

**MINUTES OF MEETING
SAMPSON CREEK
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT**

The regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Sampson Creek Community Development District was held on Thursday, **January 15, 2026** at 6:00 p.m. at the St. Johns Golf & Country Club, Meeting Room, 219 St. Johns Golf Drive, St. Augustine, Florida.

Present and constituting a quorum were:

Mike Yuro	Chairman
Graham Leary	Vice Chairman
Mike Davis	Assistant Secretary
Lori Weitzel	Assistant Secretary
Kyle Geary	Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

Daniel Laughlin	GMS
Wes Haber (<i>via phone</i>)	Kutak Rock, LLP
Branden Marcinell	Matthews
Stephanie Taylor	Vesta Property Services
Jason Davidson	Vesta Property Services
Oscar Meranda	Ruppert Landscape
Clayton Buss	C Buss
Residents	

The following is a summary of the actions taken at the January 15, 2026 Board of Supervisors meeting of the Sampson Creek Community Development District.

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

Roll Call

Mr. Laughlin called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. All Supervisors were present.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS

Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

January 15, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS

Public Comment *(regarding agenda items listed below)*

Mr. Laughlin opened the public comment period. The following residents addressed the Board:

- Ms. Lisa Murman of 935 Eagle Point Drive voiced continuing support for pickleball and finding a reasonable solution for the community, such as multi-use courts, since there was a pool of money. The flooring in the Amenity Center needed to be replaced and it needed fresh paint, but they did not need to redo the entire room. She also was not in favor of the pool enhancement project, as it would use up their remaining funds.
- Mr. Tom Daddario of 1504 Drury Court requested further discussion on the pickleball courts.
- Mr. Paul Skogerboe of 228 St. Johns Golf Drive recalled last May talking about the curb that raised up near his driveway. Mr. Laughlin indicated that this has been an ongoing matter that they have been monitoring.
- Mr. David McMullen of 793 Eagle Point Drive asked if a pickleball discussion was not appropriate at this time. Mr. Davis indicated that it was welcome because they have the large projects. Mr. Yuro felt that it was appropriate, as they had future amenity capital improvements.
- Ms. Leann Daddario of 1504 Drury Court was in favor of discussing the pickleball courts under capital improvements.

There being no further comments, Mr. Laughlin closed the public comment period.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Amenities Booking Requests

- **Proposal for Pool Pump** *(Item 8E7)*

Mr. Clayton Buss of C Buss Enterprises presented a proposal for the pool pump, which was included in the agenda package. The current pumps were cast iron and were the original suction pumps that were mounted above the water level. The outside exterior of the pump was badly corroding. Whenever the pump was running, it was producing a metal stain into the water. The pumps were going to end up breaking, the parts were harder to find and the industry had switched over to installing polycarbonate thermoplastic resin pumps, which were more efficient and would not introduce any rust into the water. By paring these pumps with an accupump drive,

January 15, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

there would be a sensor that would determine the flow, rather than having a hard start and hard stop, which was what they had now. It would allow the pumps to run cooler, more efficiently and parts would be available in the future. These were the original pumps and the motors have only been changed out once or twice, which was a good long run, but inevitably the pumps would not last long. This was not something that they needed to do now, as the pumps were running fine, at this time, but recommended that the Board set aside money to make improvements in the future. Mr. Davis questioned how long the current pumps would last. Mr. Buss estimated one to two years. Ms. Weitzel questioned the timeframe from ordering the parts to installation of the new pumps. Mr. Buss needed a four-to-six-week lead time. The plumbing and fittings they could source locally; however, the drives were a three-to-four-week lead time. Mr. Laughlin pointed out that the pumps were not included in the capital reserve. Mr. Leary recommended listing all of the capital projects and prioritizing them, as \$200,000 was budgeted in the capital reserve; however, they also had the slide resurfacing for \$25,000, a large landscaping project for \$50,000, road repairs and irrigation expenses. Mr. Yuro agreed, as he would like to understand what was coming up and prioritizing them, so the Board could make an informed decision. Mr. Leary requested that Ms. Taylor include this item on her project list.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**Discussion of Amenity Policy Updates**

Ms. Taylor provided an overview and discussed the following changes:

- On Page 1 or Page 7 of the agenda package, "*Property Owner*" was added.
- On Page 3 or Page 9 of the agenda package, mobile credentials were added, as it will be offered with the new access control system. Ms. Taylor asked if there should be age requirements. Mr. Yuro did not see why, as they did not have age restrictions now on who could use a card.
- On Page 3 or Page 9 of the agenda package, the proper usage of access cards, was added to the general rules, which were only residents or patrons and household members. A provision was also added for organized and instructional activities on District property must be approved by the Board and anything that was not approved by the Board, would be prohibited.
- On Page 5 of the policy or Page 11 of the agenda package, "*Lifeguards should have full authority to enforce the District policies or procedures,*" was added.

January 15, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

- On Page 6 of the policy or Page 12 of the agenda package, *“The use of starting blocks without permission from the General Manager was prohibited for safety reasons,”* was added.
- At the top of Page 7 of the policy or Page 13 of the agenda package, there was new rule about the ADA chairlifts. Under the slide policy, language was added on when the water slide could be used and *“Climbing on the waterslide and supporting structure, was strictly prohibited,”* and *“The landing area of the waterslide must be kept clear at all times to ensure safety,”* were added.
- On the bottom of Page 8 of the policy or Page 14 of the agenda package, *“Patrons may bring up to four guests per household to playground,”* was added, since there was no guest policy for the playground.
- On Page 9 of the policy or Page 15 of the agenda package, *“Climbing was only permitted on areas for play, such as ladders and climbing walls,”* was added, as well as *“Climbing is prohibited on roofs, perimeter walls and other surfaces not designed for play.”* Under the Fitness Center Policies, the age requirements were clarified. It was divided into three policies, so it was easier to read.

Mr. Geary asked if pets were allowed on the playground. Ms. Taylor indicated under General Provisions; pets were not allowed on property unless it was a service animal but could include it under this section as a reminder. Mr. Yuro requested that it be added.

- On Page 10 of the policy or Page 16 of the agenda package, *“Children under eight (8) years of age must be accompanied and actively supervised by an adult who is at least eighteen (18) years of age,”* was added.
- On Page 11 of the policy or Page 17 of the agenda package, under the tennis courts, *“submitting a roster,”* was added. In addition, *“Children under eight (8) years of age must be accompanied and actively supervised by an adult who is at least eighteen (18) years of age,”* was added. On the bottom of the page, a volleyball section was added, which would have the same age requirements and guest policy.
- On Page 12 of the policy or Page 18 of the agenda package, *“Field Policies”* was changed to *“Multi-Purpose Field Policies.”* Field requests were added and when they were required.

January 15, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

Ms. Taylor asked if there should be field requests for any organized team practice or for large team practices. Mr. Geary questioned how hard that was to manage and whether they would request use of the field or half of the field. Ms. Taylor indicated that there would be a transition. They could either include that it was for half of the field or a quarter of the field, if it was a smaller group, but if it was 15 or more, there should be a request. Mr. Davis pointed out if there was a uniform team like a middle school using the field, they should have the right language. Mr. Geary recalled that they could only reserve half of the field on Monday, Tuesday and Thursday and wanted to change it to Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday, as most residents wanted to use it on Thursday, Friday, Saturday and Sunday. Ms. Taylor pointed out that the front office was closed on Wednesday, but they could look into Saturday and Sunday.

- On Page 12 of the policy or Page 18 of the agenda package, “*Children under eight (8) years of age must be accompanied and actively supervised by an adult who is at least eighteen (18) years of age,*” was added. At the bottom of the page, inflatables were not permitted on the field. Mr. Geary asked if someone could use their own volleyball net. Ms. Taylor was amenable to it, as it did not cause must damage to the field, as an inflatable caused more damage.
- On Page 13 of the policy or Page 19 of the agenda package, cleats were not permitted on the multi-purpose field. Mr. Geary felt that this would be hard to enforce. Mr. Yuro was not in favor of adding it.
- On Page 13 of the policy or Page 19 of the agenda package, hanging on or moving the goal posts, was strictly prohibited, for safety reasons. A section for field reservation policies, was in the prior version, but language was added for a roster with the participants and addresses, to be submitted to the General Manager.
- On Page 14 of the policy or Page 20 of the agenda package, under Rental Policies, “*All rental reservations may not be made more than four months,*” was added. In addition, only one meeting room and one pool cabana rental can occur at the same time for two different households.
- On Page 15 of the policy or Page 21 of the agenda package, liability insurance and certified bartender requirement was highlighted in yellow.

January 15, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

Ms. Taylor pointed out that other communities require rentals with alcohol to have liability insurance and a certified bartender for their rentals with alcohol and asked District Counsel if this was a requirement. According to Mr. Haber, this was acceptable, as long as they had a waiver. Mr. Haber confirmed that it would shift liability from the CDD to either the insurers or the people renting the room, but it was not legally required. Mr. Geary asked if the form asked if the renter planned to have alcohol. Ms. Taylor replied affirmatively, which changed the deposit fee. Mr. Davidson had language from another District that he would be able to incorporate, that utilized that specific requirement.

- On Page 16 of the policy or Page 22 of the agenda package, *“The District reserves the right to ask intoxicated persons to leave District property,”* was added for safety reasons. Under General Policies, *“A household may reserve one rental space per day,”* was added, as well as *“The patron renting the area must be present for the entire duration of their rental time.”* There was also a provision for the meeting room rental to be for indoor space only and not have access to the pool, as the floor would become slippery when wet. *“Patrons renting out the pool cabana was not guaranteed lifeguards or the water slide,”* was added. Mr. Yuro requested that this provision be stricken, as no one was going to host a birthday party in the Summer and not use the pool. Ms. Weitzel agreed.
- On the bottom of Page 16 of the policy or Page 22 of the agenda package, *“Golf carts must follow local and State laws regarding operations of the vehicle,”* was added, as well as *“The numbered registration sticker must be adhered to the side of the golf cart and must be visible.”*

Mr. Geary asked if they were still doing golf cart sticker registrations. Ms. Taylor replied affirmatively. Mr. Leary questioned whether the 20 MPH limit on golf carts, was a CDD policy or State law. Ms. Taylor explained that the CDD speed limit was 25 MPH, but they started with 20 MPH. Mr. Davis felt that 25 MPH law was appropriate, as most electric carts go 25 MPH. Mr. Yuro requested that Items 6 or 7 for age limits, be stricken, as they should follow current State law. Mr. Leary wanted the speed limit language to follow the language for e-bikes, so it was consistent. Ms. Taylor asked if the Alcoholic Beverage Policy should be a separate section. Mr. Yuro preferred that it all be one place, so there was no confusion.

January 15, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

- On the bottom of Page 18 of the policy or Page 24 of the agenda package, the Pond Policies were included. Fish were added and at no point should patrons and their guests feed the wildlife.
- On the bottom of Page 21 of the policy or Page 27 of the agenda package, a Field Request Form was added, as well as “*Request Forms must be submitted at least 10 days prior to the CDD meeting for Board review.*” Mr. Geary asked if they must attach a roster. Ms. Taylor indicated that a roster must be attached for field requests, but not for a meeting room rental.

On MOTION by Ms. Weitzel seconded by Mr. Leary with all in favor the updates to the amenity policies as discussed were approved.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Discussion of Request to Purchase Land from CDD

Mr. Laughlin recalled at the last meeting a resident, Mr. Kurt Radecki of 504 Stone Bridge Path Court, wanted to acquire a 10-to-12-foot easement behind his house, that was owned by the CDD, so it could be maintained. Mr. Yuro recalled during a conference call, Mr. Haber had some comments about procedure and what this might mean. Mr. Haber explained that because this was public property, the CDD had the ability to sell it, but in the community’s best interest, must try to obtain the best value for it. The best way to do this, in his experience with other CDD’s, was to make it available to the highest bidder. There was a process that the CDD needed to follow. In addition, the Board needed to keep in mind, the potential for future requests and the process to maximize recovery for the sale of the property, with the understanding that it was a CDD asset. Mr. Yuro asked if a sale were to be made, whether it would affect the drainage easement. Mr. Haber indicated that it should be spelled out, that the sale would be subject to all platted or other recorded easements remaining on the property. Mr. Leary asked if it was part of the CDD drainage pipes. Mr. Marcinell was unaware of what was underneath the property, but no matter who owned it, the drainage requirements would remain the same. Mr. Haber pointed out that it would be treated the same as any other CDD easement and the CDD had the right to access that easement.

January 15, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

Mr. Davis asked if they processed a request like this in the past for another homeowner. Mr. Laughlin could not recall one, since he had been District Manager. Mr. Haber was not aware of any other requests, but from time to time, they agreed to reduce easements to allow structures to be constructed in people's yards, but the sale of real property, was a rare occurrence. Mr. Yuro questioned what Mr. Radecki planned. Mr. Kurt Radecki of 504 Stone Bridge Path Court explained that he wanted to add a buffer between his house and the field. It was basically dirt and leaves and had no irrigation. If the Board approved it, Mr. Radecki would reroute his irrigation to that land and make it look nicer. Mr. Haber pointed out that there could be an easement over the property, to grant Mr. Radecki the right to do these things on CDD property. Mr. Yuro was in favor of granting Mr. Radecki the approval to maintain the property, as he was concerned about putting it out for bids to the highest bidder. Mr. Davis pointed out if it was done through an easement, there was more risk on Mr. Radecki's side, but questioned whether this was a difficult agreement to prepare. Mr. Haber indicated that it was common to have easements like this, granting another party the right to access the property for the purpose of installing and maintaining improvements. Mr. Radecki was amenable to this, because if there was an issue with his irrigation system, he would cap it.

Mr. Yuro asked if the agreement could include a provision if the Board needed to cancel the easement, the CDD would pay for the removal, if Mr. Radecki provided irrigation and landscaping. Mr. Haber indicated that the Board could do something like that, as well as include termination language, if the property was needed for a public purpose, such as drainage, but if the Board wanted to take on this expense, they could do so. Mr. Davis pointed out if they approved this for Mr. Radecki, they would also have to consider anyone else who happened to ask for it, as he did not want to burden a future Board with an expense. However, he felt that it was reasonable to authorize Mr. Haber to work with the homeowner, over the next 30 days, to prepare a reasonable document and bring it to the Board at the next meeting. Mr. Yuro agreed. There was Board consensus for District Counsel to work with the resident on drafting an agreement allowing the resident to use and maintain a portion of District land, contingent on the resident paying for District Counsel's time and bringing back to the Board for approval.

January 15, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**Consideration of Resident Request to Install Retaining Wall on Pond Bank**

Mr. Laughlin reported that the Board received a request to install a retaining wall on a pond bank. The plans were included in the agenda package. Mr. Yuro pointed out that he prepared these exhibits on behalf of the Knauffs, the owner of 942 Eagle Point Drive. He was helping them out with research on the existing permit and the treatment volume required. For a request like this, they would need approval from the CDD, because the CDD has maintenance responsibilities for the stormwater management permit. They would also need approval from the Water Management District and as part of that, demonstrate what they were doing, would not negatively impact the stormwater management facility and treatment volume. The exhibits showed there were multiple ponds that were interconnected and a tremendous excess of treatment volume available. This improvement would not negatively impact it. Mr. Yuro questioned whether he would need to recuse himself from any votes, due to his involvement. Mr. Haber asked if Mr. Yuro's payment was subject to whether or not this gets approved. Mr. Yuro confirmed that there was no payment, as he was doing this for his neighbor. In that case, Mr. Haber pointed out that Mr. Yuro did not need to recuse himself, as this vote was not for his monetary gain. Therefore, declaring his involvement was adequate.

Mr. Yuro requested the opinion of the District Engineer. Mr. Marcinell reported that he looked at it before the meeting and was not able to find any historical plans that showed a pipe on the drainage easement. Mr. Yuro recalled that there was a pipe, but it could not be seen. Mr. Marcinell pointed out that his only recommendation would be to terminate the retaining walls before the easement, to avoid a pipe penetration or any sort of conflict in the future, between the CDD and resident usage. They could turn it 45 degrees and have it terminate into the land, outside of the easement area. Ms. Weitzel questioned the purpose of installing the retaining wall. Mr. Marcinell explained that there was erosion on the pond bank, causing a steep change. There was also a retaining wall near the golf course area. This was an opportunity for the resident to protect their property. Mr. Yuro understood that the resident wanted to protect their backyard. Mr. Leary asked if they wanted to extend the retaining wall. Mr. Marcinell indicated that currently, there was no retaining wall on their property. There was another retaining wall, but it was the golf course and the resident wanted to take that retaining wall along their property. Mr. Davis questioned whether the CDD approved retaining walls on other properties. Mr. Marcinell

January 15, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

had not dealt with one in this community. Mr. Laughlin recalled that there were a couple in this community but were not the CDD's responsibility. Mr. Leary was familiar with two of them.

Mr. Yuro pointed out that in other communities, they obtained the approval of the Water Management District. Then they would submit and receive the permit. Mr. Davis believed that the resident needed CDD approval for where it comes down to CDD property. Mr. Yuro confirmed that this was the case. Mr. Davis asked if there was a requirement that the design must be consistent with the existing wall that they tie into. Mr. Marcinell indicated that this would be based on Board approval. Mr. Leary asked if there was anything in the Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CC&R) of the community regarding retaining walls. Mr. Laughlin did not know and would have to reach out to the HOA management company. Mr. Yuro pointed out that it was an improvement to the resident's property and they must get HOA approval. Therefore, he was comfortable approving it with the caveat of it matching the look of the retaining wall that they were tying into. Mr. Davis asked if there were any legal issues, such as the CDD being responsible for maintaining the wall. Mr. Haber dealt with communities that had retaining walls and the first question, was whether the CDD or homeowner was responsible for the repair. However, more often than not, the retaining wall was part of the original permitted plans for the stormwater system or was constructed after the fact, in which case, it was the resident's obligation to operate and maintain the retaining wall. To the extent that it was tying into an existing wall, there should be language in a document to be recorded against the property, delineating in the future, who was ultimately responsible, whether it was the CDD or this property owner or any future property owners for operation, maintenance and repairs.

Mr. Yuro recommended having Mr. Haber draft language that the homeowner would have to approve, whereby the homeowner agrees to maintain the newly installed retaining wall, match the existing one that they were tying into and it would terminate prior to at the drainage easement to avoid damage, versus taking a vote tonight. Then it would be provided to the homeowner, to ensure that they were agreeable to it and the Board would approve it at the next meeting. Mr. Haber questioned whether the CDD owned the property where the wall would be going or if it was on the homeowner's lot. Mr. Yuro confirmed that the homeowner owns to the middle of the lake, but it looked like a portion was going onto golf course property. Mr. Marcinell pointed out that it was hard to verify that and there must be a survey to determine this. Mr. Haber recommended that the CDD specify that the CDD does not give them the authority to

January 15, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

construct a wall on golf course property and they would need golf course approval. Mr. Davis felt that they needed to make sure who owns what, according to a survey. Mr. Laughlin pointed out there was no CDD property, as it was the homeowner's property and golf course property. Mr. Haber assumed that the CDD was involved because it affected a stormwater improvement that the CDD had operation and maintenance responsibilities for. Mr. Yuro noted that the CDD had an easement over the pond. Mr. Haber indicated that the easement would remain, for the purpose of the CDD maintaining the system. Mr. Leary questioned who would pay for the work. There was Board consensus for District Counsel to work with the resident on drafting an agreement, allowing the resident to install a retaining wall on the pond bank behind their home, contingent on the resident paying for District Counsel's time and this being brought before the Board at the next meeting for approval.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Staff Reports

A. Landscaping Team

1. Report

Mr. Oscar Meranda of Ruppert Landscape presented a monthly report. Under maintenance, it says that the grasses cutbacks and palmettos around the amenity and park area were completed, but they have not been completed. The cart path should be completed next week. It was completed around the amenity and they moved on to the common areas. They were currently on Eagle Point Drive and had three areas to complete for the ornamental grasses. They would also clean leaves at the same time. During the last week of December, they completed up to 25% of the wood line cutback and should be going into February and March with these cutbacks. They had three truckloads of debris, just on Leo Maguire Parkway. The mulch schedule was not yet finalized; however, they started to discuss which areas they would begin first and planned to finish by March. Mr. Davidson planned to talk with Ruppert about pine straw in roadway areas that washed out. Mr. Meranda indicated that they noticed areas where pine straw was washed out. The January irrigation inspection had not been performed yet, but he spoke with the Irrigation Manager and requested that there be an inspection the first week of every month. Mr. Leary felt that they were making progress, as he noticed irrigation running more reliably. Mr. Meranda confirmed that everything was running 100%, but they had occasional stuck valves, like the one on CR 210 and Leo Maguire Parkway, which has been replaced. However, after it was replaced, the leak continued in the same area, due to an elbow

January 15, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

lateral line that was cracked, which has been remedied. At the next meeting, the Irrigation Manager would speak about the smart system.

Regarding the turf program, there were many ant mounds, which they were continually treating with ant baits. Turf and Winter weeds were beginning to occur. He requested a round of herbicide to be scheduled. They should be completed by the end of this month. Pre-emergent was applied the last week of December. Mr. Leary questioned who was taking care of the weeds in the Bermuda grass. Mr. Meranda indicated that it was being done in-house. Fertilization and treatment were not applied this time of year. The crew was continually cleaning out the annual beds. They provided a catalog and were ready to order the Spring selection. They also had the entrance island upgrades that were discussed at the last meeting, which involved moving the heads around all of the islands. There was also a proposal to extend the zone on St. Johns Golf Drive, where there was just dirt, as there was an irrigation head that was not irrigating any of the area to the left of it. The proposal was to have three extra heads, on the outside of the roadway, just before the basketball court. The last proposal was for sod replacement along Leo Maguire Parkway, to replace areas that had very thin grass or hardly any grass. The only island that needed to be replaced, was the main entrance island, which had no turf and the right side and 200 yards of weeds. Mr. Leary asked if there was irrigation. Mr. Meranda confirmed that all of it had irrigation.

2. Proposal for Entrance Island Irrigation Upgrade

Mr. Laughlin presented the proposal from Ruppert Landscaping for the entrance island irrigation upgrades, which was included in the agenda package in the amount of \$3,783. Mr. Yuro felt that it made sense to have these upgrades. Ms. Weitzel agreed.

On MOTION by Mr. Yuro seconded by Ms. Weitzel with all in favor the proposal from Ruppert Landscaping to upgrade the entrance island irrigation in the amount of \$3,783 was approved.
--

3. Proposal to Extend Irrigation Zone to Parking Lot

Mr. Laughlin presented the proposal from Ruppert Landscaping to extend the irrigation zone to the parking lot, which was included in the agenda package in the amount of \$1,906.

January 15, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

On MOTION by Mr. Leary seconded by Mr. Davis with all in favor the proposal from Ruppert Landscaping to extend the irrigation zone to the parking lot in the amount of \$1,906 was approved.

4. Proposal for Sampson Creek Parkway Sod Replacement

Mr. Laughlin presented the proposal from Ruppert Landscaping for the sod replacement along Leo Maguire Parkway, which was included in the agenda package, in the amount of \$54,600. The Board felt that this was a great deal of money. Mr. Davis recalled that there were sod replacements in the past. Mr. Laughlin recalled there were sod replacements in the plant bed along Leo Maguire Parkway. Mr. Leary pointed out that he requested sod replacements on Leo Maguire Parkway for two years now. The photos told the story. Mr. Davis asked if this area was irrigated. Mr. Meranda confirmed that all of Leo Maguire Parkway was irrigated. Mr. Geary questioned when they would do the sod replacements. Mr. Meranda recommended them at the end of February or March, due to the cold weather. Mr. Geary asked how long it would take once they ordered the sod, to complete the project. Mr. Meranda indicated it would take two weeks to get the sod and four days to complete the job. Davidson felt that it was reasonable to order the sod at the beginning of March, as they still had cold snaps in February or early March. Mr. Leary was not in favor of approving this proposal, as they put down sod last year and the year before, there were huge irrigation issues and it would use up all of their contingency funds. In addition, he requested at many meetings, looking at everything that needed sod replacement in the community and at prior meetings, requested that they look at ground cover for the Oaks where there was no grass and shaded areas. There was also erosion at the basketball court.

Mr. Leary questioned whether the cost of sod was competitive, as \$54,000 worth of sod equated to \$600 per pallet. Mr. Davidson confirmed that it was competitive to other vendors. Ms. Weitzel was hesitant to approve this proposal, as it was a great deal of money and would eat up their entire budget and wanted to know what other areas in the community needed sod. Mr. Davidson pointed out in the past they went through the community and looked at areas that could be top dressed. These areas have been identified and after they go through it again, they would go through it with Mr. Leary, to make sure that they have not missed anything and would go through it again with Ruppert. They had time, as they would not re-sod until it warmed up. The only way to do it right, was to do it in phases. They discussed where they needed to replace the

January 15, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

sod, where they needed to try different types of grasses in shaded areas and putting grasses closer to tree trunks and ornamental ground cover around those trunks, in order to eliminate the pine straw. Therefore, it was in the Board's best interest, to table this proposal for now and revisit it when they had a plan of how to approach it.

Mr. Yuro questioned whether it made sense to start in a high priority area from CR 210 to the amenity area on Leo Maguire Parkway, to the pond and down to St. Johns Golf Drive, if they were going to phase it. Mr. Davidson indicated with their prior vendor, they prioritized in a particular way and wanted to have the opportunity to do that with Ruppert as well. Mr. Davis felt that made sense, as there were bare areas that needed attention, such as Area 18, near Pond 25 and Area 15, near the retaining wall. Mr. Meranda reported that they recently completed a project with St. Augustine, which was heavily shaded. He would have the results by the February meeting. Mr. Davis reported that one sprinkler head on St. Johns Golf Drive, by the sidewalk, going out of the parking lot and turning left, was sticking up with dead grass around it. Mr. Meranda would have his team look at it, when they come out to perform the inspection. Mr. Leary pointed out that he received positive comments from residents about the work that Ruppert was doing, cleaning out the common areas and cutbacks, noting that it was the best that the community has ever looked and appreciated all of their hard work. However, by the tennis courts, some remediation work was still needed, adjacent to the tennis court and pathway.

B. Attorney

There being no comments, the next item followed.

C. Engineer

Mr. Marcinell reported that he checked on the resident's concern at 228 St. Johns Golf Drive. As far as the marking of the roadway and curbing issues, in April they could do a comparison between where they were and where they are now. He arrived early for this meeting, to check out the tennis courts for drainage. There was a fair amount of structures around it, more than the historical plans that he was able to find. There were six inlets around the tennis courts. As far as visible pipes, it would be easy to do an improvement for connecting that drainage, because it was readily available, but the root system was so high, that they would not be able to dig down without putting a trench drain around the perimeter, as the root system would cause a barrier. Mr. Davis asked it was reasonable to remove all of the landscaping around it, in order to

January 15, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

pave it and start over again. Mr. Marcinell indicated that it would not be necessary, as they would have to come from the golf course side to get all of the equipment in, but if they removed all of the fencing to do the paving work, they would be able to keep most of the landscaping. Mr. Davis asked if the height of the root structure was impeding waterflow in such a way that it was likely to be impacting the development. Mr. Marcinell felt that it was likely and recommended doing a low trench drain in the gap area, between the edge of the pavement and before the higher raised root sections, to provide somewhere for the water to go. Mr. Leary was informed that there was irrigation running onto the courts and asked Mr. Marcinell to look into it. Ms. Taylor pointed out that the golf course was asked to maneuver their head so it did not hit the tree between the two courts.

D. District Manager

Mr. Laughlin recalled at the last meeting, he was asked to look at the bond validation amount, which he looked into. There was \$6.3 million left in validated bond money, which they were allowed to issue. Mr. Davis pointed out it was approved at the time that the neighborhood was originally developed. Mr. Leary asked if this meant that they had \$6.3 million of borrowing capacity. Mr. Laughlin replied affirmatively. After that, they must get more validation from a judge. The initial validation was \$30 million.

E. General Manager

- 1. Amenities and Operations Report**
- 2. Lake Doctors**
- 3. Soccer Field Report**
- 4. Sidewalk Repair Update**

Ms. Taylor presented the Amenities and Operations and Lake Doctors Reports, which were included in the agenda package. Robert was cleaning out the window on the smaller playground, which was heavily oxidated. He made significant progress. They were able to paint the swing set. It may need a second coat. Two interactive boards were purchased. The tic-tac-toe did not need to be replaced. However, the other two interactive panels, looked rough. The ones that she purchased were a maze and gears one. In addition, it was a good idea to replace the swing seats with the chains, because the plastic on the chains was starting to fall apart. The cost for two interactive panels and two swing sets, one a normal swing seat and two bucket seats, was \$3,033.83, including shipping. Ms. Weitzel asked if there was a catalog to choose the interactive

January 15, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

boards from. Ms. Taylor indicated that there was a catalog, but it was limited. Ms. Weitzel liked that they were getting new seats and interactive boards, as the current ones were covered in mold. Mr. Yuro agreed that they needed to do it. Discussion ensued.

On MOTION by Ms. Weitzel seconded by Mr. Davis with all in favor the purchase of two new interactive panels, new swing seats and new bucket swing seats in an amount not-to-exceed \$3,100 was approved.

Ms. Weitzel asked if they figured out the gate issue. Ms. Taylor would ask Robert to do it in-house, as it had to do with the shifting of the sand. All that they had to do, was to re-lift it so it shut correctly. Regarding the tennis and basketball courts, she was able to obtain three proposals from their tennis court vendors and prepared a table, which she provided to the Board. It was split out between the amount for a tennis court and basketball court demo and rebuild and what it included. All of them included the removal of the tennis fencing. The parameters were 1 inch to fit every 10 feet, which was the industry standard. All of them were 1.5 inches, but it varies on the regrading of the base. They also included the installation of tennis court nets. There was a difference in the resurfacing material. Fast Dry Court does the entire fiberglass membrane installation, versus Niddi and Court Surfaces, which do patching. They would take pieces of fiberglass membrane and put it in areas where it was most needed, especially in the outer portion, where water would most likely pool. She liked having a full fiberglass membrane, as it was across the entire court. Ms. Weitzel felt that Fast Dry Court put the effort into thinking long-term. Mr. Yuro noted that Fast Dry Court offered a \$12,000 savings if they did the basketball and tennis courts together and asked if their total would be \$300,000 plus \$101,000 minus \$12,000. Ms. Taylor explained that they provided a total cost for both and if they were separated out, there would be an additional \$12,000. Mr. Geary questioned the warranty. Ms. Taylor confirmed that all of the vendors included a one-year warranty. Cracks can happen, but they could not guarantee that it would not occur.

Ms. Weitzel asked if the proposals included removal of the fencing. Ms. Taylor indicated that Fast Dry Court would install the current fencing, but highly suggested not doing that, because of the age of the fence and how it was curling. Court Surfaces did not have anything about reinstalling the fence, while Nitty included installing new fencing. No matter what, it was a

January 15, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

great idea, in her opinion, to install new fencing. Ms. Weitzel recalled how courts one and two had their own fence and three and four would have their own fence, but if they did this project, she wanted to have one fence, so it was uniform. Ms. Taylor pointed out that they could do that, but it would be through a fencing company. Mr. Davis suggested opening up a conduit between the two courts and having pavers, so people could travel back and forth between the courts. However, he wanted to prioritize the tennis courts over the other projects and to do it in the near future but did not want to spend \$100,000 to redo the basketball courts, when they wanted to use the space for something else like pickleball. Mr. Leary pointed out that residents that live next to the basketball court, did not want pickleball anywhere near their homes. Before they do the tennis courts, Mr. Davis wanted to have discussion about the middle area and requested a quote to remove the two trees that had root intrusion, keep the landscaping around it to proper grade and ensure that the water leaves the court area in the future.

Mr. Leary had a couple of conversations with the leagues, who stated that the courts always had cracks in them, but they were playable and was in favor any repairs that needed to be made, as he would need more information before spending \$400,000 to \$500,000 to redo them. Mr. Yuro recalled when they resurfaced the courts a couple of years ago, the cracks came back immediately. At that time, the vendors claimed that the courts were at the end of their useful life. Mr. Davis asked if any of the vendors provided a proposal to repair and manage the cracks. Ms. Taylor indicated that they did not feel comfortable doing so, as they would just be putting a band-aid on it. Mr. Davidson pointed out that they could look at the area that the root was impacting and repair it. Mr. Davis noted that there was one section that was not on the playable surface, that was against the fence. Mr. Leary was told by the players, it was not affecting play, but it did need to be repaired. Mr. Davidson recommended remediating the area first, where the water does not flow out of the courts correctly, as well as the fencing and entertain the idea about the pavers, bring those costs back to the Board and prioritize it. Mr. Davis questioned what was in the capital reserve plan. Mr. Laughlin recalled that it did not include a complete re-build. Ms. Weitzel was not in favor of making repairs, as they would have to put new courts down eventually. They were in this position, because this Board put band-aids on things. Mr. Yuro requested that Mr. Davidson think about the best timeframe to redo the courts and how long it would take.

January 15, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

Mr. Davis was in favor of replacing the entire court and having new fencing and landscaping, turning it over to the next Board and providing proper guidance on how to maintain it. He preferred to repair the current amenities and not add new amenities. However, before they approved it, they needed the cost to remove the existing landscaping, including the two Oak trees and finding out whether there were any county requirements that they needed to be aware of and if they needed to develop a landscaping plan for the new landscaping. In his opinion, it did not make sense to repair a few cracks, remove and replace the fence and three years later replace the entire surface, but it did not hurt to gather more information. Ms. Weitzel agreed. Mr. Davis further was in favor of replacing the flooring in the meeting room and repainting, as well as taking the upper deck pool plan and including windows to provide a pool view. Mr. Yuro agreed, as they have taken those projects far enough to have plans.

5. Proposals for Resurfacing the Slide and Annual Maintenance

Ms. Taylor presented a proposal from Slide Renu for resurfacing of the slide in the amount of \$25,000, which was included in the agenda package. The earliest that she could meet with Safe Slide was January 20th. Ms. Weitzel questioned how long the resurfacing would take from start to finish and when the slide would be open. Mr. Davidson anticipated it taking five to six days. Ms. Taylor indicated that the slide would be open on March 14th for Spring Break and on weekends until school lets out. Ms. Weitzel preferred to wait. Mr. Yuro agreed, as it was in the capital reserve for next year. *There was Board consensus to table this to the February meeting.*

- **Proposal for Pool Pump (Item 8E7)**

Ms. Taylor pointed out that there were unused funds in the Reserve Study that could be used for the pool pumps, as there would be \$50,000 left over from the \$90,000 budgeted for the road resurfacing. Mr. Davidson did do a great deal of work Mr. Buss and felt that he was trustworthy. If he says there was a year remaining on the pumps, his fingers were crossed. Mr. Laughlin recommended starting the replacement of the pumps, once the season was over, but pointed out that the Board was taking the risk of a breakdown in the middle of Summer. Ms. Weitzel agreed, as people would be angry if they could not use the pool. Ms. Taylor pointed out that Mr. Meranda provided her with a catalog of annuals. The next rotation was in March. She personally liked the two-tiered look, with taller flowers in the back, such as White Angelinas and

January 15, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

rotund flowers such as Orange Marigolds, in the front and questioned if the Board wanted to designate a Board Member to approve the annuals. Mr. Yuro offered to work with Ms. Taylor.

On MOTION by Ms. Weitzel seconded by Mr. Davis with all in favor authorization for the Chairman to work with staff on the selection of annuals was approved.
--

Regarding the access control, Ms. Taylor reported that an agreement had been prepared and signed and they were waiting for supplies. Once received, it should be a smooth transition. All current cards would transfer to the new system. Her goal was to start advertising for the mobile credentials in the February newsletter. The bulletin board was delivered. It would be installed close to the basketball court and facing the parking lot, since there were no trees. This way it could be viewed while people were getting into their car. Ms. Taylor would be presenting a sidewalk repair project from Precision Sidewalk, at the February meeting. She would be doing a ride through to look at street posts and poles, to see what touchups and repairs they needed, which would be presented at the February meeting. Mr. Davis reported that one of the light poles on Leo Maguire Parkway, going towards CR 210, was on, as he was heading out the neighborhood the other morning. In addition, there were some power cords wrapped around and dangling on multiple poles and a tremendous amount of heavy metal hardware on the front gate. Ms. Taylor spoke to Robert about it. Regarding the tree canopies, Ms. Taylor met with one tree service vendor and planned to meet with two more, so there would be three proposals for the February meeting, to lift tree canopies from roadways and sidewalks.

Ms. Taylor reported that she had not made any progress with the Amenity Center sign. However, she did put out some solar lights, to see what illumination it provided. It was not strong and they would look at stronger solar lights to illuminate the sign. In addition, she spoke with Mr. Meranda about putting in plant material between two Oak trees. At the next meeting, Ms. Taylor would have prices for the sign, solar lights and plant material. Mr. Yuro informed her that the awning poles on the pool deck, looked a little rough, so she would reach out to Tropical Pressure and Painting and ask them for a proposal to pressure wash and repaint it, which she would provide to the Board at the February meeting. She would also ask Tropical Pressure and Painting to pressure wash the entrance monuments. An audit was being performed internally, to ensure that they had all of the correct documentation for residents. They were halfway through

January 15, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

the audit, which would help with the access control transition. The trash detail was ongoing along the roadway. There was still quite a bit more that they to do, such as the golf cart path in the roundabout. They would try to keep it on a routine schedule. She did not have an update on the streetlight pole that was knocked down. It was a customized build, which was why it was taking quite a bit longer. Hopefully, she would have more information at the next meeting.

Ms. Taylor reported that there was no more information on the roadways; however, there was a map, based on the most severe and not as severe. They were preparing for Summer, starting with getting their lifeguard and Summer Camp positions filled. Registration was opened for Summer Camp. Ms. Weitzel reported that parents had recent issues with the soccer field, as their child's shoes were stained a fluorescent green and asked if Troon could remind them when they were treating the field. Ms. Taylor would ask them. Mr. Leary asked if both bridges could be painted. Ms. Taylor indicated that they could paint the bridge by CR 210, as it was the CDD's, but the golf course owned the other bridge. When she mentioned it to them, the golf course said that they would look into it. Mr. Leary wanted the CDD to split the cost with the golf course. Mr. Laughlin believed that the golf course would be agreeable to this. Mr. Leary asked if the golf course was paying for the replacement of the pavers on the pathway that leads to the playground, which they cracked with their equipment. Ms. Taylor did not mention it and would mention it when she met with Troon again this month.

6. Proposal for Lifeguard Services

Mr. Laughlin presented a proposal with Vesta for lifeguard services, which was included in the agenda package. Mr. Davidson noted that there were no changes from last year. It was for the same amount of days, same hours and same cost. The days just shifted around.

On MOTION by Mr. Yuro seconded by Mr. Davis with all in favor the proposal from Vesta for lifeguard services in a not-to-exceed amount of \$50,359.29 was approved.

7. Proposal for Pump Repair

This item was discussed.

January 15, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**Discussion of Future Amenity Capital Improvements**

- A. Pool Deck Renovation**
- B. Amenity Meeting Room Upgrade**
- C. Tennis and Basketball Court Replacements**

Mr. Laughlin reported that nothing changed on the pool deck renovations. The tennis and the basketball court replacements were discussed. They received one proposal yesterday for the amenity meeting room upgrade, which was provided to the Board. Two more proposals were expected in the next week or two. The amount came in around the \$295,000 proposal and was similar to what they bid previously, when they were looking at estimates. Mr. Yuro asked if final documents were provided by the architect. Mr. Laughlin confirmed that he received them and provided them to the Board. The proposal did not include the LED track lighting. As he received the remaining bids, he would provide them to the Board.

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**Contracts Review**

Mr. Laughlin presented the Contract List, which was included in the agenda package. Nothing has changed. Mr. Leary recalled that the Sylvester contract was expiring this year. Ms. Taylor confirmed that this was the case. Mr. Leary pointed out that there were two additional one-year renewals and asked if those were over and above 2026. Mr. Laughlin explained that the 2026 date was included in all of the renewals. Mr. Leary asked if there was a contracted cost on those renewals. Mr. Laughlin confirmed that this was typically part of the budget approval and was in writing. Mr. Leary pointed out that the Board would only make a decision, if they expanded the basic contract or go through another Request for Proposals (RFP) process and wanted to know what was in the contract, whether there was a renewal and the cost. Mr. Davidson would provide this information. Mr. Leary pointed out for the lifeguards, the hourly rate did not increase, but the hours increased. Mr. Davidson confirmed that it was the same as last year. Mr. Leary looked at prior agenda packages and noticed a lower number by \$2,000 or \$3,000. Mr. Davidson explained that it was higher, due to an error that he made, but when he adjusted it, it went down by \$8,000. Mr. Yuro questioned why most of the contracts had automatic annual renewals, but lifeguard, amenity maintenance, amenity operations and landscape maintenance did not. Mr. Laughlin explained that the lifeguards were on a year-to-year contract. For the landscape maintenance, they were under the formal RFP process, but they

January 15, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

had the option to negotiate directly with the landscape company, to extend it further, if those renewals run out. If they had three years of pricing, at year four, they could bring it back to the Board. If the Board was agreeable, they would continue with them or go out for RFP. Ms. Weitzel asked if the Central Security contract was renewed. Mr. Laughlin indicated that the Board approved their updated pricing last year.

ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Supervisors' Request

There being no comments, the next item followed.

TWELFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Public Comments

Mr. Tom Daddario of 1504 Drury Court asked if the CDD owned the property, making a right off of the main road, where the maintenance shed was. Mr. Yuro believed that it was CDD property, but it was under a conservation easement. Mr. Daddario asked if this was a reasonable location for a pickleball court. Mr. Yuro assumed that it could be, if there was no conservation easement. Mr. Laughlin recalled that this was one of the areas that the Board identified. Mr. Leary reported that prior to the last meeting, he looked at locations that were not near homes that the Board had not thought about. There was clear land behind the 17th green, that could fit two or three courts, which was owned by the golf course, but they could negotiate with the golf course to purchase this property. Mr. Daddario asked if there was any chance with this current Board, to move pickleball forward or if it was a dead issue. Mr. Davis confirmed that it was not a dead issue, but the Board had not found a practical way to go forward. Since it was last discussed, Mr. Leary found some potential places. Mr. Leary pointed out that he found two locations that were not near homes. Mr. Davis clarified that the locations that Mr. Leary found, had some other costs like buying land from the golf course. In addition, the previous discussion about pickleball was in depth and they were framing that conversation within the \$500,000 that was left from the 2020 bond. If the neighborhood was amenable to using additional bond money, Mr. Laughlin indicated that there was \$6.3 million that they could potentially access, without having to go to residents. However, the Board would need a reasonable amount of input from residents to say that it was reasonable enough to pursue.

Mr. Daddario questioned how they would get to that next step. Mr. Davis indicated that residents could meet on their own and bring it back to the Board. Mr. Daddario was not opposed

January 15, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

to it but wanted to get clarity. Mr. Yuro recalled that the last large expense that they did for an amenity, was the Gym, which was spearheaded by some homeowners. Mr. Davis further recalled that residents presented an idea about upgrading the upper pool deck. Mr. Yuro pointed out that homeowners did not pay for the architectural plans, but they did the legwork to see whether it was feasible to bring to the Board and the Board took it from there. Having residents engaged, helps flush out some of the ideas, but shows if there was a demand from residents. Therefore, having ideas from residents was a better approach than having an individual Board Member spearhead it. Mr. Davis encouraged residents who were in favor of pickleball, be on the ballot in August, to serve on the Board. Mr. David McMullen of 793 Eagle Point Drive recalled the last time pickleball was addressed, was in June of 2023. Many residents attended and after that meeting, he drafted a proposal and submitted it to the Board. The only response was from Mr. Yuro, who appreciated the insight. There were enough residents to spearhead it, but there was the need for a champion on the Board to guide the residents. His proposal was to take a tennis court and turn it into a multi-use court. Mr. Davis felt that it was a great idea, but it presented a noise challenge and devalued homes.

Ms. Lisa Murman of 935 Eagle Point Drive noted that there were neighboring communities that had homes close to their pickleball courts and they could find out if they devalued any homes. Ms. Weitzel believed that the residents needed to discuss it. Mr. McMullen suggested having a survey of residents. Mr. Leary recalled that two prior surveys were done. Mr. Davis pointed out that the Board could send out an email, but they wanted something new, to help them package something that makes sense. Mr. Leary reiterated that he brainstormed locations and the cemetery location was not going to work, due to complaints from Brookhaven residents. Mr. McMullen asked if Troon would build the courts, since it was their property. Mr. Yuro felt that one of the challenges in that location, was that they must account for parking, bathrooms and access. Mr. Leary pointed out that there were no bathrooms at the soccer field. Mr. Yuro indicated that there were ways to mitigate for noise that have not been fully explored. Mr. McMullen heard about a pickleball surface that had less noise. Mr. Davis requested that he put that into a document and circulate it to the Board. Residents can also discuss pickleball at the beginning and end of the meeting, during public comments or reach out to Board Members individually on the CDD website.

January 15, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

THIRTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Approval of Consent Agenda

- A. Minutes of November 20, 2025 Meeting**
- B. Financial Statements as of December 31, 2025**
- C. Check Register**

Mr. Laughlin presented the minutes of the November 20, 2025 Board of Supervisors meeting, Financial Statements as of December 31st and Check Register for January 15, 2026, totaling \$66,703.87, which were included in the agenda package.

On MOTION by Ms. Weitzel seconded by Mr. Geary with all in favor the Consent Agenda was approved.

FOURTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Proposals for Security Services

The Board entered into a Closed Session to discuss the proposals for security services.

FIFTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Next Scheduled Meeting – February 19, 2026 @ 6:00 p.m. @ St. Johns Golf & Country Club Meeting Room

Mr. Laughlin stated that the next meeting was scheduled for February 19, 2026 at 6:00 p.m. at this location.

SIXTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Adjournment

On MOTION by Mr. Leary seconded by Ms. Weitzel with all in favor the meeting was adjourned.

Signed by:


 Secretary/Assistant Secretary

Signed by:


 Chairman/Vice Chairman