$5,249,475	\$5,792,738	\$6,392,925	\$50,767,313
Debt Service Reserve	\$2,918,725	\$3,220,780	\$3,554,486	\$28,082,987
Under Writer's Discount	\$848,400	\$936,200	\$1,033,200	\$8,096,400
Cost Of Issuance	\$601,655	\$696,491	\$806,275	\$5,085,379
Rounding	-\$1,621	-\$1,920	\$417	-\$1,501
Bond Issuance	======== \$42,420,000	======= \$46,810,000	======= \$51,660,000	======== \$404,820,000

#### Table 7. Estimated Bond for CIP with Inflation by Phase of Development



#### 3.0 Assessment Methodology

#### 3.1 Overview

The assessment methodology has four components. First, the Districts' Engineer determines the costs for the CIP's master improvements that benefit all developable property in the Districts and for the subdivision improvements benefitting specific subdivisions. Second, the Assessment Consultant and the Underwriter estimate of the dollar amount of bonds required to finance the CIP. Third, the Assessment Consult determines the properties in the Districts that specially benefit from the installation of the CIP. Finally, the as-financed costs of the CIP are allocated to the specially benefiting properties based on the approximate relative benefit each property receives.

#### 3.2 Allocation of Specific Assessments

The discussion below illustrates the process by which the Districts will allocate bond debt incurred to fund the CIP. As shown in Table 7, the Districts anticipate issuing \$404,820,000 in bonds to fund the CIP. The Districts' bond debt will be secured by special assessments allocated to properties in the Districts based on and proportional to the benefits that each property receives from the CIP. As described above, until such time as either: (a) properties are sold along with their entitlements or (b) plats are recorded; the specific land uses in the Districts are not known with certainty. Therefore, at the outset, the debt is allocated on a gross acreage basis across all benefited acres in the Districts totaling approximately 542 acres. As the sale and platting process unfolds, the Districts will more finely articulate the allocation of debt to benefiting properties based on their land uses. At this juncture the Developer has platted 110 lots comprising phase 3a of SweetBay.

As noted above, as long as two basic principles are adhered to, Florida law generally allows the Districts latitude in determining the appropriate methodology to allocate the costs of its CIP to benefiting properties in the Districts. The two principles are: (1) the properties being assessed must receive a special benefit from the CIP and (2) the assessments allocated to each property must be fairly and reasonably apportioned among the benefiting properties.



In allocating special assessments to benefiting property, Florida governments have used a variety of methods including, but not limited to, front footage, area, trip rates, dwelling units, acreage, and equivalent residential units ("ERU"). The development plan for lands in the Districts encompasses a variety of single-family unit types, multifamily apartments, a marina, clubhouses, and commercial/retail uses. Given this variety of land uses, the ERU method is best suited to produce an equitable allocation of bond debt proportional to the special benefits provided by the installation of the CIP.

The use of ERU values to estimate the benefit derived from infrastructure improvements is recognized as a simple, fair, and reasonable method for apportioning benefit. The Florida Supreme Court concluded that the ERU method was a valid methodology in its decision in Winter Springs v. State.<sup>4</sup> In addition, the ERU methodology is widely used in other similar CDDs.

In this application the ERU unit of measurement is a standard, single-family lot, with a 50' frontage. All other land uses will be measured in terms of the 50' standard single-family metric. The average apartment unit is about 1,000 square feet and is expected to house an average of 2 people. This is about 50% of the standard 50' single-family home, so the apartments are assigned 0.50 ERU per unit. There are six categories of single-family homes planned for SweetBay ranging from: (1) small, three-bedroom, twobath standard homes to (2) large estate homes, with five or more bedrooms and 4 our more bathrooms. ERUs are assigned in proportion to the lot frontage and the expected size of the homes. The development plan also includes townhomes assigned 0.75 ERU and condominiums measured at 1.5 ERU. Commercial/retail/marina uses are counted as 1 ERU per 2,000 square feet.

As noted above, the CIP can be usefully divided into two categories: (1) master infrastructure which benefits all developable property in the Districts and (2) subdivision infrastructure benefitting only particular residential subdivisions installed in 10 phases. In Table 7 the estimated bonds needed to fund the master infrastructure improvements total \$59,630,000. Table 8 shows the allocation of the \$59,630,000 of bond debt needed to fund the master infrastructure to the benefitting properties in the Districts using the ERU method. Phase 1 and 2 of the residential units are in SweetBay, but they are outside of the Districts. Therefore, they have no ERUs assigned. Each of the other land uses are assigned their ERU/unit and allocated their proportionate share of the master infrastructure bonds totaling \$59,630,000. Annual debt service is estimated at the rates used to size the bonds. The administrative charges allow for 4% early payment of property taxes and allowances for the costs of the tax assessor and tax collector.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> City of Winter Springs v. State, 776 So.2d 255 (Fla 2003)



Land Use	Volume	ERU/Use	ERUs	%ERU	Par Bonds	Annual Assessment	Administrative Charges	Total Annual Assessment1
Residential (units)								
Phase 1	252	0.00	0.00	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Phase 2	234	0.00	0.00	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Multifamily 1	360	0.50	180.00	4.8%	\$2,865,725	\$208,192	\$13,289	\$221,481
Multifamily 2	219	0.50	109.50	2.9%	\$1,743,316	\$126,650	\$8,084	\$134,734
Phase 1D 34'	3	0.70	2.10	0.1%	\$33,433	\$2,429	\$155	\$2,584
Phase 1D 40'	26	0.80	20.80	0.6%	\$331,150	\$24,058	\$1,536	\$25,593
Phase 1D 50'	73	1.00	73.00	1.9%	\$1,162,211	\$84,433	\$5,389	\$89,823
Phase 1D 60'	15	1.20	18.00	0.5%	\$286,573	\$20,819	\$1,329	\$22,148
Phase 1D 70'	13	2.00	26.00	0.7%	\$413,938	\$30,072	\$1,919	\$31,992
Phase 1D Towns	11	0.70	7.70	0.2%	\$122,589	\$8,906	\$568	\$9,474
60'	12	1.20	14.40	0.4%	\$229,258	\$16,655	\$1,063	\$17,718
50'	16	1.00	16.00	0.4%	\$254,731	\$18,506	\$1,181	\$19,687
45'	5	0.90	4.50	0.1%	\$71,643	\$5,205	\$332	\$5,537
50'	4	1.00	4.00	0.1%	\$63,683	\$4,626	\$295	\$4,922
45'	8	0.90	7.20	0.2%	\$114,629	\$8,328	\$532	\$8,859
35'	15	0.70	10.50	0.3%	\$167,167	\$12,145	\$775	\$12,920
25'	24	0.50	12.00	0.3%	\$191,048	\$13,879	\$886	\$14,765
24'	26	0.48	12.48	0.3%	\$198,690	\$14,435	\$921	\$15,356
60'	3	1.20	3.60	0.1%	\$57,315	\$4,164	\$266	\$4,430
50'	11	1.00	11.00	0.3%	\$175,128	\$12,723	\$812	\$13,535
45'	9	0.90	8.10	0.2%	\$128,958	\$9,369	\$598	\$9,967
60'	4	1.20	4.80	0.1%	\$76,419	\$5,552	\$354	\$5,906
50'	15	1.00	15.00	0.4%	\$238,810	\$17,349	\$1,107	\$18,457

#### Table 8. Allocation of Bond Debt Funding Master Infrastructure



45'	26	0.90	23.40	0.6%	\$372,544	\$27,065	\$1,728	\$28,79
35'	26	0.70	18.20	0.5%	\$289,757	\$21,051	\$1,344	\$22,39
25'	17	0.50	8.50	0.2%	\$135,326	\$9,831	\$628	\$10,45
Phase 1D South Townhomes	19	0.70	13.30	0.4%	\$211,745	\$15,383	\$982	\$16,36
Phase 3 South	73	1.00	73.00	1.9%	\$1,162,211	\$84,433	\$5,389	\$89,82
Marina District	352	2.00	704.00	18.8%	\$11,208,169	\$814,261	\$51,974	\$866,23
School & Fire Station/Build to Rent	258	1.00	258.00	6.9%	\$4,107,539	\$298,408	\$19,047	\$317,45
Single Family- East Side Parcels	217	1.00	217.00	5.8%	\$3,454,791	\$250,987	\$16,020	\$267,00
Multifamily 3- East Side Parcels	375	0.50	187.50	5.0%	\$2,985,130	\$216,866	\$13,843	\$230,70
Marina Premium Podium Condos	196	1.50	294.00	7.8%	\$4,680,684	\$340,047	\$21,705	\$361,75
Gold Coast	220	2.00	440.00	11.7%	\$7,005,106	\$508,913	\$32,484	\$541,39
Gold Coast Premium Podium Condos	200	1.50	300.00	8.0%	\$4,776,209	\$346,986	\$22,148	\$369,13
Multifamily 4- East Side Parcels	375	0.50	187.50	5.0%	\$2,985,130	\$216,866	\$13,843	\$230,70
Single Family- East Side Parcels	288	1.00	288.00	7.7%	\$4,585,160	\$333,107	\$21,262	\$354,36
Commercial (square feet)								
Marina District 1	70,988	0.001	35.49	0.9%	\$565,089	\$41,053	\$2,620	\$43,6
Marina District 2	18,492	0.001	9.25	0.2%	\$147,203	\$10,694	\$683	\$11,37
Town Center 1	78,888	0.001	39.44	1.1%	\$627,976	\$45,622	\$2,912	\$48,5
Town Center 2	39,710	0.001	19.86	0.5%	\$316,105	\$22,965	\$1,466	\$24,43
Town Center 3	60,641	0.001	30.32	0.8%	\$482,723	\$35,069	\$2,238	\$37,30
Town Center 4	26,000	0.001	13.00	0.3%	\$206,969	\$15,036	\$960	\$15,9
Marina and Clubhouses	50,000	0.001	25.00	0.7%	\$398,017	\$28,916	\$1,846	\$30,7
Total	344,719		======= 3,745.44	=======================================	======= \$59,630,000	======= \$4,332,055	======= \$276,514	====== \$4,608,5



Land Use	Debt/Unit	Annual Assessment/Unit	Administrative Charges	Total Annual Assessment1
Residential (units)				
Phase 1	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Phase 2	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Multifamily 1	\$7,960	\$578	\$37	\$615
Multifamily 2	\$7,960	\$578	\$37	\$615
Phase 1D 34'	\$11,144	\$810	\$52	\$861
Phase 1D 40'	\$12,737	\$925	\$59	\$984
Phase 1D 50'	\$15,921	\$1,157	\$74	\$1,230
Phase 1D 60'	\$19,105	\$1,388	\$89	\$1,477
Phase 1D 70'	\$31,841	\$2,313	\$148	\$2,461
Phase 1D Towns	\$11,144	\$810	\$52	\$861
60'	\$19,105	\$1,388	\$89	\$1,477
50'	\$15,921	\$1,157	\$74	\$1,230
45'	\$14,329	\$1,041	\$66	\$1,107
50'	\$15,921	\$1,157	\$74	\$1,230
45'	\$14,329	\$1,041	\$66	\$1,107
35'	\$11,144	\$810	\$52	\$861
25'	\$7,960	\$578	\$37	\$615
24'	\$7,642	\$555	\$35	\$591
60'	\$19,105	\$1,388	\$89	\$1,477
50'	\$15,921	\$1,157	\$74	\$1,230
45'	\$14,329	\$1,041	\$66	\$1,107
60'	\$19,105	\$1,388	\$89	\$1,477
50'	\$15,921	\$1,157	\$74	\$1,230
45'	\$14,329	\$1,041	\$66	\$1,107
35'	\$11,144	\$810	\$52	\$861
25'	\$7,960	\$578	\$37	\$615
Phase 1D South Townhomes	\$11,144	\$810	\$52	\$861
Phase 3 South	\$15,921	\$1,157	\$74	\$1,230
Marina District	\$31,841	\$2,313	\$148	\$2,461
School & Fire Station/Build to Rent	\$15,921	\$1,157	\$74	\$1,230
Single Family- East Side Parcels	\$15,921	\$1,157	\$74	\$1,230
Multifamily 3- East Side Parcels	\$7,960	\$578	\$37	\$615
Marina Premium Podium Condos	\$23,881	\$1,735	\$111	\$1,846
Gold Coast	\$31,841	\$2,313	\$148	\$2,461
Gold Coast Premium Podium Condos	\$23,881	\$1,735	\$111	\$1,846
Multifamily 4- East Side Parcels	\$7,960	\$578	\$37	\$615
Single Family- East Side Parcels	\$15,921	\$1,157	\$74	\$1,230

#### Table 8. Continued



Commercial (square feet)				
Marina District 1	\$8	\$0.58	\$0.04	\$0.62
Marina District 2	\$8	\$0.58	\$0.04	\$0.62
Town Center 1	\$8	\$0.58	\$0.04	\$0.62
Town Center 2	\$8	\$0.58	\$0.04	\$0.62
Town Center 3	\$8	\$0.58	\$0.04	\$0.62
Town Center 4	\$8	\$0.58	\$0.04	\$0.62
Marina and Clubhouses	\$8	\$0.58	\$0.04	\$0.62

(1) Total annual assessments represent the assessment placed on the County tax roll each year using the Uniform Method of collecting non-ad valorem assessments authorized by Chapter 197 of the Florida Statutes. Total assessments include a 6.0% gross-up to account for the fees of the County Property Appraiser and Tax Collector and the statutory early payment discount.

In addition to the master infrastructure, the subdivision improvements will be installed in phases over ten years. The Developer has initiated the plat for the first plat of 110 units in phase 3a of its development program, which is a subset of phase 1 of the Districts' infrastructure program. Also, in support of the initial plat the Developer has begun installation of the subdivision improvements. As shown in Table 7, the subdivision improvements have an estimated cost of \$16,567,929 with \$21,360,000 of bonds needed for the financing. Table 9 shows the allocation of debt funding the subdivision improvements to the 362 residential lots planned for the initial development phase. The same ERU method used for the master infrastructure was applied to the subdivision infrastructure. As Table 9 shows, only the 362 residential units in this phase (the 110 platted lots of Developer phase 3a plus the 111 lots planned for Developer phase 3b and 141 lots planned for phase 1d, for a total of 362 residential lots) are allocated the costs for phase 1 of the subdivision improvements.

In the future the Districts will allocate debt funding each phase of the subdivision improvements following this same methodology.



Land Use	Volume	ERU/Use	ERUs	%ERU	Par Bonds	Annual Assessment	Administrative Charges	Total Annual Assessment1
Residential (units)								
Phase 1	0	0.00	0.00	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Phase 2	0	0.00	0.00	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Multifamily 1	0	0.50	0.00	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Multifamily 2	0	0.50	0.00	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Phase 1D 34'	3	0.70	2.10	0.7%	\$139,617	\$9,606	\$613	\$10,220
Phase 1D 40'	26	0.80	20.80	6.5%	\$1,382,869	\$95,149	\$6,073	\$101,222
Phase 1D 50'	73	1.00	73.00	22.7%	\$4,853,337	\$333,936	\$21,315	\$355,251
Phase 1D 60'	15	1.20	18.00	5.6%	\$1,196,713	\$82,340	\$5,256	\$87,596
Phase 1D 70'	13	2.00	26.00	8.1%	\$1,728,586	\$118,936	\$7,592	\$126,528
Phase 1D Towns	11	0.70	7.70	2.4%	\$511,927	\$35,223	\$2,248	\$37,472
60'	12	1.20	14.40	4.5%	\$957,371	\$65,872	\$4,205	\$70,077
50'	16	1.00	16.00	5.0%	\$1,063,745	\$73,191	\$4,672	\$77,863
45'	5	0.90	4.50	1.4%	\$299,178	\$20,585	\$1,314	\$21,899
50'	4	1.00	4.00	1.2%	\$265,936	\$18,298	\$1,168	\$19,466
45'	8	0.90	7.20	2.2%	\$478,685	\$32,936	\$2,102	\$35,038
35'	15	0.70	10.50	3.3%	\$698,083	\$48,032	\$3,066	\$51,098
25'	24	0.50	12.00	3.7%	\$797,809	\$54,894	\$3,504	\$58,397
24'	26	0.48	12.48	3.9%	\$829,721	\$57,089	\$3,644	\$60,733
60'	3	1.20	3.60	1.1%	\$239,343	\$16,468	\$1,051	\$17,519
50'	11	1.00	11.00	3.4%	\$731,325	\$50,319	\$3,212	\$53,531
45'	9	0.90	8.10	2.5%	\$538,521	\$37,053	\$2,365	\$39,418
60'	4	1.20	4.80	1.5%	\$319,124	\$21,957	\$1,402	\$23,359
50'	15	1.00	15.00	4.7%	\$997,261	\$68,617	\$4,380	\$72,997

#### Table 9. Allocation of Bond Debt Funding Subdivision Infrastructure



45'	26	0.90	23.40	7.3%	\$1,555,727	\$107,042	\$6,832	\$113,87
35'	26	0.70	18.20	5.7%	\$1,210,010	\$83,255	\$5,314	\$88,56
25'	17	0.50	8.50	2.6%	\$565,115	\$38,883	\$2,482	\$41,36
Phase 1D South Townhomes	0	0.70	0.00	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$
Phase 3 South	0	1.00	0.00	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$
Marina District	0	2.00	0.00	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$
School & Fire Station/Build to Rent	0	1.00	0.00	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$
Single Family- East Side Parcels	0	1.00	0.00	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$
Multifamily 3- East Side Parcels	0	0.50	0.00	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$
Marina Premium Podium Condos	0	1.50	0.00	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$
Gold Coast	0	2.00	0.00	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$
Gold Coast Premium Podium Condos	0	1.50	0.00	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$
Multifamily 4- East Side Parcels	0	0.50	0.00	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$
Single Family- East Side Parcels	0	1.00	0.00	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$
Commercial (square feet)								
Marina District 1	0	0.001	0.00	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$
Marina District 2	0	0.001	0.00	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$
Town Center 1	0	0.001	0.00	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$
Town Center 2	0	0.001	0.00	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$
Town Center 3	0	0.001	0.00	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$
Town Center 4	0	0.001	0.00	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$
Marina and Clubhouses	0	0.001	0.00	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$
			======= 321.28	======= 100%	======= \$21,360,000	====== \$1,469,683	======= \$93,810	====== \$1,563,49



#### Debt/Unit Land Use Administrative **Total Annual** Annual Assessment/Unit Charges Assessment Residential (units) Phase 1 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 Phase 2 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 Multifamily 1 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 Multifamily 2 \$0 \$0 Phase 1D 34' \$46,539 \$3,407 \$217 \$3,624 Phase 1D 40' \$53,187 \$3.893 \$248 \$4,142 Phase 1D 50' \$66,484 \$4,866 \$311 \$5,177 Phase 1D 60' \$79,781 \$5,840 \$373 \$6,212 Phase 1D 70' \$132,968 \$9,733 \$621 \$10,354 Phase 1D Towns \$46.539 \$3.407 \$217 \$3.624 60' \$79,781 \$5,840 \$373 \$6,212 50' \$66,484 \$4,866 \$311 \$5,177 45' \$59.836 \$4.380 \$280 \$4,659 50' \$66,484 \$4,866 \$311 \$5,177 45' \$59,836 \$4,380 \$280 \$4,659 35' \$217 \$3,624 \$46,539 \$3,407 25' \$33,242 \$2,433 \$155 \$2,589 24' \$149 \$31,912 \$2,336 \$2,485 60' \$79,781 \$5,840 \$373 \$6,212 50' \$66,484 \$4,866 \$311 \$5,177 45' \$59,836 \$4,380 \$280 \$4,659 60' \$79,781 \$5,840 \$373 \$6,212 50' \$4,866 \$311 \$5,177 \$66,484 45' \$59,836 \$4,380 \$280 \$4,659 35' \$46,539 \$3,407 \$217 \$3,624 25' \$33,242 \$2,433 \$2,589 \$155 Phase 1D South Townhomes \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 Phase 3 South \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 Marina District \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 School & Fire Station/Build to Rent \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 Single Family- East Side Parcels \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 Multifamily 3- East Side Parcels \$0 \$0 \$0 Marina Premium Podium Condos \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 Gold Coast \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 Gold Coast Premium Podium Condos \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 Multifamily 4- East Side Parcels \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 Single Family- East Side Parcels \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0

#### Table 9. Continued



Commercial (square feet)				
Marina District 1	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Marina District 2	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Town Center 1	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Town Center 2	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Town Center 3	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Town Center 4	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Marina and Clubhouses	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

#### 3.3 True-Up Mechanism

Although the Districts do not process plats, they do have important roles to play during the course of development. Whenever a parcel's land use and development density and intensity is determined with sufficient certainty, the Districts must allocate a portion of its debt to the parcel according to the procedures outlined in Section 3.2 above. In addition, the Districts must also prevent any buildup of debt on land that has not yet been developed. Otherwise, the land could be fully subdivided without all of the debt being allocated.

To preclude this, a True-Up test is conducted when development thresholds are reached within the Districts. As long as the development at these thresholds does not cause the debt on the remaining land to increase above Ceiling Level, then no further action in necessary. However, if the debt on the remaining land does increase, a debt reduction payment will be necessary.

The debt Ceiling Level is established at the time each series of bonds is issued. For example, as shown in Table 7, the Districts plan to issue \$80,990,000 of bonds in 2025. Since no property has yet been platted or sold in the Districts, there are 542 acres remaining unplatted and unsold. The Ceiling Level would be set when the Series 2025 Bonds are issued by dividing \$80,990,000 by 542 acres resulting in a Ceiling Level of \$108,025. At the time of each future debt issuance, the Ceiling Level is recalculated by dividing the total amount of debt remaining on the unsold/unplatted property by the number of remaining acres remaining unsold/unplatted.

The True-Up tests are conducted when 25%, 50%, 75%, and 90% of the acreage within the Districts has been developed. Table 10 below illustrates when the true-up test will be applied to determine if debt reduction payments are required.



Category	<u>25%</u>	<u>50%</u>	<u>75%</u>	<u>90%</u>
Platted Developable Acres	136	271	407	488
Unplatted Developable Acres	407	271	136	54

#### Table 10. True- Up Thresholds

In the event that additional land not currently subject to the assessments required to repay the debt associated with the CIP is developed in such a manner as to receive special benefit from the CIP, it is contemplated that this Methodology will be re-applied to include such new parcels. The additional land, as a result of applying this Methodology, will be allocated an appropriate share of the special assessments, with all previously-assessed parcels receiving a relative adjustment in their assessment levels.

#### 4.0 Assessment Roll

Table 11 outlines the maximum bond principal assessment per assessable acre for the lands within the Districts. A description of the land within the District, which will be assessed to secure the repayment of the District's bonds, is found in Exhibit "A". The assessments shall be paid in not more than thirty (30) annual installments.

Category	Amounts
Parcel ID Numbers	Exhibit "A" - Legal Description
Assessable Acreage	542
Bond Principal Assessment	\$404,820,000
Bond Principal Assessment per Acre	\$746,900
Net Total Bond Annual Assessment	\$28,082,987
Net Annual Assessment per Acre	\$51,814
Bond Gross Annual Assessment (1)	\$30,196,760
Bond Gross Annual Assessment per Acre (1)	\$55,714

(1) Gross assessments represent the assessment placed on the County tax roll each year, if the Districts elects to use the Uniform Method of collecting non-ad valorem assessments authorized by Chapter 197 of the Florida Statutes. Gross assessments include a 7.0% gross-up to account for the fees of the County Property Appraiser and Tax Collector and the statutory early payment discount.



When the pending plat is processed, the District will update the assessment roll by applying the Methodology to the platted property. Finaly, the Districts will only levy and collect debt service for bonds or notes that are issued and at the time their capitalized interest periods expire.

Table 12 displays the assessment roll allocated to each district based on its gross acres.

District	Acreage	Assessment
Residential District 1	36.0	\$26,840,235
Residential District 2	74.7	\$55,741,659
Residential District 3	70.4	\$52,526,325
Residential District 4	58.8	\$43,866,499
Residential District 5	81.7	\$60,963,683
Residential District 6	98.8	\$73,757,830
Residential District 7	28.7	\$21,427,844
Commercial District 1	39.7	\$29,631,536
Commercial District 2	53.7	\$40,064,387
	========	=========
Total	542.3	\$404,820,000



#### EXHIBIT "A" LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF LAND LOCATED WITHIN THE DISTRICT\* \*Source: Petition to Establish SweetBay CDD



### EXHIBIT 3

#### **RESOLUTION 2025-03**

A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE SWEETBAY RESIDENTIAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT 1 SETTING A PUBLIC HEARING TO BE HELD ON \_\_\_\_\_\_, 2025, AT \_\_\_\_\_\_, M. AT \_\_\_\_\_\_, FOR THE PURPOSE OF HEARING PUBLIC COMMENT ON IMPOSING SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS ON CERTAIN PROPERTY WITHIN THE DISTRICT GENERALLY DESCRIBED AS THE SWEETBAY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT 1 IN ACCORDANCE WITH CHAPTERS 170, 190 AND 197, FLORIDA STATUTES.

**WHEREAS,** the Board of Supervisors of the Sweetbay Residential Community Development District 1 (the "Board") has previously adopted Resolution 2025-\_\_\_\_ entitled:

A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE SWEETBAY RESIDENTIAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT 1 DECLARING SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS; INDICATING THE LOCATION, NATURE AND ESTIMATED COST OF THOSE INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS WHOSE COST IS TO BE DEFRAYED BY THE SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS; PROVIDING THE PORTION OF THE ESTIMATED COST OF THE IMPROVEMENTS TO BE DEFRAYED BY THE SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS; PROVIDING THE MANNER IN WHICH SUCH SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS SHALL BE MADE; PROVIDING WHEN SUCH SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS SHALL BE PAID; DESIGNATING LANDS UPON WHICH THE SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS SHALL BE LEVIED; PROVIDING FOR AN ASSESSMENT PLAT; ADOPTING A PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT ROLL; PROVIDING FOR PUBLICATION OF THIS RESOLUTION.

WHEREAS, in accordance with Resolution 2025-\_\_\_\_, a Preliminary Special Assessment Roll has been prepared and all other conditions precedent set forth in Chapters 170, 190 and 197, Florida Statutes, to the holding of the aforementioned public hearing have been satisfied, and the roll and related documents are available for public inspection at 250 International Parkway, Suite 208, Lake Mary FL 32746, (321) 263-0132 (the "District Records Office").

#### NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE SWEETBAY RESIDENTIAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT 1:

1. There is hereby declared a public hearing to be held at \_\_\_\_\_\_\_.m. on \_\_\_\_\_\_, 2025, at \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, for the purpose of hearing comment and objections to the proposed special assessment program for District improvements as identified in the Preliminary Special Assessment Roll, a copy of which is on file. Affected parties may appear at that hearing or submit their comments in writing prior to the hearing to the office of the District Manager at 250 International Parkway, Suite 208, Lake Mary FL 32746, (321) 263-0132.

2. Notice of said hearing shall be advertised in accordance with Chapters 170, 190 and 197, Florida Statutes, and the District Manager is hereby authorized and directed to place said notice in a newspaper(s) of general circulation within Bay County (by two publications one week apart with the first publication at least twenty (20) days prior to the date of the hearing established herein). The District Manager shall file a publisher's affidavit with the District Secretary verifying such publication of notice. The District Manager is further authorized and directed to give thirty (30) days written notice by mail of the time and place of this hearing to the owners of all property to be assessed and include in such notice the amount of the assessment for each such property owner, a description of the areas to be improved and notice that information concerning all assessments may be ascertained at the District Records Office. The District Manager shall file proof of such mailing by affidavit with the District Secretary.

**3.** This Resolution shall become effective upon its passage.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 20th day of June, 2025.

ATTEST:

#### SWEETBAY RESIDENTIAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT 1

Secretary/Assistant Secretary

Chair/Vice Chair, Board of Supervisors