

**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, **February 19, 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>by phone</i>	Kutak Rock, LLP
Branden Marcinell	Matthews
Stephanie Taylor	Vesta Property Services
Jason Davidson	Vesta Property Services
Nick Angelo	Ruppert Landscape Irrigation Manager
Joe Miletello	Ruppert Landscape
Residents	

The following is a summary of the actions taken at the February 19, 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.

February 19, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS**Public Comment** *(regarding agenda items listed below)*

Mr. Laughlin opened the public comment period. Resident Michael Schwebel of 208 St. Johns Golf Drive drafted a letter regarding pickleball, which his neighbors signed and sent to the Board, the District Manager and the HOA. Mr. Schwebel was discouraged by what he was reading in the minutes and would like for his letter to be added to the record and posted on the CDD website, as it had good information and good talking points. They could not install pickleball by someone's home, as it would be a nuisance and impact the use of the home. It was unreasonable to assume that there would not be litigation. He questioned whether the CDD was insured and who would pay for the defense or indemnify in the event of a lawsuit. Ms. Weitzel appreciated the letter and the attachments. Mr. Davis pointed out that the packet of information that Mr. Schwebel enclosed in his email, was thorough and was amenable to adding a link to the documents page on the CDD website. Mr. Laughlin would add it to the website. Mr. Yuro appreciated the time that Mr. Schwebel put into this, although he did not agree with some of the points made in the letter, for example saying that sound mitigation would not work, as from everything that Mr. Yuro read, sound mitigation did work.

In addition, Mr. Yuro pointed out that Mr. Schwebel mentioned several times that the Board could not allow a minority to drive a decision, if one person feels that they were harmed or inconvenienced. Furthermore, no decisions have been made and was unsure whether the Board was ready to make any final decisions but wanted to ensure that the Board understood all of the options. There was threat of legal action, but it was implied and believed that the Board had to the right to make improvements to the amenity area and questioned whether the Board's exposure to liability against lawsuits was increased due to this specific situation. Mr. Haber concurred that there was certainly a threat of litigation if they installed pickleball courts next to someone's home and was something that the Board needed to keep in mind. He was fine with posting the letter on the District's website, as it was a public record, but was reluctant to post it without a statement that it was being posted at the request of the author and was not the position of the CDD, unless the Board agreed with the contents of the letter. Furthermore, the District had the right to make improvements, especially improvements of a similar kind, to the District's amenity facilities.

Mr. Haber reviewed the letter and did some research on pickleball cases. It discusses the Board having to make certain decisions based on minorities and majorities and the standard that

February 19, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

this Board must follow, as an elected official, which was to do what was in the best interest of the District. It was impossible to make 100% of the community satisfied with their decisions nor were they obligated to do. However, his research was limited to only instances where individuals or entities were bringing suit against the District as a government and to the extent that the Board was going to make a decision that would result in litigation, he preferred to do more in-depth research to provide a more definitive answer. However, he did not see anything that would lead him to believe that there was a great danger to not successfully defend a decision to install pickleball courts, wherever they choose to do so, assuming that they were properly permitted and take certain considerations, such as sound abatement, to show that the Board was trying to make a decision that was in the best interest of the CDD. Furthermore, if this course of action was pursued, Mr. Haber would want to have the Board authorize him to spend additional time performing more detailed research. At this time, they had a threat of litigation, but they would not get sued with the Board still discussing the issue, without any definitive decision being made. Therefore, Mr. Haber was comfortable with the Board having the discussion and keeping their options open with respect to the installation of pickleball courts, notwithstanding the letter and the threat of litigation.

Mr. Haber further pointed out if the decision was made that the District would get sued, under Florida law, parties were only entitled to attorney's fees, if there was a contractual or statutory provision or something that provides for it. Otherwise, in litigation, regardless of the outcome, each party was responsible for their own fees. He was not aware of anything that would shift the burden of attorney's fees in the event of litigation, even if the District defended it. However, even if the District fully succeeded and was victorious in the lawsuit, the District would not be able to recover attorney fees for defending the lawsuit. If the Board wanted to post that information, Mr. Laughlin offered to include that the Board was posting it as information that was received from a homeowner and the Board was not endorsing any of the commentary. Mr. Yuro felt that the added language was appropriate but asked that Mr. Laughlin provide it to Mr. Haber before it gets posted. *There was Board consensus for Mr. Laughlin to post Mr. Schwebel's email to the CDD website, include a disclaimer and provide to Mr. Haber before posting.*

Ms. Weitzel pointed out that the District had amenities that were in terrible shape and before this Board entertains spending over \$300,000 to build a brand-new facility, they needed to

February 19, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

ensure that the current facilities were in perfect condition. Furthermore, at this point in time, the Board needed to take a stand and make a decision about whether or not this was something they were moving forward with or to focus on improving their current amenities. If residents were unhappy with the Board's decision, they could serve on the Board. Resident Chuck Hood of 260 St. Johns Golf Drive recalled that the District completed an exhaustive acoustical study for the cemetery location and the noise was deemed to be acceptable, but this location was discarded, because people did not want additional traffic on their street. He suggested that the Board look at the property behind Hole 17 that was CDD property, to develop three pickleball courts. Mr. Hood was not against pickleball but was against affecting his neighbors. Abatement on the basketball courts, would require a solid structure such as a building, according to the acoustical study. Therefore, they needed to find another viable location, build a building that shuts all of the noise out or not pursue this matter. Mr. Yuro was not certain that pickleball was ever going to happen but felt that it was important for the Board to keep their options open. He understood the frustration, if they introduced a new amenity in that area, but improving the amenity area with a new amenity, was not the same as adding a new amenity in an area where there never was an amenity. Mr. Hood asked if residents would purchase homes here, if there was pickleball before they moved in. Mr. Yuro indicated that residents purchased next to an amenity area.

Mr. Davis pointed out that future amenity capital improvements was on the agenda, as a way to capture the items that the Board was the most interested in doing at this time, versus items that were discussed over time. There was no effort to design a pickleball court, but appreciated the additional commentary that Mr. Hood provided. Mr. Hood did not recall the basketball court being a location under consideration for pickleball. Mr. Yuro pointed out that it was discussed a long time ago. Mr. Hood felt that pickleball should be eliminated, as they spent a great deal of time talking about it and they were not getting anywhere. Mr. Clay Wild pointed out that every two or three months, a petition was submitted and after two years of going back and forth, the Board should make a decision. Mr. Davis did not want to make a decision today; however, it keeps coming back up by residents and felt that the Board did a thorough job of running a sound study. The Board selected the cemetery and did some cost estimates, but Brookhaven residents requested that the Board not put pickleball there. As a result, the Board decided to set it aside. Mr. Davis appreciated the information provided by Mr. Schwebel, as they now had the opinion of residents who did not want pickleball courts at the basketball court

February 19, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

location. The letter would be included on the record. There being no further comments, Mr. Laughlin closed the public comment period.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**Amenities Booking Requests**

Mr. Laughlin presented an amenity booking request from the Stingrays Swim Team for the 2026 season. Mr. Chris O'Connor, President of the St. Johns Stingrays, requested access of the pool from April 28, 2026 through July 12, 2026. Participants would practice after school and in the morning when school was out. There would be three or four home meets, one mock meet and a banquet at the end of the season. Mr. Yuro asked if there were any scheduling issues. Ms. Taylor did not recall any. Mr. Leary asked if they were using all of the lanes or some of them. Mr. O'Connor indicated that they leave one lane open. Mr. Leary pointed out that residents could use the left-hand side of the pool.

On MOTION by Mr. Davis seconded by Ms. Weitzel with all in favor the amenity center request from the Stingrays Swim Team for the 2026 season was approved.

Ms. Taylor presented an amenity booking request from the HOA for a neighboring community, The Preserves at St. Johns, to use the meeting room quarterly for their HOA meetings. Mr. Yuro did not have an issue, if there was no conflict, but since it was outside of the CDD, asked if the CDD could allow them use of the room. Mr. Haber confirmed that the CDD was always able to open it up to more groups, but it could set a precedent. Mr. Davis asked if they should set a fee. Mr. Laughlin recalled that another CDD had their meeting at another CDD, as their facility was undergoing renovations. They received approval from the Board, but did pay a fee. Ms. Taylor suggested charging a \$50 rental fee. Mr. Haber pointed out that it was fee that the District was charging for the use of facility and if it was something that the Board wanted to have in place, they could approve it on a temporary basis, with the understanding that a public hearing would be scheduled, in order to charge the fee going forward. Mr. Davis pointed out that the \$50 fee was only for a patron renting the room, who was a homeowner and paid assessments for the upkeep of the building and preferred to deny this request, as there were other rentable facilities nearby. Ms. Weitzel and Mr. Yuro did not want to have outside use. *There was Board consensus to deny this request.* Mr. Laughlin asked if the Board wanted to consider a rental fee

February 19, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

of \$200 to \$500 and set a rate hearing. Mr. Davis recalled that the Board discussed it before and decided not to have a fee.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Discussion of Amenity Policy Updates

Mr. Laughlin reported that the purpose of this agenda item, was to discuss the following language in Bring Your Own Bottle (BYOB):

- *Alcoholic beverages may not be served or sold, but must only be considered BYOB where Patrons and their Guests are assisting themselves. The Patron is solely responsible for ensuring that alcohol is consumed in a safe and lawful manner in accordance with all applicable laws, regulations and policies.*

Mr. Laughlin confirmed that all of the changes discussed at the last meeting, was incorporated and asked if Mr. Haber had any concerns about the BYOB. Mr. Haber pointed out that as long as the CDD was compliant with Florida Law, with respect to alcoholic restrictions on a wet deck, he had no issues, understanding that alcohol has increased liability. However, this Board had the authority to make determinations and had the benefit of sovereign immunity. Mr. Laughlin pointed out that this was specifically for rentals. If alcohol was being served, they must hire a licensed bartender, at the recommendation of the insurance company. Mr. Davis recalled that there was a cocktail making event. Ms. Taylor pointed out that they had a licensed bartender for this event and the purpose of this language was for when a resident wanted to reserve the room for a birthday party. They must have a licensed bartender or liability insurance, but if they did it as BYOB, they did not have to do this. Most people did not want to pay for a bartender or liability insurance. Mr. Laughlin pointed out that many of the CDDs he managed, had BYOB language.

Ms. Weitzel felt it was impractical to think that anyone who rented this room was going to hire a bartender. Mr. Davis questioned what would happen if someone wanted to host the cocktail making party and not the CDD. Ms. Taylor indicated that it must go through the Board. Mr. Davidson pointed out if a resident wanted to have a bartender, staff would request the bartender's COI, to ensure that they were certified to serve alcohol. Mr. Leary questioned how easy it was to get a bartender, how much it typically cost and how many events had alcohol. Ms. Taylor confirmed that they had more than 10 baby showers and bridal showers that were more catered to adults. Event liability insurance typically cost \$110 per day and to hire a bartender, they must pay for the alcohol and the bartender would charge \$100 to \$125 per hour for their

February 19, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

services. Mr. Davidson believed that this helped the District, as it provided guidelines. Mr. Leary asked if someone from Vesta was present for such an event. Ms. Taylor indicated that they typically had security. Mr. Davidson pointed out that there were Districts that require staff to be present, which would be an additional fee to the District, as it would be outside of the contracted service hours. Mr. Davis recalled that this was one of the potential edits last month and the Board decided to pass on it. However, he was fine with the BYOB language.

On MOTION by Mr. Davis seconded by Mr. Leary with all in favor the updates to the amenity policies for Bring Your Own Bottle as discussed were approved.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Staff Reports

A. Landscaping Team

1. Report

Mr. Nick Angelo, Ruppert Landscape Irrigation Manager, was present to discuss the irrigation portion, as Mr. Oscar Meranda could not attend this meeting.

- **Proposal for Irrigation System Upgrade** (*Item 6A4*)

Mr. Angelo presented a proposal to convert one of the controllers to a smart controller, which had flow sensing capabilities. This would provide potential water savings of up to 30%, because when it rains, the controller would automatically shut it down for several days, based on the amount of water it detected. The controller needs to be upgraded anyway, as the current rain sensors did not do that. Mr. Laughlin pointed out that this allowed staff to shut off the system if something breaks. Mr. Angelo explained that they could schedule not allowing watering between 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. They get alerts when a valve was stuck or there was a mainline break and would automatically shut itself down if water was moving in that timeframe. It would help them to function and respond quicker. Mr. Laughlin asked if it would identify where the problem was, so they did not have to spend the time trying to locate it. Mr. Angelo confirmed that this was the case. Mr. Leary understood that this was Phase 1, for a Centralis System, at a cost of \$4,000 and questioned the number of phases. Mr. Angelo confirmed that there were two phases; the controller, which could operate on a conventional system. They could also upgrade to do a flow sensor and two wire system. In Phase 2, they would run new wire to all of the valves, have new decoders and surge suppressors. Currently, when they had surges, something would get fried.

February 19, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

Mr. Leary questioned the annual cost for the Centralis System and the warranty. Mr. Angelo indicated it was \$110 annually and there was a one-year manufacturer's warranty. However, if it was due to Mother Nature, it would not be warrantied. Mr. Leary questioned the amount of their annual water bill. Mr. Yuro pointed out that most of the water comes from the ponds. Without the Phase 2 project, Mr. Yuro asked if Phase 1 was recommended. Mr. Angelo recommended it, as it provided at least a 15% savings on their water bill. Mr. Joe Miletello of Ruppert Landscape, indicated that the current rain sensors dry out and they had to change them every other year and were not the most reliable. With the Centralis System, they could put in parameters. Mr. Leary felt that their biggest problem was outages and dead sod. Mr. Angelo pointed out that they only perform an inspection the first week of every month, unless someone called them to come back out. Currently if a valve goes down, unless someone called them, they would not know to come out and replace it, but with the Centralis System, they would know about it, because it would detect it and provide an alert. Mr. Davis questioned the cost of Phase 2. Mr. Angelo indicated that it was \$250,000. Mr. Yuro asked if the system would detect a mainline break. Mr. Angelo confirmed that a mainline break was separate and would cost \$10,000. However, they could provide an estimate, if this was something that the Board wanted to do.

Mr. Leary was frustrated that they had ongoing issues with irrigation and it took until now, to provide a proposal for long-term improvements. However, if it improved their irrigation, he was in favor of moving forward, as he was relying on Ruppert's judgement and recommendation. Ms. Taylor pointed out that it would not go throughout the entire community, as they had battery operated controllers. This was just for the controller behind Hole 17, which irrigated half of Leo Maguire Parkway, all the way down to Eagle Point Drive. Mr. Yuro asked if there was any overlap with the golf course. Mr. Angelo confirmed that there was no overlap. Mr. Leary estimated that for all of the proposals that Ruppert submitted,, the cost would be \$32,000. Mr. Yuro noted that this was more than their contingency. Mr. Laughlin confirmed that the contingency for the entire year was \$52,000. Mr. Yuro wanted to discuss the other proposals before approving this one.

February 19, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

2. Proposal for Landscape Demo Around Tennis Courts

Ms. Taylor presented a proposal from Ruppert, in the amount of \$10,700, to demolish all of the plantings surrounding the tennis court. It was not for re-landscaping. They were working on the second quote. However, they have to remove two Oak trees between Courts 2 and 3 and asked if the Board was in favor of not putting trees there and putting in fencing, as it would change the quote for the re-landscaping. Ms. Weitzel felt that ideally they should remove all of the landscaping and put in benches, versus installing any landscaping, as the roots were pushing up the courts. Mr. Davis asked if the county was fine with removing those two trees and not replacing them. Mr. Yuro pointed out that the trees were dead. Mr. Davis recalled that one was dying and the other was perfectly thriving. Ms. Taylor understood that they could remove the trees and had to replace them, but not in the same area and would double check with the county, as they had to pay an application fee. Mr. Yuro believed that they did not have to re-plant, because of the large amount of trees in the community. Mr. Davidson pointed out that the easiest way would be to find out what the threshold was and count up to that point; however, they were well beyond it. Mr. Yuro felt that this was premature, until they had a count of the trees.

3. Proposal for Irrigation Zone 15 Controller Replacement

Ms. Taylor presented a proposal from Ruppert for a controller replacement in Irrigation Zone 15, which was in the amount of \$695. This controller was covered up by plant material, which was why it was missed in their original audit. Ruppert asked if the CDD could purchase this one, instead of being in the all-inclusive irrigation. Mr. Davis asked if they had seen it, how it would have been addressed. Ms. Taylor indicated that it would have been included in the original audit. Ms. Weitzel assumed that they needed to get the controller. Mr. Laughlin pointed out that the zone should be functional. Mr. Angelo explained that the proposal was for a hybrid controller on a small post, as the current controller was battery operated and was in the ground. It would never get missed again. Ms. Weitzel felt that it was something that they had to do. Mr. Yuro agreed that they needed to do it.

4. Proposal for Irrigation System Upgrade

This item was discussed.

February 19, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

5. Proposal for Tree Canopy Elevation Along St. Johns Golf Drive)

Ms. Taylor presented a proposal from Ruppert to elevate 13 Oak trees along St. Johns Golf Parkway to the amenity parking lot entrance, in the amount of \$3,120. They elevated the ones closer to the basketball courts, but not the ones leading up to the Amenity Center, turning off of Leo Maguire Parkway. This would allow for more sunlight to come into those areas. Mr. Leary was not disputing that it needed to be done, but asked if there was a sod plan, to be done at the same time. Ms. Taylor would request one. Mr. Davidson pointed out that there was a season to lift these trees. If they did it during the growth season, it would promote quicker growth. Therefore, it was better to do this when it was dormant. Mr. Yuro asked if there was something in the contract about elevating trees up to a certain height. Mr. Davidson confirmed that this was beyond that.

6. Proposal for Parkway Sod Replacement

Ms. Taylor presented a proposal from Ruppert for sod replacement down Leo Maguire Parkway, on the walking path side, in the amount of \$24,600. Mr. Leary recalled that this proposal was \$50,000 at the last meeting. Ms. Taylor confirmed that it was \$50,000, but it was for all of Leo Maguire Parkway and she requested that Mr. Meranda focus on the turf area on the left side of Leo Maguire Parkway. Mr. Davidson suggested looking at top dressing in some of those areas, to see if it would come back. Mr. Leary pointed out that there was no sidewalk there. It just goes into the forest. Mr. Yuro understood that the \$24,600 was not to do soil from one end of Leo Maguire Parkway to the other and was just to do sections that were in bad shape. Ms. Taylor confirmed that this was the case. Mr. Laughlin pointed out that this expenditure could be paid from capital, but would take a good portion of the contingency. Mr. Leary noted that this area was in bad shape and had been for a long time, but questioned whether it was the whole length of Leo Maguire Parkway or the upper half where it was worse. Ms. Taylor indicated that it goes in phases. Mr. Yuro estimated that the \$24,600 equated to \$702 per pallet. Mr. Davis felt that this was a good price, as a pallet of sod at Home Depot was \$600 and this proposal included labor and installation. Mr. Laughlin recalled that there was pricing in the agreement for certain items, such as St. Augustine, which was \$650 per pallet. Mr. Yuro pointed out that they would need a few pallets of Bermuda sod at the basketball court, especially if they get consistent irrigation. Mr. Davis asked if the automation of the irrigation system would effect this area on Leo Maguire Parkway. Mr. Angelo confirmed that it would improve the water situation.

February 19, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

Mr. Davis asked the Board if they should approve the irrigation and place the sod on hold, until they could see if the irrigation improved the area and focus on the area around the Amenity Center. Mr. Geary was in favor of putting the sod on hold and approving all of the other proposals. Mr. Leary recommended approving the proposal for the controller and tree canopy, but hold off on doing the sod, until they received proposals for the other locations. Mr. Davis wanted to spend a large amount of money on Leo Maguire Parkway, before they spend money on sod at the Amenity Center. Mr. Leary noted two or three tracks that were bad and that five or six pallets of sod, might help in those areas. Mr. Yuro was in favor of purchasing sod for the worst areas, but was hesitant to approve \$24,600 worth of sod. Ms. Weitzel suggested doing this like the sidewalk repairs, where they repair the biggest hazards. Mr. Davidson recommended focusing the area on the right-hand side of St. Johns Golf Parkway, going past the golf course. Ms. Weitzel recalled receiving an email today with pictures showing how terrible it looked. Mr. Davidson recommended once the Board had everything in front of them, segregating the areas throughout multiple years and concentrating on the visible, high-traffic and entry areas. He would then work with Ruppert and Mr. Leary on those areas.

Mr. Geary asked if they needed to lift the tree canopies between now and the next meeting. Mr. Davidson recommended lifting the tree canopies and going ahead with the irrigation system controller replacements and upgrades. He would like for the Board to consider sod at the next meeting, because it would take a period of time for the sod to arrive, which puts them right at the growing season. They were also looking at a couple of areas for Bermuda, such as heavily shaded areas, which he was working with Mr. Meranda on. They wanted to bring in sod that could survive in these shaded areas, closer to tree rings and then look at some additional ground cover for around those trunks, as string trimming could damage the trees and the root systems around it. They could then come back at the next meeting and discuss what was necessary to get those areas sodded. In the meantime, they would continue to work on making sure that they had everything for 2027 and spreading it out in the future, due to the expensive cost. He could see it as a three-year project.

On MOTION by Mr. Davis seconded by Ms. Weitzel with all in favor the proposal from Ruppert Landscape for the Irrigation Zone 15 controller replacement in the amount of \$695 was approved.

February 19, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

On MOTION by Ms. Weitzel seconded by Mr. Leary with all in favor the proposal from Ruppert Landscape for a central controller irrigation system in the amount of \$4,034 was approved.

On MOTION by Mr. Leary seconded by Mr. Yuro with all in favor the proposal from Ruppert Landscape for the tree canopy elevation along St. Johns Golf Drive in the amount of \$3,120 was approved.

B. Attorney

There being none, the next item followed.

C. Engineer

Mr. Marcinell recalled that at the last meeting, a resident at 228 St. Johns Golf Drive requested a visit for water in the curb line, which he inspected before this meeting. There was approximately 30 feet of standing water along the curb, which goes 2 feet out into the roadway. A quick Google search shows that the only rain they had, was from Sunday and Monday, totaling $\frac{3}{4}$ of an inch. The water has been there for a while and would probably always remain wet, due to a tree that was in the curb, blocking the flow. This area was the only wet area, due to contributions from the cul-de-sac. It was an ongoing issue. Mr. Davis asked if this area was right across from Stonebridge Path. Mr. Marcinell indicated that it was just off of the main road. Mr. Davis asked if Mr. Marcinell saw anything that was obvious. Mr. Marcinell confirmed that the tree root was lifting the curb. Mr. Yuro pointed out that this was occurring all over the neighborhood. Mr. Marcinell would document all of this. At 504 Stonebridge Court, there was a 20-foot drainage easement. Mr. Haber provided easement language, as well as ownership language for the retaining wall at 942 Eagle Point Drive. Mr. Yuro asked if Mr. Haber or Mr. Marcinell were in contact with the owners. Mr. Laughlin indicated that he contacted the owners regarding attorney fees and provided them with an estimate but had not heard back from them. Mr. Haber confirmed that he had not had any contact with the owners.

D. District Manager

. Mr. Laughlin reported that they would start discussing the budget next month, as the District must approve the Proposed Budget at the May meeting, since the June meeting was after the 15th, which was the deadline to approve the budget. A draft would be provided to the Board

February 19, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

at the next meeting for discussion in March and April, for approval at the May meeting. In August, the Board would adopt the final budget.

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. She and Mr. Meranda performed a complete ride through of the community. They broke it down into 28 areas. Pictures of the current state of each area, was provided to the Board, as well as suggestions that she and Mr. Meranda had. Their overall suggestion, which the Board was in favor of, focused on the high traffic focal points and eventually getting to enhancements. Ms. Taylor would be working on that with Mr. Meranda.

5. Proposals for Slide Resurfacing

Ms. Taylor reported that Safe Slide was able to complete their onsite visit on Wednesday, January 21st, for resurfacing of the water slide and they provided a proposal of \$30,436. Slide Renu provided a proposal of \$25,050. They had not resurfaced the slide for quite some time and there was some discomfort when going down the slide, due to normal wear and tear. However, there were no structural concerns. This expenditure was budgeted for the 2027/2028 Fiscal Year and was included in the Reserve Study for \$23,000. She recommended doing the resurfacing sooner rather than later, because the contractors were getting booked up. Mr. Yuro asked if there was money in the reserve to cover this expenditure. Mr. Laughlin confirmed that there were sufficient funds. Mr. Yuro did not want to have any injury issues, if the slide was in bad shape. Ms. Taylor pointed out that the landing spot at the top, needed some additional work, which was in both proposals and the seams were starting to show wear and tear. Therefore, in an abundance of caution, she preferred to do the resurfacing this season than waiting until next season.

Mr. Yuro was in favor of moving forward with the resurfacing. Mr. Leary questioned the two vendors experience and performance. Ms. Taylor indicated that both vendors served Vesta at multiple locations and there were positive results from both. Therefore, she felt comfortable with either vendor. Mr. Leary did not recommend joining the seams, as there were some pros and cons. Ms. Taylor agreed, explaining that Safe Slide included an additional option to put in

February 19, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

fiberglass at the seams, but this was for a higher usage water slide. Typically, they caulk the seam, but if they put in fiberglass, they would not have to worry about the wear and tear. Mr. Leary did not feel that they needed to invest in the ongoing maintenance package, but felt comfortable with the Slide Renu proposal. Ms. Weitzel and Mr. Yuro agreed. Mr. Geary asked if they were getting complaints about the slide. Ms. Taylor confirmed that she had not received any complaints, but Vesta likes to review the slide and pool pumps before pool season, to ensure that everything was ready to go. Ms. Weitzel pointed out that when she used the slide with her child on the lap, it was slightly uncomfortable. Mr. Davidson indicated that before the Summertime, he walks around the slide and looks for specific things. If there were seams needed attention and there was fading, they try to repair it, because they did not want delamination, resulting in the need for severe restoration.

On MOTION by Mr. Leary seconded by Mr. Yuro with all in favor the proposal from Slide Renu for slide resurfacing in the amount of \$25,050 was approved.

6. Landscaping Projects

This item was discussed.

7. Proposal for Painting Pool Awning

Ms. Taylor reported that the awning poles by the lap lane cabana, needed some repair, as paint was chipping off of all of the supports. Mark with Tropical Pressure & Painting provided a proposal for \$3,800, to remove all of the paint, prime and repaint. He worked at other Vesta locations and they received good results from him. Because it was close to the pool, they needed to be extra cautious, which explained some of the additional labor amount. Ms. Weitzel questioned where the \$3,800 would come out of. Mr. Laughlin confirmed that it would come out of the repair and maintenance (R&M) line item. Mr. Davis was in favor of this proposal. Mr. Yuro felt that it was reasonable.

On MOTION by Mr. Yuro seconded by Ms. Weitzel with all in favor the proposal from Tropical Pressure & Painting for repainting of the pool awning in the amount of \$3,800 was approved.

February 19, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

- **Proposal for Pressure Washing Entry Monuments (Item 6E9)**

Ms. Taylor presented a proposal from Tropical Pressure & Painting to pressure wash and milicide the three brick entry monuments, in the amount of \$200. These were the monuments at Eagle Point Drive, St. Johns Golf Drive and Stonehedge Trail Lane. Mr. Leary questioned why the Board had to approve a \$200 expenditure. Ms. Taylor indicated that the Board typically did not approve these expenditures, but she wanted to bring it to the Board. Mr. Davis appreciated Ms. Taylor informing the Board about it, as it was a good idea. *There was Board consensus to pressure wash and milicide the three brick entry monuments.*

8. Proposal for Painting Golf Cart Bridge

Ms. Taylor presented a proposal from Tropical Pressure & Painting to repair the wooden bridge by the entrance monument on Leo Maguire Parkway, close to CR 210, in the amount of \$5,800. The bridge needed some re-touching of loose wooden boards. However, most of the caps that were on the railing, were falling off and they would replace them. They would also pressure wash, milicide it, remove the paint and re-paint it. Mr. Davis recalled that at the last meeting, the Board wanted to see what it would cost to repair the wooden bridge on the 18th Hole and then ask the golf course if the CDD could do the repair work and hopefully the golf course would pay some money towards it. Mr. Laughlin confirmed that they would need approval from the golf course. Ms. Taylor would include photos from the CR 210 bridge into her next report. She believed that the cost would be within the price range of \$5,800. Mr. Leary requested photos of the bridge by the entrance monument on Leo Maguire Parkway. Ms. Taylor would include it in the next report. Mr. Davis asked if the bridge was lit. Ms. Taylor did not believe so. Mr. Yuro recalled that there was a light on both ends. Mr. Davis suggested installing lit caps. Ms. Taylor would look into this. Mr. Davis requested photos of the bridge at night and provide a quote for the bridge on the 18th Hole.

9. Proposal for Pressure Washing Entry Monuments

This item was discussed.

- **Sidewalk Repair Update (Item 6E4)**

Ms. Taylor reported that Precision Sidewalk came onsite and provided a proposal for all of the sidewalk hazards on Meadowview Lane, Stonehenge Trail Lane and Brookhaven Drive.

February 19, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

The majority of the severe sidewalks were completed and now they were looking at moderate severe sidewalks, just under 1 inch. To complete all of the sidewalk hazards on those roads, would cost \$25,026. Ms. Weitzel questioned whether they completed all of the sidewalk repairs on St. Johns Golf Drive. Ms. Taylor reiterated that the majority of the severe sidewalks were completed, but they had some panels that had to be replaced and was getting in touch with 2 Men Concrete. However, she was happy to have Precision Sidewalk repair sidewalks on St. Johns Golf Drive. Ms. Weitzel pointed out that the sidewalks on St. Johns Golf Drive were the ones that people walked the most. Mr. Davis recalled that there was a trip and fall on Stonebridge Trail Lane. Ms. Weitzel asked if this item was budgeted. Mr. Laughlin confirmed that the funds would come from capital. Originally, they were using the bond funds, but it was now coming out of the capital, unless the Board wanted to use the bond funds. Mr. Yuro felt that they needed to repair the sidewalks, as they identified hazards. If they ignored it, they were putting themselves in a bad position. Mr. Davis recommended grinding sidewalks every couple of months, to keep everybody happy and safe.

On MOTION by Mr. Davis seconded by Mr. Yuro with all in favor the proposal from Precision Sidewalk Safety for sidewalk repairs in a not-to-exceed amount of \$27,000 was approved.

Ms. Taylor previously provided proposals for the tennis and basketball courts. The only update that she had, was to provide the proposal from Ruppert for the landscape demolition. They were currently working on the re-landscaping and there would be some renderings as well as prices, for the next meeting. She would reach out to the vendors to see how much the proposal would change, if they installed new fencing. Mr. Davis asked if they were considering French drains around the outside edge of the tennis courts. Ms. Taylor indicated that the re-landscaping would push back any plant material, at least 1 to 2 feet and coordinate with piping, around the tennis courts with decorative rocks, which would help the water go straight into the pipes. There were currently six French drains. This would be a better way to stop water from going onto the tennis courts. Mr. Davis felt that it was more important to get the water off of the tennis courts.

Regarding the playground renovations, Ms. Taylor reported that Robert was able to install the panels this week. They looked good, but was still waiting for the wooden slat replacement. Mr. Davis asked if this was for the benches and picnic tables. Ms. Taylor replied

February 19, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

affirmatively, which she was trying to coordinate with the vendor. They have not yet installed the swing seats, but they were delivered. Ms. Weitzel reported that the dome looked great. Ms. Taylor confirmed that Robert worked hard on it. They tried a couple of things on the plastic slide and were going to keep figuring out how to make it look better. It was still on their radar. Regarding the access control system update, they were currently using a new system, which went online the last week of January. It was a major success; however, there were some cards that fell through the cracks, during the transition from one system to the other, but everyone was reasonable about it. They were doing a raffle for anyone who comes into the office and fills out a registration form in the month of February. Approximately 75 to 100 people were using the mobile access, which they received positive results for.

10. Proposal for Pool Pump

Ms. Taylor recalled that the Board wanted to table the purchase of pool pumps and listed this item on the agenda as a reminder. Mr. Leary suggested including this item on the budget items list, so they could plan for it. Ms. Taylor did a review of the street sign posts, street light poles and street names. Every one of them was in good shape, but paint was starting to chip at the bottom, which was common, but it was not being structurally compromised. If they painted the bottom, they would have to paint the pole to match it, but did not think that they were at that point yet. The street signs were looking good, but two were faded. They may want to replace them sometime soon. The street light poles were probably in the worst shape, but were not structurally compromised. However, the Caution Child at Play or Speed Limit Signs, had algae on them and would ask Robert to clean them. However, he does have a few items on his list, so it might take time to get to it. Mr. Leary asked if this included the sign at the golf course entrance. Ms. Taylor indicated that this was a separate item.

Regarding the tree canopies, Ms. Taylor was still working with the vendors. She obtained one proposal, from a vendor who performed an onsite visit this past week and was working on a third vendor. This was for the lifting of the canopies on the roadways and sidewalks. Mr. Leary asked if they should do this shortly. Mr. Laughlin confirmed that this amount was spent in the past, as this was completed a few times over the years. The last time that it was done was in 2023. Ms. Taylor anticipated it costing \$45,000 to \$50,000, based on the cost of inflation, but did not expect to do it this fiscal year and recommended it for Fiscal Year 2027. Regarding the

February 19, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

Amenity Center sign, which was right before the turn into the parking lot, they included some solar lights, which were not strong. Changing the turf, would fall under when they do everything with Ruppert. She recommended doing this through a pilot program, to see what plant material would work, as there were many Oak trees with huge root beds. The sign was missing a cap that needed to be replaced and would be one of the signs that Robert would clean, to make it look sharper. Mr. Leary appreciated that, as the sign was pitiful and recommended getting a new sign, which the golf course should work with them on. Ms. Weitzel agreed, as the sign said, "*Golf and Country Club.*" Ms. Taylor pointed out that there was a similar sign before the marquee board on Leo Maguire Parkway. The words may not be the same, but it had the same logo on top and was the same type of material. Therefore, if they wanted to change the Amenity Center sign, she recommended changing both signs. Mr. Leary questioned how much it would cost to get a new sign. Ms. Taylor would find out. Mr. Davis suggested having a cost share with the golf course.

Ms. Taylor reported that a street light pole was knocked down a couple of months ago; however, this type of pole was not made any more and trying to find one that matched, has been difficult. She was checking in with Beacon Electric on a regular basis and would continue to work with them. Mr. Yuro asked if this was one that was towards the front of the neighborhood. Ms. Taylor replied affirmatively. Regarding the Summer season preparations, all of their seasonal hiring was completed and camp registration was open. Regarding upcoming events, last Saturday was Resident Appreciation Day and free donuts were provided to residents. Next Saturday, there would be a paint workshop with Ancient City Designs. Participants would create their own Spring themed sign. There was a Spring Break Dash on Tuesday, March 17th. There would be live music and Frankie's and Edie's would be providing hot dogs and Italian ice. Parks Critters would be providing a variety of reptiles. A Spring Fling was being held on March 28th. This was their Easter event and the Easter Bunny would be there for photos. There would also be craft stations, face painting, balloon artists, inflatables and an Easter Egg Hunt. It was brought to Ms. Taylor's attention, that there was some e-bike usage on the pond bank of Pond 14A, across from Stonehedge Trail Lane on Leo Maguire Parkway. Robert was able to put the pond bank back in its original state and it was now level again. They would keep an eye on it and see what happens. Signage could be placed back there, if the Board was interested. The e-bike and e-scooter policy was posted on social media and through an e-blast.

February 19, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

Mr. Davis asked if all of the areas that use was prohibited, were mentioned. Ms. Taylor replied affirmatively, but they could make it clearer. Mr. Davidson asked if there was language or a map showing the areas. Ms. Taylor indicated that there was language. Mr. Davidson recommended including a map, so it was easier to understand. Ms. Weitzel was in favor of having a sign, but questioned the cost. Ms. Taylor confirmed that a sign was inexpensive. Mr. Yuro questioned what the sign would say. Ms. Taylor indicated that it would say, "*CDD Property – No Trespassing.*" Mr. Davis wished that there was a way to get residents to discipline their kids about e-bike use and fix the damage that they caused. He was going into the forest to pick up trash left behind, but rather than have staff pick it up, residents should be picking it up. Mr. Laughlin pointed out that another CDD does a community clean up. Ms. Taylor would include a map in the e-blast and post on the bulletin board. They would monitor this area and bring it back to the Board if she had any additional report. Mr. Davis suggested doing another bulk email to residents. Ms. Taylor received a proposal from a local business that frequents the meeting room, offering to re-do the flooring, in the amount of \$6,263.73. They would provide a discount and install LVP, which was common for high foot traffic.

Regarding the bulkhead, Mr. Laughlin received an email from the resident regarding attorney's costs. While they understood the Board's position, they were willing to pay for and maintain the wall to remedy an erosion issue, caused by a CDD managed lake and requested that the Board absorb any attorney costs. Mr. Yuro understood that the resident was saying that they pushed the CDD to fix the erosion, as all of the lakes had erosion and it would cost more than the attorney fee. Mr. Laughlin pointed out that technically, it was the resident's property, but it was part of the District's stormwater system. Mr. Davis asked if the CDD was responsible for repairing shorelines for ponds that encroach onto homeowners property. Mr. Haber indicated that the District had responsibility for the permitted stormwater system and if the shoreline was part of a pond or lake that was part of that system, even if the pond itself was located on a homeowners lot, the CDD may be responsible to maintain it, to ensure that the stormwater system was functioning. Mr. Davis questioned if dirt on the homeowner's property erodes down into the pond, whether it was the District's responsibility to repair it. Mr. Haber indicated if part of the lot was part of the permitted pond bank, there were certain requirements that must be met to comply with the District's stormwater permit. However, if what was occurring was on the homeowner's property, the CDD would not be obligated to fix it.

February 19, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

Mr. Geary questioned what type of costs they were looking at for attorney's fees. Mr. Laughlin believed that it could be anywhere from \$500 to \$2,500. Ms. Weitzel pointed out if they were putting something in that has not been there before, this was the homeowner's choice and the CDD should not be responsible for paying for their attorney's fees. Mr. Laughlin indicated that District Counsel would be doing all of the work, which would typically be billed to the District. Mr. Leary felt that they were setting a precedent. Mr. Yuro recalled that they have never done this before. Mr. Laughlin confirmed that they never had a situation like this and believed that the resident was more concerned about having the easement taken away in the future. Mr. Davis pointed out if the resident was just restoring the shoreline to what it was when they purchased the house, they would not be coming to the CDD. The only reason that they were coming to the CDD, was because they wanted to install a wall. Mr. Marcinell confirmed that they were tying to an existing wall. Mr. Davis felt that it was reasonable for the resident to pay the attorney's fees, as they were looking for a change. *There was Board consensus for the resident to pay for the District Counsel fees and Mr. Laughlin would reply to the resident.*

Resident Erin Radecki thanked the Board for saving the playground and felt that it was the best playground in St. Johns County. She loved the energy of the community, but did not like that they would be taking away a basketball court and replacing it with a pickleball court. She lived in the community for almost 12 years and would like to make her backyard pretty. However, it was CDD property. They would like to move the property line and landscape it. Mr. Davis recalled at the end of last month's meeting, staff asked the Radecki's to cover the legal fees and questioned the status. Mr. Laughlin indicated that Mr. Haber provided some language for an agreement to help streamline the process and there would be some legal costs. Mr. Radecki pointed out that the last thing that they wanted to do, was to spend thousands of dollars in legal fees, when the Board's answer would have been no. If the Board was against it, they could table it and move on. He understood that they would be setting a precedent, as other neighbors might want to do the same thing, but questioned how many neighbors were willing to spend thousands of dollars on a fence that they might have to move back at some point, because a future Board decided that they did not want to give the land to the residents to manage. Therefore, there would be a risk, but understood why the Board might say no.

Mr. Laughlin asked if there was any hesitation from the Board. Mr. Yuro was fine with it, as long as Mr. Haber worked out whatever language he was comfortable with. Ms. Weitzel

February 19, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

indicated that she was fine with it and was more in favor of having an easement. Mr. Laughlin confirmed that the process of purchasing the property was complicated, as they must allow other people the right to purchase the land. Therefore, having an easement was simpler. Ms. Weitzel pointed out if the Radecki's were willing to help make this area look nice, she had no problem with it. Mr. Marcinell asked if they would be moving their fence into an easement. Ms. Radecki confirmed that they did not yet have a fence, but since they were building a pool, they were required to have a fence. Mr. Radecki pointed out that it would be ideal to move the fence back, but they could place it on their property line. Mr. Geary was not in favor of putting a fence or anything on the easement, as it would be setting a precedent. However, he liked the idea of this area looking nice, but questioned whether the CDD should be making that area nice. Mr. Radecki recalled coming to a prior meeting and saying that the area looked horrible, as it was a dirt pit with some crab grass and a bunch of leaves. However, it was being mowed, but was told that there was no irrigation. They could put in irrigation to make the area look nice at their own cost, if the CDD provided the right to do so. They would like to include some bushes to provide a buffer. The fence was negotiable.

Mr. Geary did not like the idea of blocking off CDD land from the other residents, but had no problem irrigating it and making it look nice. Ms. Weitzel pointed out that most people use that land to drive their golf cart on and questioned whether that would be possible with a fence. Ms. Radecki indicated that they did not need to go that far back with the fence. Mr. Radecki confirmed that they were not blocking it off and there was room for people to take their carts or walk. Mr. Leary understood that the fence would be on the property line and the easement would have plant materials to provide privacy. Mr. Davis asked if the county had a buffer for fence placement. Mr. Marcinell confirmed that there were easement allowances, such as a pipe going through the middle of the drainage easement, as it was supposed to be maintained, opened and clear for access and maintenance. If maintenance was required for the pipe, the removal of the fence and replacement of the fence, was the responsibility of the homeowner. The repair was the responsibility by the CDD and HOA. Therefore, a fence within an easement was allowed, depending on what was underneath it and what the allowances were for that easement language.

Mr. Marcinell felt that the bigger necessity was having irrigation coming from the Radecki's property within the easement, to maintain the vegetation. The irrigation choice was the

February 19, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

Radecki's, but the CDD would have to grant permission for the irrigation to come onto the property. The Radecki's would also be responsible for the plantings. Maintenance would come down to an agreement. The fence would be in question, because of the increase in buffer, as vegetation, does provide for sound suppression and visibility, but all items would be allowable within that easement. He did not believe that there was a pipe underneath the easement. Mr. Laughlin understood that there was currently no easement, but the CDD would grant the Radecki's one. Mr. Marcinell confirmed that there was currently a drainage easement and they would be modifying that easement to allow the Radecki's to have irrigation. Mr. Yuro was 99% certain that there was not a pipe underneath it and pointed out that every house had irrigation into CDD property, because the sprinklers go up to the street. Mr. Davis recalled that the HOA had rules about where the fence could be placed and asked if that was relevant to this discussion. Mr. Radecki confirmed that the HOA was not concerned about the placement of the fence.

Mr. Yuro pointed out that the CDD was not looking to vacate that easement. The CDD was deciding whether to allow access over it, which simplified things with the county. Ms. Radecki indicated that she submitted a survey from Superior Fence to the HOA. Mr. Yuro had no issue with the request, as long as Mr. Haber could draft language that was agreeable to the Radecki's. Mr. Laughlin suggested that the Board approve it subject to the agreement being completed and paying for attorney costs. Mr. Radecki was agreeable to paying the attorney costs, but voiced concern about the Board saying no after they paid it. Mr. Laughlin pointed out that the agreement would not be drafted and no legal costs would be paid until the request was officially approved. Mr. Marcinell suggested that the Radecki's coordinate with the HOA through their ARB application, as it was an agreement between the CDD and the Radecki's and there were clear lines, in case a future Board had questions. Mr. Davis felt that it was appropriate to see if there was language in the ARB application, that the homeowner acknowledges that if the HOA denies their request, they would move the fence. Mr. Laughlin pointed out when the homeowner submits the ARB, the HOA would see that there was an easement and would contact the CDD.

Mr. Geary voiced concern that the fence goes past the property line. Mr. Marcinell pointed out that the fence could still technically go in the middle of the easement. According to their survey, there would be a gain of 10 feet. The Radecki's property line ends in the middle with a 10-foot easement on their side for drainage and a 10-foot easement on the CDD's side for

February 19, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

drainage. They would come out 10 feet with the fence. Mr. Davis supported Mr. Geary's concern that if the fence goes beyond the existing property line, the rest of the neighborhood would be aware of it and they would be upset that there was a fence in the middle of open land. Mr. Radecki pointed out that if a future Board tells them to move the fence back and they had to pay for it, they were fine with it. Ms. Weitzel felt that if the Radecki's were willing to take the risks and understand that this was a possibility and were fine with it, they could cross that bridge later. Mr. Davis asked if the Board should approve it pending District Counsel preparing the agreement. Mr. Laughlin requested that the Board approve it subject to the agreement being completed.

On MOTION by Mr. Davis seconded by Ms. Weitzel with Mr. Leary, Mr. Yuro, Mr. Davis and Ms. Weitzel in favor and Mr. Geary dissenting, authorization for Mr. and Mrs. Radecki to use easement land outside of their property line up to the edge of their easement at 504 Stonebridge Path Court, subject to an agreement and paying District Counsel fees for the agreement was approved.

Mr. Laughlin reported that Mr. Haber would draft the agreement, send it to him and Mr. Yuro as Chairman, would have to sign it, but if the Board wished, the agreement could be brought back to the Board for final approval. Mr. Yuro did not need to see it again, if Mr. Haber was comfortable with it. The Board agreed.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Discussion of Future Amenity Capital Improvements

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

Regarding the amenity meeting room upgrade, Mr. Laughlin reported that two proposals were received, after the final bid package was completed. There has been no contact from the low bidder, Bradshaw, but he heard from the architect. The first proposal was from Marand Builders, in the amount of \$390,555.41. The second proposal was from Brogdon Builders, in the amount of \$320,000; however, if they used a vinyl exterior window instead of aluminum, the amount would decrease to \$295,000. The estimate from Bradshaw, the low bidder, was \$226,000. Mr. Davis recommended setting it aside and concentrating on the basketball court

February 19, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

replacement. Mr. Leary questioned what changed, as a few meetings ago, the Board was ready to proceed with this project and completing it before Summer and they spent \$16,000 to get to this point. He was surprised that they had not heard back from Bradshaw and recalled that none of the bids included appliances, which was another \$20,000. Mr. Geary wanted to take out a bank loan over a five-year term to do all three projects. Mr. Yuro agreed with Mr. Davis, due to having a \$300,000 to \$400,000 bill to reconstruct their basketball courts. However, if they wanted to use the money in the bank for the tennis and basketball court reconstruction and take out a bond for the improvements, that was more appropriate, but they should have input from residents. Mr. Laughlin pointed out if they take out a bond, the CDD must have public hearings and pay exorbitant fees, versus taking out a five-year loan. However, with the five-year loan, the residents must pay higher assessments.

Mr. Geary felt that the tennis and basketball courts were a priority and estimated if they take out a \$500,000 loan, to do the amenity meeting room upgrade and tennis and basketball court reconstruction, it would cost \$100 per household per year for five years. Mr. Laughlin pointed out that once the Board was ready, the Underwriter could present all of the options and provide numbers to do a five-year loan or 30-year bond. Ms. Weitzel agreed that the tennis and basketball court reconstruction needed to be done, as it was something that the Board did not anticipate, but was in favor of doing the pool deck renovation and amenity meeting room upgrade. However, the proposal for \$300,000 to upgrade this room, was a bit much. From the resident comments, everyone has agreed that the lighting, flooring and walls needed an upgrade and was in favor of making the improvements, but was unsure about how they could redo this room without spending \$300,000. The Board needed to be proactive and start making these projects become a reality.

Mr. Davis felt that the pool deck project would be great and had a beautiful design, but they only had one pool of money to work with. There were aspects of the amenity meeting room upgrade that he loved such as blowing out a wall and putting in windows, but he did not think that the ceiling design was great and did not like the sliding barn door. The cracks were not going to get any better on the basketball courts and there were holes in the court, along the edges. There was no hope that it was going to get better, because the drainage situation on the courts was such, that the landscaping was above the level of the court in some areas and the water could not drain. Therefore, he was at the point of moving towards using the money for the

February 19, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

reconstruction of the tennis and basketball courts and doing minor repairs on this room. Then they could ask residents to help them put together an excellent design option for this room, figure out how to do the financing and convince the residents that it was a good thing to do. Mr. Leary suggested that they look into the amenity meeting room upgrade, as this room did not stand up to rooms in other communities. He could not speak to the cost, as it was outside of his expertise. He wanted to find out what the other Board Members felt, because three to four meetings ago, there was consensus to move forward, which has now flipped. Ms. Weitzel felt that the floor in this room was a necessity and asked if the majority of the cost to upgrade the amenity meeting room, was due to blowing out the wall. Mr. Laughlin indicated that they were blowing out the wall in two areas and there was a roof extension. Mr. Leary pointed out that there was a kitchen and there would be a transformation. The proposal from Marand Builders provided a breakdown for concrete, masonry, wood and plastics, thermal and moisture protection, openings, furnishing, plumbing, HVAC, electrical and utilities.

Ms. Weitzel liked the idea of the windows, flooring, ceiling and re-doing the walls, but questioned the Board's thoughts about the pool deck area. Mr. Geary thought it was a great idea. Mr. Yuro and Mr. Leary supported it. Mr. Laughlin pointed out that the bond money could also be used for sidewalk and road repairs. Mr. Leary would like to have an option for repair of the tennis courts and reconstruction. Mr. Geary recalled everyone saying that the tennis courts were irreparable. Mr. Davidson confirmed that according to the contractors he spoke with, there was no repair option, because they had no ability to warranty it. Mr. Leary questioned whether they asked the contractor who resurfaced the courts to provide a proposal. Ms. Taylor indicated that she tried calling them, but had not received a response. There were three proposals. She reached out to the second bidder. They provided a cost for resurfacing, but were not going to do an onsite visit and based the cost on the 2023 onsite visit. Mr. Leary pointed out that more than resurfacing was needed and asked if there was still a two-year life on the courts. Ms. Taylor confirmed that they were looking at a maximum of two years, but they could run into safety concerns earlier than that.

Mr. Leary requested that the three vendors attend the next three meetings and speak to the Board one at a time, so that the Board could ask questions. Mr. Laughlin would include them at the beginning of the agenda. Mr. Geary asked if there was anyone that they could eliminate due to the price. Ms. Weitzel liked Fast Dry, as they were the most proactive. Mr. Yuro would

February 19, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

disqualify the vendor that they used the last time, as cracks appeared within two months and the project took twice as long as it was supposed to take. Mr. Leary suggested asking the builders to come in one at a time. Mr. Davis was not amenable to the design, as he did not like the ceilings and bar area, but loved the windows. Ms. Weitzel asked if they were going with one company, just to do the floors or have one vendor do everything. Mr. Laughlin pointed out if they did an entire renovation, they would want it all to be done by one vendor. However, there was a proposal to just do the floors and nothing else, which would be paid out of the capital. Ms. Weitzel felt that they were throwing \$7,000 down the drain, as they would have to pull up the floor anyway when they do construction. Ms. Taylor did not suggest doing the floors separately, if they were going to do an entire renovation.

Mr. Leary asked if the floor was safe. Mr. Geary pointed out that it was not aesthetically appealing and to bring it to a safety factor would be challenging. Ms. Taylor indicated that there were resident concerns about the flooring. Mr. Geary questioned whether they should do the flooring, as they would probably be discussing what to spend the money on for months. Mr. Leary felt that any floor like this should be repaired, but did not know the most cost-effective way of doing it. However, if they did not have to dig up the entire floor and repair it, that could be an option. If the Board wanted to proceed with the flooring, he could obtain additional proposals, in order to see the different pricing. Mr. Yuro pointed out that regardless of what they do, they needed to consider the type of flooring, as luxury vinyl plank may not do well with the kids using this room for camps. Mr. Davidson indicated that it was scratch resistant and was no different than what they currently had. Ms. Weitzel asked if it was better than a porcelain tile. Mr. Davidson pointed out that porcelain tile was nice, but it was cold, slippery and loud. Mr. Yuro was not opposed of doing something to the floor, but requested a sample of the flooring to see what it looked like. Ms. Taylor asked if the Board wanted the same color as the current flooring. Mr. Yuro was looking for the experts to provide a recommendation.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Consideration of Resolution 2026-02, Instructing the St. Johns County Supervisor of Elections to Conduct the District's 2026 General Election

Mr. Laughlin presented Resolution 2026-02, instructing the St. Johns County Supervisor of Elections to conduct the 2026 General Election. This was a bookkeeping item, as the General

February 19, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

Election was coming up this year. The seats that were up for election, were Seat 3, Mr. Yuro’s seat, Seat 5, Mr. Leary’s seat and Seat 1, Mr. David’s seat. Once they get closer to June, there would be a qualifying period to be on the ballot for November. Mr. Davis asked whether it would be on the primary ballot. Mr. Laughlin explained if a someone qualified and no one else ran for the seat, it would not be on the ballot.

On MOTION by Mr. Yuro seconded by Ms. Weitzel with all in favor Resolution 2026-02, Instructing the St. Johns County Supervisor of Elections to Conduct the District’s 2026 General Election was adopted.

Mr. David reported that on the CDD website, where each Supervisor was listed, Mr. Leary, in Seat 5, was in the second box and should be in the fifth box. Mr. Laughlin would reach out to the website administrator.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Contracts Review

Mr. Leary asked if they had a new contract for athletic field maintenance, as the list says it was from 2015. Mr. Laughlin did not change it, because they did not change vendors, but could include that it was updated. Ms. Weitzel questioned the email regarding the Fitness Center. Mr. Laughlin did not plan on talking about it, as it was a dead issue, but wanted to share it with the Board. Mr. Yuro confirmed that he received the same letter in the mail with no return address. Mr. Leary received the same letter.

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Supervisors’ Request

Ms. Weitzel requested that the brightness of the speed limit sign be lowered. Mr. Laughlin reported that Ms. Taylor was working on it. Mr. Geary wanted to increase it, in order to get people to slow down and pay attention to how fast they were going. Ms. Weitzel pointed out that she was receiving messages about it. Mr. Davis would like the sign to be replaced with the exact same sign that was in the other position, which was much more subtle, not as bright and blinks, instead of showing stupid colors. It did not make sense to have two different signs that were functioning in different manners and did not think that the white light was appropriate, as they were taking offensive action on someone going the speed limit, by shining a bright light into

February 19, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

their face to get their attention. Ms. Weitzel agreed, as it provided pushback. Mr. Leary pointed out that this sign was temporary. Mr. Yuro questioned why it was not the same sign that was there for two years. Mr. Laughlin noted that it was provided by the same vendor and was under the impression that it was going to be the same sign. Mr. Davis would be surprised if they did not hear from one of the homes that could see the sign from their property and would like to use no offensive measures.

Mr. Davis indicated in doing research, he found that there were State and Federal Laws, that the signage not have any intentionally distracting features. They were doing the wrong thing for their community and recommended taking down the sign, replacing it with the same type of sign that they had before and then discuss the positioning of the sign, because it was buried behind trees. Ms. Weitzel recalled that this was a hot topic for residents. Mr. Laughlin pointed out that they were only approved within a certain parameter and this was the only location that did not effect residents. Mr. Leary did not think that they would be able to move the sign, although they could, because the CDD owned the property, but it took a long time to get to this final location. A resident wanted to desperately fix the speeding problem, because they had so many issues with speeding vehicles and begged the CDD to put the sign there. He did not see it causing it issue with other residents who lived by it. In terms of changing the sign, they could go back to the vendor and explore it. The white light was an additional feature that would be temporarily turned off. Mr. Davis pointed out that the vendor was onsite last week, but they did not disable it. They only placed a piece of tape over it. Mr. Leary indicated that the purpose of the tape was to reduce the brightness. The vendor was planning on coming back and work on lowering the brightness and felt that the Board should give them a chance to make those changes. However, the sign has been amazingly effective, as traffic speeds going through that crossing, have dramatically reduced. It was working as planned.

Ms. Weitzel pointed out that the boy who lost his life, was one of her students. Mr. Davis noted that was a totally different situation. Ms. Weitzel acknowledged that it was a different situation, as accidents do happen, but the crosswalk where the accident occurred, had golf carts coming out from the field and trees blocking people from seeing kids on bikes. It was also a crosswalk that was heavily used and was in favor of having something that encourages people coming from St. Johns Golf Drive, to slow down, as people were speeding down St. Johns Golf Drive. There should be the same sign that was in the opposite direction. If a sign was not

February 19, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

available, they needed to remove the light, as having the green and red lights, were too much. Mr. Davis pointed out that the pre-existing sign that faces Leo Maguire Parkway, was visible for 200 yards; however, the current sign was not visible from a distance, was very bright and had two modes, green and red with a white spotlight. The red light with a white spotlight, activated at 25 MPH, which was perfectly legal. If they had the exact same sign that they already had, the only objection that he had, was the placement behind the two trees, as opposed to being placed in a long straightaway, which can be seen for some distance. However, if they keep the same sign, they were doing the wrong thing for their community, as they were using public money to install an intentional distraction.

Mr. Geary loved the new sign, but would like to put white bars at the major crosswalks, as the paint on the road was ugly. Mr. Laughlin offered to have those painted, as they were District owned streets. Mr. Geary asked if they could paint crosswalks at other spots in the neighborhood. Mr. Yuro indicated that they could and probably should, especially where they were not at a stop sign. Mr. Geary liked the fact that the sign showed red when going faster than the speed limit, as it prompted drivers to slow down, but preferred to have white bars at the crosswalks. Mr. Laughlin would obtain proposals, if the Board was agreeable to painting them. Mr. Yuro was in favor of it. *There was Board consensus.* Mr. Leary asked if the white light was permanently disabled and if the luminescence of the existing sign was taken down, whether that would resolve the issue. Mr. Laughlin indicated that Ms. Taylor asked the vendor to adjust the sign so it turned red at 26 MPH. Mr. Geary would not vote to remove the sign. Mr. Yuro felt that it should match the sign that they had. Ms. Weitzel agreed. Ms. Taylor would have the vendor adjust the brightness and to disable the white light, if possible, obtain a quote for an exact replica of the existing sign closest to the Amenity Center parking lot and paint the crosswalks with horizontal bars. Mr. Laughlin suggested finding out if there was a yellow setting.

ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**Public Comments**

There being no comments, the next item followed.

TWELFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**Approval of Consent Agenda**

- A. Minutes of January 15, 2026 Meeting**
- B. Financial Statements as of December 31, 2025**
- C. Check Register**

February 19, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

Mr. Laughlin presented the minutes of the January 15, 2026 Board of Supervisors meeting, Financial Statements as of January 31st and Check Register for February 19, 2026, totaling \$269,595.35. This included the \$175,000 transfer into the State Board of Administration account.

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

THIRTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Proposals for Security Services

The Board entered into a Closed Session to discuss the proposals for security services at 9:08 p.m. The Closed Session ended at 9:13 p.m.

FOURTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Next Scheduled Meeting – March 26, 2026 @ 6:00 p.m. @ St. Johns Golf & Country Club Meeting Room

Mr. Laughlin stated that the next meeting was scheduled for March 26, 2026 at 6:00 p.m. at this location.

FIFTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Adjournment

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

Signed by:

9A989FE97A6A46D...
Secretary/Assistant Secretary

Signed by:

E55AE2DB2E4542E...
Chairman/Vice Chairman