

**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, **March 26, 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

Also present were:

Daniel Laughlin	GMS
Wes Haber <i>(via phone)</i>	Kutak Rock, LLP
Branden Marcinnell	Matthews
Stephanie Taylor	Vesta Property Services
Jason Davidson <i>(via phone)</i>	Vesta Property Services
Oscar Meranda	Ruppert Landscape
Chris Cessera	Ruppert Landscape
A.J. Pope	Ruppert Landscape
Sean Froehling	Fast-Dry Courts
Residents	

The following is a summary of the actions taken at the March 26, 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. Four Supervisors were present in person constituting a quorum.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS

Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

March 26, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

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

There being none, the next item followed.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**Amenities Booking Requests – LPA Football Practice**

Mr. Laughlin presented an amenity booking request from Liberty Pines Academy Football (LPA). Ms. Taylor reported that the LPA tried to get approval from Beachside High School and was waiting for their response. Their request was for use of the CDD's field for two days per week. They were told that they had to reserve for any additional practices. Ms. Weitzel asked if it was for varsity or JV. Ms. Taylor confirmed that it was for both. Mr. Sean Spicer, of 421 St. Johns Golf Drive, an Assistant Coach for the LPA middle school football team, confirmed that he signed the forms as one organization, but there were two teams. They were optimistic about getting approval from Beachside, but there were some blackout dates and this was Plan B. Mr. Davis asked if this increased the number of kids that were on the field at one time. Mr. Spicer confirmed that overall, there were less kids than last year. There would be 25 kids for varsity and 25 kids for JV. Mr. Leary pointed out that Mr. Yuro was not present and he did not want to approve this request and Mr. Leary was against the request, given the issues that existed last time, as the schedule dates were not adhered to and there was damage on the field. He also did not like having 50 kids on half of the soccer field. However, he was in favor of approving one day with less kids. Ms. Weitzel asked if it was possible to approve Monday for varsity and Tuesday for JV. Mr. Spicer confirmed that it could work and they would take what they could get, but preferred jointly, due to the lack of coaches. This request was only for 30 days, concluding with a jamboree on May 2nd.

Ms. Weitzel questioned whether they anticipated using the Beachside field in the Fall season. Mr. Spicer anticipated using it in both seasons; however, there were certain days or weeks when they would not have access. Approximately 85% to 90% of the time, they would be at Beachside. Ms. Weitzel pointed out that Thursday was difficult for LPA to use the field, because the field was packed. Mr. Spicer indicated that he selected Thursday, because there were only three options. Ms. Weitzel noticed that it was less packed on Tuesday. Mr. Davis questioned the days that the field was not reservable. Ms. Taylor confirmed that Thursdays, Fridays, Saturdays and Sundays were not reservable. Mr. Davis recalled that LPA using the field

March 26, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

had always been on a trial basis and if the Board approved something, it should be on Mondays for this period only and LPA should be encouraged to find another location for the Fall that was better suited for their needs. Mr. Leary questioned what the Board was being asked to approve. Mr. Davis indicated that LPA was requesting use of the field on Mondays and Thursdays from 5:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. from March 30, 2026 until May 2nd and was in favor of approving Mondays only for use of half of the field, with the understanding that this would be the last time that their request would be approved. Ms. Weitzel was amenable to LPA using the field on Mondays, but not on Thursdays.

Mr. Davis MOVED to approve the amenity booking request from LPA Football to use the soccer field on Mondays from 5:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. from March 30, 2026 to May 2, 2026 and Ms. Weitzel seconded the motion.

Mr. Leary did not think that 50 players using half of the field was a feasible request, as it was unsafe.

On VOICE VOTE with Mr. Davis and Ms. Weitzel in favor and Mr. Leary dissenting, the LPA Football request to use the soccer field Mondays and Thursdays from 5:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. from March 30, 2026 to May 2, 2026 was approved. (Motion Passed 2-1)

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Staff Reports

A. Landscaping Team

1. Report

Mr. Oscar Meranda of Ruppert Landscape reported that in the last few days of February, they cleaned out the mulch beds, removing leaves and installing mulch. Through the first week of March, they completed 200 yards of the shredded brown mulch at the Amenity Center, St. Johns Golf Drive and Leo McGuire Parkway. Cutbacks on the grasses, were 75% completed and were currently working on the palmetto and wood line cutback on Leo McGuire Parkway. It was still on track to be completed by the end of the month, but if for whatever reason it was not completed, he would follow up with Ms. Taylor. They moved back their mowing service to weekly starting on March 16th, with heavy focus on the Amenity Center, Leo McGuire Parkway

March 26, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

and St. Johns Golf Drive. On Day 1, they would focus on the ponds and Leo Maguire Parkway on Day 2 and anything that was not completed, would be on Day 3. On the week of March 16th, they started the weekly mowing cycle. The amenities, St. Johns Golf Drive and the common areas were mow edged, line trimmed and blown. The annual beds received new soil and pre-emergent during this rotation. The team would visit each annual bed weekly, to ensure that the weeds were maintained; however, with the pre-emegent, it was not always 100% guaranteed that the weeds would be suppressed. The week of March 23rd, they continued their mowing rotation throughout the community and completed all of the ponds. They continue to cut back the damaged plants from the cold snaps. All of the islands had the ginger cleaned up. They cut half of the Arboricolas and Hawaiian Ties throughout the community. This was the standard routine that they would have throughout the mowing season, but anything that changed, they would communicate ahead of time and would continue to do monthly ride throughs with Ms. Taylor.

Mr. Meranda submitted irrigation reports. He was informed that the hybrid controller for Area 15 was installed and would confirm it. The main clock was also replaced with a new smart clock. It was programmed and everything was running. There was a mainline break this week, which they quickly repaired. The flowers at the main entrance from Leo Maguire Parkway were struggling, but now that the irrigation was working, they should bounce back. A few valves that were flagged, were shut down and scheduled to be replaced on March 20th. Mr. A.J. Pope, the Chemical Manager for Ruppert, reported that the pre-emergent application was completed two months ago, in order to catch the Spring weeds before they germinate. An herbicide application was started last week and would be completed next week. At the same time, he would be doing the first round of fertilizer on the turf, to provide macro and micro-nutrients to assist root growth and help the overall health of the grass throughout the season. Shortly after that, they would be doing the first granular application for the year. Ms. Taylor asked when they would start to see the weeds die out from the second application of the herbicide treatment. Mr. Pope indicated that right before the second application, they would start seeing some discoloration and necrotic spots on the leaves of the weeds inside of the turf, which was early near week. They were still having some cool nights, which slows down the herbicide, but the hot days would help push it along.

Mr. Pope pointed out that there were two different herbicides; one to treat the majority of the turf along the roadway, which was a two-week application and the other to treat the Bermuda around the ballfield, which was a 30 day second application. Mr. Leary recalled that the

March 26, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

Bermuda adjacent to the sidewalk was sprayed last year but had seen some growth coming back and asked if it was sprayed periodically. Mr. Pope confirmed that it would be sprayed as well. There Bermuda would have a slightly different program, which would provide the same results and same goal. Mr. Leary pointed out that one resident emailed the Board with concerns about the state of the neighborhood. Ms. Taylor confirmed that she received messages about it. Mr. Chris Cessera of Ruppert introduced himself. He was familiar with large CDDs, as he managed the Fleming Island Plantation CDD and was just promoted to Associate Branch Manager. Mr. Cessera previously worked for Valley Crest for 27 years and their Branch Manager used to live in Sampson Creek. His purpose was to come to this meeting to hear the Board's concerns, as Mr. Davidson voiced concerns to him about this CDD and asked him to assist Mr. Meranda. He walked the community and wanted to fix it. His specialty was cleaning up messes, recalled that he had a great relationship with the Board in the past and was not trying to sell the Board anything. Mr. Leary did not realize that Mr. Cessera worked with the CDD in the past when he was with Valley Crest. Mr. Cessera recalled that he started working with BrightView, which was once Valley Crest and was a hands-on manager.

Mr. Leary questioned what Mr. Cessera noticed. Mr. Cessera indicated that in the 45 minutes he drove through the community, going up and down the parkway and walking to the Amenity Center, he noticed cutbacks that still needed to be completed and Winter damage on plants that needed to be taken care of immediately. When pulling into the side entrance of the parking lot, there was 50 feet of Arboricola that was completely dead and going down the parkway, there was Fakahatchee grasses that needed to be cut back, Loropetalum shrubs that had 2 to 3 feet sheets on them and piles of debris all over the property. There were also weeds in beds and leaf drops. He could see the effort that his team has made, but they were nowhere near where they needed to be. However, he believed in Mr. Meranda and with the right support, they could get this turned around and fixed. He questioned overall what the Board's biggest concerns were and what he could do to try to correct them. His concern was that communication was at risk and reporting could be better. The overall attention period should be what they pour into a CDD of this size. Dealing with Fleming Island Plantation and Eagle Harbor, Mr. Cessera understood what the residents and homeowners were paying for and expected to see. Ms. Weitzel appreciated the effort that Ruppert have made, but three weeks ago, this community was an embarrassment. In her eight years of living in the community, she had not seen this community

March 26, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

look in worst shape than it currently looked. In addition, messages that the Board Members received from residents, was not good. Mr. Cessera agreed.

Ms. Weitzel recalled when the Board voted to hire Ruppert, she dissented, as she did not like Ruppert's salesperson. Mr. Cessera pointed out that the salesperson was no longer with Ruppert. Ms. Weitzel felt that it would take a great deal to bring the landscaping up to standard and it would need to happen quickly. Mr. Cessera understood, as there was a great deal of neglect on this property over the Winter months. There was no excuse and this was his first time seeing it. However, he felt that the things that were wrong were fixable and appreciated Ms. Weitzel's honesty. As far as the turf issues and plant material, this Winter was harsh. The lost plant material in North Florida, had not been lost in 27 years, such as the Arboricola. This year, their crew has been faced with more Winter cleanup. The landscaping was confused, as three weeks ago it was freezing and then they were into the 90-degree weather and then it was cold again this week. Therefore, while much of what he was seeing was neglect, most of the outstanding issues, should recover fine during the Spring, but they needed to get into cleanup mode immediately. Mr. Davis was happy to hear Mr. Cessera say that but believed that the Winter cold plant die off was temporary. What troubled him was the condition of the beds out front, because Ruppert was onsite every week. In addition, he was watching areas of grass die and stay dead and the dry areas get bigger. For example, there was one sprinkler head that had been sticking up for weeks, off of St. Johns Golf Drive. It was finally fixed and the grass around it was removed.

Mr. Davis further pointed out another area where Forest Glen Way meets Eagle Point Drive, where Ruppert was proposing to install sod, to replace the dead sod. However, there was a sprinkler head that had not been running for weeks, which caused the dead sod, but on the far side of the street, the grass was fine. In Area 20, which was by his house, the grass was dry. If Ruppert was driving around the neighborhood once a week, they should see these areas, especially the dead grass. In addition, the flower beds looked terrible. In Area 18, the grassy area at the end of Pond 25, the grass was getting thinner and now was completely covered with leaves. Furthermore, the area underneath the Oak trees, Ruppert promised to provide ground cover. Grass was not the right solution. The entire neighborhood would see this area every time they drive in. Mr. Davis wanted it to look green. Mr. Cessera appreciated this insight, as he was learning about the property. There were no excuses, as the cause was sheer neglect. He suggested

March 26, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

having a University of Florida Extension Agent come out and provide an assessment, as there were many solutions that they could come up with such as perennial peanut, which had beautiful yellow flowering. Mr. Leary pointed out that the irrigation was the number one issue. Mr. Polk indicated that they had a new Irrigation Manager, who was cleaning things up in the Irrigation Department and would have him run monthly irrigation inspections. Their crew were not irrigation techs, but they did not need to be. They just needed to tell Mr. Meranda about dry spots. There were internal communication issues, which they were trying to resolve. He was not promising that he could save this community but promised to work with Mr. Meranda to get these issues taken care of, so they could head in the right direction. He would be regularly coming out and riding the property with Mr. Meranda and would provide him with a punchlist.

Ms. Weitzel pointed out that there was neglect over the past several months and was hesitant to keep paying Ruppert. Mr. Laughlin was asked by Mr. Yuro how long mowing was paused during February and March. Mr. Meranda confirmed that no mowing was taking place at all, as it was not needed. Mr. Laughlin pointed out that Mr. Yuro felt that there should have been mowing where needed and proposed having the dead plant material replaced in exchange for previous issues. Mr. Cessera acknowledged that there were many things that they needed to handle and the first thing that he was going to do, was to clean up the mess that they had and was willing to work with the Board on what they could do to accommodate the non-mowing in February. Mr. Davis wanted to green up the dead space, whether with grass or ground cover. Mr. Cessera offered to have his Enhancement Manager, Kyle, walk around and look at all of the plant material, get with the Branch Manager and start replacing it. However, he asked if there were any warranty sod replacements in the past. Mr. Leary confirmed that no sod replacements were completed. Mr. Meranda reported that they performed an audit, got the irrigation up and running and with every inspection, they were repairing every mainline break. Mr. Cessera was more concerned about the areas that Mr. Davis eluded to. Mr. Meranda indicated that the areas that Mr. Davis referred to, were declining due to the cold weather. A Tree Technician came out to evaluate the tree roots and canopies on St. Johns Golf Drive and a proposal was provided to the Board to lift up the trees, to bring in more sunlight.

Mr. Davis recalled that Ruppert promised to address an area underneath the trees on the Hole 17 side. Mr. Cessera would have Ruppert address it, as well as Area 22, which Mr. Davis also requested be addressed. Mr. Davis wanted Ruppert to get the community green, so residents

March 26, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

felt good about the landscaping. Mr. Cessera agreed. Mr. Leary wanted to hear back from Mr. Cessera in a month and to have a community-wide sod replacement program, as many areas needed to be replaced with sod, especially in areas where irrigation was not working. Mr. Cessera pointed out that it would cost money to do so. Mr. Leary understood that they would have to spend money and was expecting the final proposal at this meeting. In his mind, the number one issue was irrigation. However, there were some positive things such as the wood line cutback and clearing out all of the debris along St. Johns Golf Drive. When Ruppert first started, he did not see anyone but felt like Ruppert got the message. Mr. Cessera tells his guys all the time, if they have green grass, clean flower beds and no trash, they would rarely get complaints. Mr. Leary preferred for Vesta and Ruppert to work together to work everything out, so that the Board would not have to provide direction.

- 2. Proposal for Jasmine Pilot in Common Area 13**
- 3. Proposal for Blue Citra Turf Pilot in Common Area 22**
- 4. Proposal for Freeze Damaged Plant Replacements**

Mr. Leary questioned what the Board needed to approve tonight. Mr. Meranda indicated that he provided a sod proposal for Leo Maguire Parkway. The most updated one was provided to the Board. Mr. Laughlin pointed out that the new proposal was for the worst areas. Mr. Leary was in favor of approving the proposal, as it has been discussed for a long time. Mr. Davis pointed out that he did not see any dead grass, driving in off of Leo Maguire Parkway. Mr. Leary requested that Ruppert walk the second half of Leo Maguire Parkway, between St. Johns Golf Drive and Eagle Point Drive, as there was erosion, which he asked to be fixed for three years. Mr. Cessera pointed out if they could get some of the sod approved, he would provide free plants. Mr. Laughlin also presented a proposal from Ruppert, to pilot the jasmine bed on the curblin in Area 13, where the turf was struggling in a shaded area where there were mature Oak trees. They would remove the existing turf, re-grade it and install Asiatic Jasmine along the curblin and around the trees. Mr. Leary questioned the endgame. Mr. Meranda indicated that they discussed testing this jasmine with Vesta, see how it does within the next year and if the Board liked it, they could transition the turf along the curblin on St. Johns Golf Drive into jasmine ground cover. The work would be done in phases.

Mr. Davis felt that this area would collect dog feces, as many people walk their dogs in this area. Mr. Leary asked if Area 13 was on Eagle Point Drive. Mr. Davis indicated that Area 13

March 26, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

was right before St. Johns Golf Drive, where Holes 4 and 5 cross Eagle Point Drive. If the idea was to have a pilot program, Mr. Davis suggested using Golf and Country Club property. Mr. Leary asked why they were piloting. Mr. Cessera explained that depending on the soil conditions and the amount of water in the ground, the jasmine could be difficult. It is beneficial to do a pilot to ensure that the soil pH balance was right. Mr. Davis felt that they would be better off dropping little spots of sod into place, in order to lift it up. Mr. Meranda confirmed that they would not have beautiful sod in Area 13, due to the tree canopies, shade and roots that were spreading sideways. Mr. Cessera suggested doing a mulch bed with some ornamental grasses and bring it out to the curb. Rather than Area 13, Mr. Davis suggested starting with the destroyed areas underneath the big tree next to the basketball court and on the side of Hole 17. Mr. Leary felt that they should start from the St. Johns Golf Drive/Leo Maguire Parkway entranceway to the basketball court. Mr. Davis pointed out that when Ruppert pitched their company to the Board, they informed the Board that they knew exactly what to do with an area like that one, but it has not happened yet. Mr. Cessera promised to make that their main focus.

Mr. Cessera questioned whether the Board was receiving the monthly irrigation reports. Mr. Davis pointed out that the monthly irrigation report did not solve the problem, as every week there was area that was dry and was still dry the next week, which should never happen. Mr. Cessera agreed 100% but pointed out that the monthly irrigation report provided him with a starting point, so he knew who to look at and why things were not getting done. Ms. Taylor confirmed that the irrigation report for this month was received. They received one after the audit but was not receiving it monthly. Mr. Davidson pointed out that he understood the needs of the community and the Board and that there have been some shortcomings, which was why he requested that Mr. Cessera attend this meeting. Mr. Davidson requested a full analysis of everything that the Board was discussing and an action plan. He understood that the Board was frustrated but requested that the Board give Mr. Cessera time to remedy the situation, which was challenging. However, if he could not do so, the Board could look at alternative solutions. Mr. Davis agreed but asked if the Board should approve the sod proposal. Mr. Leary wanted to allow Mr. Cessera and the Vesta team come back with alternatives. Mr. Cessera pointed out that he would schedule a drive through with Mr. Meranda and their enhancement team and would provide an action plan to Ms. Taylor in a week.

March 26, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

- **Tennis and Basketball Court Replacements** (*Item 6D*)

Ms. Taylor requested that the Board discuss the tennis and basketball replacements at this time, as Mr. Sean Froehling with Fast-Dry Courts, was present. Mr. Froehling questioned the history of the courts. Ms. Taylor recalled that the tennis courts were built in 2001/2002 and the last time that it was serviced, was in early 2024. There were cracks before the resurfacing. They did the resurfacing and the cracks came back within months, which was why they were looking at rebuilding them. The asphalt base was disintegrating. In the updated proposal, they were looking at fencing it in.

Mr. Yuro joined the meeting in person.

Mr. Froehling acknowledged that the tennis courts were in better shape than the basketball courts, as the basketball court was showing worse signs. Some fiberglass repairs were made, but there were cracks and some of it was lifting. Therefore, a rebuild of the basketball courts was 100% warranted. In his opinion, the District could get a lower contract amount for the tennis courts and do a resurfacing, as there was much more life in the asphalt. Mr. Leary pointed out that this was exactly what he was asking for. Ms. Weitzel questioned how many years they had until a rebuild was needed. Mr. Froehling believed that they would get many more years out of the asphalt on the tennis courts, as the cracks were mainly paving machine cracks. Fast-Dry were strong proponents of fiberglass and included that in their proposal. The asphalt would crack at some point and the fiberglass either gives the paint more strength to hide the cracks or inhibits the appearance of them. Therefore, they suggested patching all of the cracks and adding fiberglass to everything inside of the fence line. Most of the cracks were not heaved or spalled. There were no dangerous spots, but there were a couple of places where the glass puckered, but that could be a moisture issue. Mr. Froehling reported that there was a great deal of sediment build up on the east and west most courts and recommended before any work was done on the courts, the drainage be improved. There was also a great deal of imminent root intrusion, causing some evidence of lifting. Mr. Davis pointed out that there was one area on the edge by the fence that was torn up. Mr. Froehling would look at this area, because if the Board chooses to do a resurfacing, it should be cut out and patched.

Mr. Davis recalled that the cost to do a rebuild was \$300,000 for all four courts and questioned the cost to do what Mr. Froehling was referring to. Ms. Weitzel recalled seeing a cost of \$282,500 for the rebuild and \$51,500 for the fence. Mr. Froehling indicated that what he was

March 26, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

proposing was \$100,000 less. Ms. Weitzel recalled that Fast-Dry proposed making one large tennis court area and removing the trees. Mr. Davis was interested in hearing that the court would last longer, but the question was whether it would be worth \$200,000 to make the court last a couple of more years or \$300,000 to make it last 20 years. Ms. Taylor recalled when Mr. Froehling's colleague, Amy, came out, she recommended a rebuild, based on the amount of moisture found on the asphalt base, plus the age of the asphalt and questioned why Mr. Froehling felt differently. Mr. Froehling felt that the community could still benefit from a rebuild and believed that Amy was primarily seeing that the cracks were pervasive and were along every single pavement seam. He pointed out that he has been in the business for 11 years and have seen many cracked courts and in his opinion, these tennis courts were not in danger of cracks getting out of control. If they did a resurfacing and repainted them every five years, they would get 10 to 20 years out of them. Ms. Weitzel's biggest concern was that she looked at it as a safety standpoint, because the courts get so much usage. She asked before and received a response from multiple companies that they had two years left before the courts get unsafely played on.

Mr. Froehling indicated that he resurfaced courts all of the time and his opinion was that these tennis courts did not have to be rebuilt. However, the basketball courts should be rebuilt as there was delamination of fiberglass and the lifting of cracks. There was also a drainage issue and felt that some landscape barriers would be helpful. Mr. Yuro questioned the difference in construction time, if they were going to resurface the courts versus having to rebuild them. Mr. Froehling indicated that it would take a couple of weeks to pull the asphalt out, scratch the rock, re-fortify the rock with a few truckloads and re-compact it. Then the asphalt had to cure for 30 to 45 days. Mr. Davis asked if this was to redo the basketball court. Mr. Froehling confirmed that it was to redo either the tennis or basketball court. If it was just a resurfacing, they could do four tennis courts in under three weeks. Mr. Yuro estimated that a re-build would take three to four months. Mr. Leary asked if Fast-Dry subcontracted the asphalt or did it in-house. Mr. Froehling indicated that they work with All Pro Surfaces, their main subcontractor. They had six surfacing crews and a couple of in-house crews, most of which were contractors. It was common to subcontract it out, as most tennis court contractors did not have their own paving crew, as the equipment was extremely expensive. Mr. Yuro questioned the last company that resurfaced the courts. Ms. Taylor recalled that it was Court Surfaces.

March 26, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

Ms. Weitzel noticed dead spots on Court 1 and a slope and felt that Court 4 needed to be looked at. In addition, the fence, was rolling up on the bottom, causing balls to go under the fence and was separating from the pole. She asked if it was \$200,000 to resurface the tennis courts. Mr. Froehling replied affirmatively, which included the rebuild of the basketball court. Ms. Weitzel pointed out that there was a huge difference between a rebuild and resurfacing and she just wanted to make smart decisions with the communities money. She did not want to resurface and have a similar conversation in three years and have angry residents. Mr. Davis questioned what guarantee Fast-Dry provided. Mr. Froehling confirmed that they provided a one-year warranty. Cracks were not covered, but fiberglass was a proactive approach to prevent cracks. Mr. Yuro felt that what Mr. Froehling was saying made sense, as they could get 10 plus years out of it. Mr. Davis asked if the price was \$100,000 if they just did the resurfacing of the two tennis courts. Mr. Leary recalled that prior resurfacing was a fraction of that cost. Mr. Yuro recalled paying \$30,000 for the last resurfacing, but they did not do a full membrane. Mr. Leary questioned the best practice for fencing. Mr. Froehling indicated that it depends on what they choose. If the Board wanted the fence mesh, they would do it first, as they did not want to get paint on the surface, but if the Board chose not to do the fence, they could resurface the courts as is. However, there were some gouges, especially where the fence mesh sunk and it was best to patch it. Mr. Davis asked if a fence redo was in order, as part of this project. Mr. Froehling confirmed that it was the time to do it, as the fence looked terrible. The fence currently had 9-gauge fence mesh, which was acceptable, but they would use a slightly thicker mesh. Mr. Yuro asked if they do anything down at the bottom to prevent it from curving up. Mr. Froehling indicated that they offer a bottom rail option.

Ms. Weitzel was in favor of the resurfacing, but if they were going to do the fencing, they talked about conjoining all four courts. However, if they were not rebuilding, they still needed to have a plan for the middle section, because the trees had to be removed. Mr. Leary questioned why the trees had to go, as they were cutting the roots. Mr. Froehling pointed out that consistently pruning the roots, should prevent root intrusion. Ms. Weitzel did not see the need to have two separate fenced in tennis areas and questioned what they were still going to do in that middle area. Mr. Froehling indicated that they could excavate in between courts. All of the fence options could be done with a rebuild or resurface, as their fence crew would be separate from their surfacing crew. Mr. Leary appreciated Mr. Froehling's honesty but felt that this problem

March 26, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

was messy and they needed to break it down into pieces. Their options were to either keep the courts and fences as they were and resurface them or make aesthetic changes, which was a separate project that they needed renderings for. Mr. Davis recalled that the quotes that they received separated out the tennis and basketball courts. There was also a quote from Ruppert for \$10,000 to remove the existing landscaping and two trees in the middle and a separate quote to redo the landscaping, including drainage solutions for around the edge of the tennis court. On the outside edges of both courts, the ground was higher than the low of the court and there should be at least 1 inch drop from the end of the courts down to the landscaping, with a French drain around it, so the groundwater would have a place to go. He requested a quote from Fast-Dry for the primary resurfacing and a couple of fence options. Mr. Froehling would provide a resurfacing option on the same itemized quote.

Mr. Davis did not recommend, if they did the resurfacing, not joining the courts. Mr. Froehling recommended preparing the area in the middle landscaping for removal and drainage. Mr. Davis preferred to have the fence and landscaping removed and to resurface and re-install the fence in the same configuration. Ms. Weitzel wanted to see the options side by side and questioned the life span of the basketball court, before it was unsafe to play on. Mr. Froehling indicated that there were cracks that were slightly raised but did not see any tripping hazards or anything alarming and questioned whether the Board had a timeframe to rebuild the basketball courts. Mr. Davis felt that if they did a complete rebuild of the basketball courts before the tennis courts get resolved, they were making the wrong move for the residents. They should do something that would solve the residents problems and requested a quote for the resurfacing of the tennis courts and separate fence quotes. Mr. Laughlin pointed out that it was included in the \$282,500 quote. Mr. Yuro wanted the option with the lower rail. Mr. Froehling left the meeting. Mr. Yuro felt that what Mr. Froehling stated made more sense to him, because there was no way that an asphalt tennis court should deteriorate as fast as an asphalt road. Mr. Leary wanted to see an apples-to-apples comparison with all three vendors and questioned whether they all provided the same recommendation. Ms. Taylor confirmed that all three vendors recommended a rebuild and this was the first time that she heard anything about resurfacing the tennis courts. However, when all three vendors provided their proposals, Fast-Dry was the company that she felt was the most proactive dealing with cracks and was the only company that suggested a fiberglass

March 26, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

membrane. Mr. Leary requested that the other two companies provide a bid on a fiberglass membrane and whether they were willing to resurface.

- **Tennis Court Relandscape** (*Item 6E*)

Mr. Davis recalled Ruppert's quote for \$10,700 to remove the existing landscaping and trees all around the tennis courts and a separate quote for \$39,500 for a number of different plants, rock, perforated pipe and a drainage box. Mr. Yuro was not concerned about the \$10,700 removal but wanted to obtain additional bids for the second quote, because anyone could do that work. Mr. Leary felt that at a bare minimum, they could resurface the tennis courts and install landscaping to improve the drainage or aesthetics and requested renderings. Mr. Davis recommended between now and the next meeting, that the Board walk the interior edge of the tennis courts and look at the level of the landscaping, as through the fence line, there were hedges and a mound where the roots causing the water to not get out. The hedges were too close to the courts and needed to be reduced. Mr. Leary preferred to remove the bushes and put in different material. Mr. Yuro recalled that this was part of the \$10,700 proposal. Mr. Marcinell pointed out that it was \$10,700 to remove the landscaping and \$39,500 for drainage and plantings; however, he would not recommend adding a perforated pipe, as there were many drainage structures and recommended doing a trench drain, to get the water away from the courts. Mr. Davis proposed getting a couple of landscapers to tell them what to do, with the goal of getting the level of the landscaping down and ensuring that the water could flow freely through and drain. Ms. Taylor asked if the Board wanted her to get quotes on the exact plant material that Ruppert suggested. Mr. Davis wanted to see what other landscapers recommended. Ms. Weitzel preferred to obtain bids from other landscaping companies, as Ruppert currently needed to focus on the issues that were brought up earlier. Mr. Yuro requested that Mr. Marcinell provide a recommendation on the type of drain.

B. Attorney

Mr. Haber did not have much to report, as the Legislative Session recently ended in Tallahassee. However, there were two big Bills that he wanted to bring to the Board's attention. The first Bill, which he did not expect to impact this District, was the ability for members of a community to recall Board Members, to the extent those Board Members commit certain specified violations in the Statute. There was an entire process where a petition was needed with

March 26, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

a certain number of signatures and an opportunity to respond. If all of that was met, then there was an actual recall election held by the Supervisor of Elections, which must be paid for by the individual seeking the recall. This was due to a District in Osceola County, that had Board Members stealing money from the District, allegedly and then refusing to meet to address the topic. The legislation was sponsored by representatives from Osceola County. The other Bill that hopefully would not impact the District, but had the possibility of impacting it, was regarding sovereign immunity, where certain cases could not be brought against the CDD. But there are a limited number of cases, primarily negligence or tort cases, where someone gets injured, which was the result of a failure for the CDD to properly maintain an improvement that resulted in the injury. In those cases, a lawsuit can be brought against the CDD, but there were monetary limits on the amount that the plaintiff could recover. Those monetary limits were increased from what they were statutorily. To the extent that this District was sued and lost and those higher limits were reached, the District's general liability insurance was still below \$1 million and the District should be in good shape. His office would circulate an update on Bills that were of interest to the Board.

Mr. Leary asked if Mr. Haber would be drafting the field usage agreement with the LPA. Mr. Haber replied affirmatively. Mr. Leary asked if the LPA paid a deposit, as previously there was field damage and they violated the agreement. Mr. Laughlin requested that there be language included in the agreement. Mr. Haber explained if a contractor did something that resulted in damage to the CDD, the CDD would have the right to make a claim, without there being a clause in the agreement. Therefore, there was likely recourse under the law and in the agreement, to address the issue. Mr. Davis thanked Mr. Haber for his response on the email that he sent regarding the speed sign, as he asked Mr. Haber if placement or visual clearance came up in any regulations and if there was potential liability for the District placing a sign too close to a tree, so it could not be viewed. Mr. Haber reported that he did not see anything about the placement of a sign, relating to the distance from trees or obstacles.

C. Engineer

Mr. Marcinell reported that Ms. Taylor contacted him to inquire whether they were able to transfer the ownership of roads and he contacted Mr. Clint Lynch, the Chief Engineer for St. Johns County, who indicated that the Board of County Commissioners had recently been pushing

March 26, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

back on accepting any new roads for county ownership or maintenance and would be surprised if they accepted a 20-year-old road. Mr. Yuro shared earlier with Mr. Marcinell that he looked at this eight or ten years ago and was told that before the Board of County Commissioners would even consider it, the CDD needed to bring the roads up to brand-new levels, which included a video inspection of every storm pipe. However, it would cost \$1 million to do the inspections and make any corrections, before it even got presented to the Board of County Commissioners and it was highly unlikely that the Board of County Commissioners would even accept the roads at that point. Mr. Haber indicated that he represented many developers that established new communities and one of the exhibits that was included in the petition to establish a new CDD, was to show what improvements the CDD was going to finance and construct. They further needed to identify who was going to operate and maintain the roadways. Spine roads like the ones in St. Johns and Sampson, were owned by the county.

D. District Manager

Mr. Laughlin recalled that he was contacted by a company that was interested in purchasing land that the District owns at the entrance of Old County Road (CR) 210 and Leo McGuire Parkway. However, it was a conservation easement, which the CDD could not sell. They then asked whether there were any other areas in the community that they could purchase to develop it commercially. Mr. Laughlin informed them that the Board would not be interested in that at all. Mr. Yuro did not think that anything was available. Mr. Laughlin further reported that the initial plans were to have the budget on this agenda for discussion; however, they were still finalizing it but provided a rough draft to the Board. He planned to meet with Mr. Davidson and Ms. Taylor, to discuss each individual line item and obtain Vesta pricing. At this time, the preliminary increase was 2.6% or \$41 for the entire year. The budget would be on next month's agenda for discussion purposes, as the Board would not be approving it until May and adopting it in August. When the budgeted was adopted, the Board could lower the price but not increase it.

Ms. Weitzel asked if the concerns raised by the Board to Ruppert were not satisfactory to the Board and the Board needed to look elsewhere, whether this needed to be decided for budgeting purposes. Mr. Laughlin indicated that it should be approved prior to the budget adoption. When Yellowstone was the landscaper, the landscaping line item was \$201,000 and it was possible that some of the companies could honor the prices that they submitted previously,

March 26, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

as long as it was under the \$195,000 threshold. However, there could be a contingency line item, but if they had issues through August and wanted to switch landscape companies, they could engage another landscape company or remove the contingency line item. Mr. Yuro questioned why there was a 62% increase in water. Mr. Laughlin noticed that it increased from \$18,000 to \$30,000 and believed that it was due to the mainline breaks. Mr. Yuro pointed out that most of the mainline breaks were at the pump house. Mr. Davis recalled where tons of water was coming out into the street. Mr. Leary estimated that almost half of the year, \$12,000 was spent on water. Mr. Yuro requested that staff review the water bills.

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. In the Pond Report, she asked Lake Doctors to check the bulkheads at each pond, as they were approaching growing season. Everything looked good except for Pond 25A. Lake Doctors planned to spray this pond earlier this week, but due to the wind, they were unable to and were aiming for tomorrow.

5. Proposal for Fountain Nozzle Repair

Ms. Taylor reported that the pond fountain nozzle broke again. The contractor was able to come out and fix it and proposed installing a premium nozzle, which was made out of sturdier material, as the current one was made out of two pieces, which break when joined together. The cost for the premium nozzle was \$605, which she could approve, but wanted to bring it before the Board, as it would change the height of the fountain.

On MOTION by Mr. Yuro seconded by Ms. Weitzel with all in favor the Proposal from Lake Doctors for the fountain nozzle repair in the amount of \$605 was approved.

Mr. Davis questioned why someone would sell the District something that was in two parts, versus one. Ms. Taylor did not know as it was a cheaper version. Ms. Weitzel recalled

March 26, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

forwarding an email from Mr. Williams, who complained about the trash and debris that was building in the lake and questioned whether this was done by Lake Doctors. Ms. Taylor confirmed that Lake Doctors mainly did algae treatments and if they pulled out algae and trash, it was an additional fee. Ms. Weitzel pointed out that according to the email, there was massive trash and debris on Cross Pointe Way, between 1876 and 1900. Mr. Leary believed that this was the homeowners responsibility. Ms. Weitzel requested that someone respond to Mr. Williams. Mr. Davis pointed out that his property was behind Pond 25 and he was picking up trash regularly. Mr. Leary felt that it was appropriate for Ms. Taylor to respond to Mr. Williams.

Ms. Taylor reported that there were a couple of crosswalks that needed to be painted. A color-coded map was provided to the Board. The blue lines were where people were crossing the street, but there was no stop sign, such as from St. Johns Golf Drive to Drury Court. There were five crosswalks, but one of them was on Forest Glen Way, against a cul-de-sac, which was not necessary. The purple ones were where the flow of traffic was going in one direction, but had a stop sign in the other direction, such as from Glenfield Crossing onto Foxtail Court, where someone could turn without having to stop, but had to stop at Foxtail Court to turn onto Glenfield Crossing. The red ones were where stop signs were all around the intersection. It would cost \$200 for a new crosswalk. There was also a proposal from Duval Asphalt to repaint all of the stop bars and current crosswalks, in the amount of \$4,000 and an additional \$800, to paint the four that were blue where there was no stopping, for a total amount of \$5,000. If the Board wanted to just paint the four that were blue, she requested that the Board approve a not-to-exceed amount of \$1,000. Mr. Marcinell recommended re-painting all of the crosswalks, even the one in the cul-de-sac, due to the liability of excluding a single one. Mr. Yuro pointed out that the blue ones, where there was a crosswalk with no stop sign, should have a crossing sign.

Mr. Marcinell reported that when he was performing an inspection for the curbing, he noticed a painted crosswalk and another section and sidewalk near it, that was not painted. It was odd to have two of them back-to-back. Ms. Weitzel asked if a push button was needed. Mr. Yuro did not think that it needed one. Mr. Yuro was not against the proposal but wanted to know if it was thermoplastic versus paint. Mr. Marcinell pointed out that it was a raised layer that was used on crosswalks for longevity and for people that were blind. Mr. Yuro preferred thermoplastic over paint, as paint fades. Shearwater just repaved a section of road that was half a mile or three quarters of a mile and were using thermoplastic striping on all of a stop bars and center striping.

March 26, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

If Duval Asphalt was repainting all of the stop bars and crosswalks with thermoplastic for \$4,000, Mr. Yuro was in favor of it. Ms. Taylor would come back to the Board with that information and an updated proposal. Mr. Leary requested photos of the locations.

6. Slide Colors

Ms. Taylor reported that the slide resurfacing was going to be scheduled; however, the color schemes, did not fit their current colors and requested Board approval. The slide colors were included in the agenda package. Their current colors were Traffic White with a hint of Ivory. Ivory and Tan would be too close to the color of the actual structural beams. Mr. Davis asked if Ms. Taylor had a recommendation. Ms. Taylor felt that Traffic White was closer to what the slide currently had but was concerned with how bright it would be and the amount of pollen that would show on it. However, they could ensure that maintenance stays up to date on the pressure washing. Ms. Weitzel questioned why they would not go with Ivory. Ms. Taylor was concerned that Ivory would clash with the beam color. Mr. Laughlin suggested Window Grey. Ms. Weitzel thought that Grey was pretty and assumed that the pollen and all of the dirt would show less on Grey than White. Mr. Yuro did not have an opinion on colors. Mr. Davis preferred to go with Ms. Taylor's recommendation.

7. Proposal for Speed Radar Sign

Ms. Taylor reported that Mr. Don Clark of Stripe Zone was able to perform an onsite visit and dimmed the brightness of the radar sign and permanently disabled the white lighting. There was a noticeable difference while driving at night. A quote was provided for an exact replica of the sign that was next to the Amenity Center parking lot. There was a big difference, as the sign that was further from the Amenity Center, was \$700 to \$850 and the sign that was closest to the Amenity Center was \$7,000. Mr. Yuro pointed out that when the sign was approved, two signs were approved. Mr. Laughlin recalled that the Board approved a not-to-exceed amount for two signs. Mr. Yuro indicated that only one sign was approved, because the Board had issues with the location of the other sign. Mr. Leary recalled that the vendor came back to the Board and stated that there were more options for these signs and the Board assumed that it would be the same spec, but the actual sign cost was significantly lower than the original sign that was installed. Mr. Laughlin believed that the sign closest to the Amenity Center was a radar sign, which was \$3,050. Mr. Leary asked if it included the sign and the post. Mr. Laughlin replied

March 26, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

affirmatively. Mr. Davis pointed out that first sign was for the inbound traffic and had yellow numbers. Mr. Laughlin confirmed that this was the \$3,050 sign. Mr. Davis questioned the cost for the new sign, which was white with green and red numbers, facing outbound traffic. Mr. Laughlin indicated that it was \$6,150. Mr. Davis questioned whether they had to spend any more time and money, as the most important problem, was resolved, but felt that the green and red numbers were still too bright and the placement of the sign was not appropriate. It should be brought into the neighborhood and be visible by 100 yards without any obstructions but did not know if it was worth doing any changes at all. Ms. Weitzel agreed with lowering the brightness of the red and green and if the speed limit was 25 miles-per-hour, it should be green.

8. Proposal for Tree Canopy Life

Ms. Taylor presented proposals with Taylor Tree Services in the amount of \$50,000 and Quills Tree Services in the amount of \$45,000, to lift up the tree canopies on sidewalks and roadways. There was a third proposal, but it was much higher and was not included. Taylor Tree Services did quite a bit of work in this community and helped with cutting down any dead trees in the preserves. Quills Tree Services lifted tree canopies in 2023. Mr. Yuro questioned the amount spent last time. Ms. Taylor recalled that \$38,000 was spent. Ms. Weitzel asked if staff was happy with the job that Quills did last time. Mr. Laughlin did not receive any complaints. Mr. Yuro was in favor of lifting the tree canopies, as they would get complaints from the School Board. Ms. Weitzel preferred to use the same company as last time. Mr. Leary questioned where they would get the \$38,000 from. Mr. Laughlin indicated that it would come from capital. Mr. Laughlin pointed out that Taylor Tree would elevate tree canopies eight to ten feet over the sidewalk, but Quills would elevate them 10 feet. Ms. Weitzel asked if this work could be completed over the Summer, as there were only two more months of school. Mr. Laughlin noted that the ideal time was when the trees were dormant. Ms. Weitzel was concerned that during the growing season, the trees would grow faster. Ms. Taylor pointed out if the tree company could schedule the work as soon as possible, they would not have additional growth, but if not, they should do this work in October/November. Mr. Yuro suggested including this item in the budget and budgeting \$15,000 to \$20,000. Mr. Laughlin would add a General Fund line item for tree trimming. Ms. Weitzel preferred to wait until October. Mr. Laughlin recommended including it as a capital expense in the budget.

March 26, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

9. Proposal for Streetlight Pole

Ms. Taylor reported that it took some time to find the closest match to their current streetlight pole, which was taken down in an accident, because they did not make it any more. As a result, she worked with a lighting company and found out this morning from Beacon Electric, that they could not replace the streetlight pole that had two light fixtures on it, in the medians. It was helpful to have lights in the medians, as it lights up both sides of the road. It was not the best option to have one light fixture in those medians, as it would not give off enough light and would meet with the lighting company representative and their installation crew representative, to discuss what they had and requested that this item be placed on hold. In the Reserve Study, it was tentatively scheduled to replace these light poles in the next three years and if the Board selects a streetlight pole and decided to do this project in the next three years, the light would have to be replaced again. Mr. Yuro asked if they were only replacing one light pole. Ms. Taylor was only planning on replacing one at this time but did not want to replace it with something that they could not match. Mr. Davis requested a side-by-side comparison. Mr. Yuro recalled replacing one light pole five or six years ago on CR 210, which looked different than all of the other ones, but it was close and suggested that Ms. Taylor see who the vendor was. Mr. Davis asked if the driver's insurance was covering the replacement of this pole. Ms. Taylor indicated that the CDD would pay for it and the insurance company would send a check.

Mr. Laughlin recalled that in one community, a large monument got hit and the proposals were provided to the driver today and their insurance company was already cutting a check, but there were times where the insurance company requested proof of payment and recommended not doing anything until the pole was being replaced. Mr. Davis pointed out that the Board could decide not to replace it this year and replace all 10 poles later. Mr. Laughlin indicated that they could not wait years, but it could take as long as four or five months. Mr. Leary pointed out that the Reserve Study indicated that streetlight poles may need to be replaced, but that did not mean that they would be replaced. Mr. Davis requested that they match the pole as close as they could and get it replaced; however, they should choose one that has the option of a double light. Mr. Leary asked if they were looking at the level of illumination at the entrance ways, especially the one at Leo Maguire Parkway, as it could be brighter. Ms. Taylor indicated that this was one of

March 26, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

the things that she was talking to their installation team about and planned to discuss this with the lighting team, as she would like more illumination.

10. Proposals for Painting Golf Cart Bridges

Ms. Taylor presented a proposal from Tropical Pressure & Painting to repaint the golf cart bridge off of CR 210, in the amount of \$6,400. She asked for some updates and Mr. Mark Burdetsky was able to add in the lighted caps to the railing posts and a step on either side of the bridge, to make it easier to get onto the bridges. That raised the cost of the proposal from \$5,800 to \$6,400. Ms. Weitzel questioned when this work would be completed. Ms. Taylor indicated that they held off on pressure washing of the awning poles and entrance monuments, because she wanted to see if the Board was interested in painting and pressure washing the bridges. Therefore, if the Board were to approve the work, it could be scheduled relatively soon. Ms. Weitzel voiced concern that they were approaching prom season and the bridges would be heavily used. A quote was also provided to pressure wash and repaint the bridge closest to the Amenity Center parking lot, which was in the amount of \$4,200. She contacted Mr. Chris Reiner at the golf course but had not heard back from them. Mr. Leary pointed out that he received an email from the club saying that Mr. Reiner moved to a different club. Ms. Taylor was not aware of this and would reach out to the golf course. Mr. Leary indicated that the bridge closest to the Amenity Center needed to be repainted, but it should be paid for by the golf course, as the golf course owned it. Ms. Taylor would inform Mr. Burdetsky to proceed with these projects and to hold off on the bridges until they learned more.

Ms. Taylor reported that in addition to Robert's daily tasks, there were a couple projects that he was focusing on in the upcoming month. He will be cleaning out the debris in storm drains throughout the neighborhood, due to the number of leaves dropping this season and the recent storm. He completed pressure washing and deep cleaning of the pool deck, to ensure that they were ready for Spring Break. He was going to strengthen the stop sign at Stonehenge Trail Lane, where Cross Pointe Way intersects, as it was crooked and would then focus on strengthening the golf cart wooden posts that were near the playground/volleyball court, which were also crooked. Ms. Taylor did not have an update on the sidewalk repairs, but it was tentatively scheduled for April 6th through the 9th, as long as they did not have any bad weather. Information would be sent out to residents. Andrew was going to provide a comprehensive

March 26, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

proposal of all the replacements, as well as a history of all of the repairs that were made in the community. Mr. Davis pointed out that the panel in front of 413 St. Johns Golf Drive was still not replaced. Mr. Yuro noted that a panel in front of his house had a large gap and should be replaced sooner rather than later, as it was next to a school bus stop.

Ms. Taylor obtained two proposals for the meeting room flooring and was obtaining a third one. She would provide all proposals to the Board at the next meeting. She would also have color and flooring samples and requested a Board liaison, to ensure that the flooring recommendations that they receive, the Board was happy with. However, it was difficult to find a match, because the walls had both cool and warm tones. Ms. Weitzel questioned whether they should put much effort into it, as they were talking about eventually upgrading the meeting room. Mr. Laughlin pointed out that the Board needed to decide what route to take. Mr. Leary recalled saying at the last meeting, that if the floor was broken, it needed to be fixed but recommended not putting much time into choosing colors. Ms. Weitzel felt that the floor needed to be fixed prior to Summer Camp. Mr. Laughlin recommended discussing this matter further during the amenity meeting room upgrade. Ms. Taylor reported that the swing set sets have been installed and was waiting to hear back about the wooden slats. She planned to look for a different vendor. She had not obtained any quotes for the benches and picnic tables. Ms. Weitzel recalled that a resident emailed pictures of the playground climbing structure, which had peeling paint. Ms. Taylor reported that Robert was able to cut off the peeling material and it was not sticking out any more.

Ms. Taylor reported that the Amenity Center sign had many moving parts to it and would be an ongoing conversation. They needed more information on the best route to go in for the St. Johns Golf Drive sign, as the root system was up against the sign. Therefore, putting in turf would not be a good idea and recommended having a mulch bed with some plant material. The poles for the sign match the rest of the community but questioned whether the Board wanted it to match the light poles. In the meantime, Robert was going to cut the poles so they would be straight and at the same height and cap it off. Mr. Davis asked if these poles were by the Amenity Center and if they were not the same height. Ms. Taylor replied affirmatively. On one of the poles, the cap got torn off and the top of the pole was crooked. The other one was perfectly fine but asked if the Board wanted the sign posts to be the same color as the streetlight poles. If that was not the case, she could stick with the same poles. Mr. Yuro wanted the color to be the

March 26, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

same as the streetlights, signs and mailboxes. Ms. Taylor pointed out that at the next meeting, she would bring renderings for a new bigger sign. Spring Break was last week and there were new lifeguards. She spent most of her time on the pool deck and heard good things about their certification weekend and the quality of the lifeguards. They were going to start having audits in May in order to be rescue ready and a flyer would be sent to residents, as they would see lifeguards jump into the pool. Mr. Davis asked if they had lifeguards every weekend. Ms. Taylor confirmed that they would have lifeguards on weekends leading up to the end of May and then every day during the Summer.

Regarding upcoming events, they had a raffle for their mobile access registration form. Of the 70 households that participated, three went home with a nice cookie basket. A Spring paint workshop was held on the last Saturday of February. There was supposed to be a Spring Break bash on Tuesday, but it was 58 degrees and it was moved to Friday. Clarks Critters would be there with their reptiles. There were hot dogs, ices and live music. This Saturday was the Spring Fling, which was their Easter event. They would have inflatables, Easter crafts, the Easter Bunny and Easter egg hunt, which starts at 12:30 p.m. Movie on the Lawn was on Friday, April 3rd, with a showing of the movie Zootopia 2. On April 11th, there were going to be two events. In the morning, there was a Spring community yard sale and in the evening, there was a 21 and up Family Feud night. To finish out April, they were having a Resident Appreciation Day, where residents would receive free ice cream from Brewsters. In regards to Summer Camp, last year, the Board allowed non-residents and questioned whether the Board would allow non-residents this year, as they were at a plateau with 15 kids. Ideally, they wanted to have 30 kids. Her plan was to have non-residents who were connected with the community or the relative of a resident who lived in the community but not push it out to neighboring communities. Mr. Yuro was fine with this, as long as they were not preventing residents from joining.

Ms. Weitzel reported that many residents wait until closer to Summer Camp to register and wanted residents to have the opportunity to sign up. Ms. Taylor did not want to push it out to non-residents until after the Spring clean, as they would be promoting upcoming events, such as Summer Camp. Ms. Weitzel thanked Ms. Taylor for bringing back many of these community-based events like the paint workshop and Spring Break bash. Mr. Leary asked if Ms. Taylor had an update on the budget request that she was planning to make, which was to increase Robert's hours. Ms. Taylor did not have the numbers and would provide it at the next meeting; however,

March 26, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

Robert was currently part-time, working 20 hours and would like for Robert to work full-time at 40 hours. Mr. Leary felt that they should be looking for some offsets in the budget, as the hope was for Robert to substitute in some third-party work. Ms. Taylor pointed out that the pressure washing and storm drain cleaning were done by a third-party vendor, as Robert runs out of time. Mr. Davis requested better coverage on trash pickup in the forests. Mr. Laughlin pointed out that there were offsets in the budget for specific items, but what would be affected, was the repair and replacement (R&R) line item.

SIXTH 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. Davis felt that the pool deck renovation was a brilliant project and it should be completed. However, he would like to revise his statement made at the last meeting on the amenity meeting room upgrade, as his favorite things on the room renovation were the windows that face the pool and additional storage space. With those two items, he would support the project but was not confident in the design and questioned whether they would fund it with a bond or a bank loan and requested presentations on these two funding mechanisms. Mr. Laughlin pointed out if they were not going to use the bond funds that they already had, MBS could make a presentation. However, the cost of issuance of a bond would be approximately \$200,000 to \$300,000. The other option was to take out a private five-year bank loan. Ms. Weitzel pointed out from a resident perspective, she wanted to know where they were going with this, because they seem to have the same conversation every month. She wanted to know the status of the projects and where the Board was heading. Regarding the tennis and basketball court replacements, Mr. Laughlin indicated that bond money could be used for the engineering report but did not know if the resurfacing with fiberglass was considered to be a maintenance item or enhancement and was looking into that. However, it was possible for the tennis court resurfacing, to be paid out of the capital. At this time, there was healthy capital.

Regarding Ms. Weitzel's question, Mr. Davis recalled that the Board spent the last three months discussing the basketball court, as it would cost \$400,000 to rebuild them and now all of a sudden, they were discussing resurfacing the tennis courts. Ms. Weitzel pointed out that these

March 26, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

conversations were taking place prior to her being on the Board and felt that the Board needed to start making decisions on the direction. Mr. Leary recalled that the amenity meeting room was discussed for two years and up until the last meeting, felt that the Board was moving ahead with that project. In addition, a great deal of money was spent on designs and bids. However, he felt that the pool deck and meeting room upgrades, added a tremendous amount to the community and liked the designs as they were. He proposed having the two meeting room bidders attend a meeting, so they could discuss the project and share some ideas and thoughts, as well as having the top bidders on the pool deck renovation attend a meeting. He would also like to look at the least cost to get the tennis and basketball courts fixed and taking out a loan. Mr. Yuro did not disagree and was of the opinion, if the money was set aside, the money should be spent on these upgrades, but if they wanted to take out a loan or a bond, that was a different conversation. However, if they were looking at a loan or a bond, they should communicate that to the residents, to make sure that the residents were aware that the Board was obligating them to spend additional money. Mr. Davis pointed out if the tennis courts were \$60,000 instead of \$300,000, then they had enough money in the existing bonds. Mr. Laughlin must confirm that the prices were still the same.

Regardless of the recommendation of the vendor today about the basketball courts, Mr. Davis felt that they could let it go longer, as residents were not asking for it. Mr. Yuro felt if they did the basketball courts ahead of the tennis courts, there would be an uproar from residents. Mr. Davis agreed. Mr. Leary pointed out that the amenity room upgrade was \$295,000. Mr. Davis recalled that the pool deck renovation was \$189,000. Mr. Laughlin indicated that the lowest bid was \$164,000. Mr. Davis felt that both projects would be valuable to residents but did not need MBS to do a presentation at this time, as he wanted to wait for the tennis court quote. However, he liked Mr. Leary's suggestion of having the vendors come before the Board to discuss the amenity meeting room and pool deck renovations. Ms. Weitzel recalled that they had renderings of the windows and asked if they had renderings of the upgraded furniture. Mr. Yuro believed that they had all of the designs. Mr. Yuro did not think that it hurts to hear from the vendors but felt that there was vagueness in the pool proposal. Mr. Laughlin pointed out that the pool proposal was updated by Urban Edge. They submitted off of the plans that ETM provided for the splash pad and provided different options. Mr. Laughlin would reach out to the vendors and ask

March 26, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

them to attend the next meeting. Mr. Davis requested a list of projects for future agenda packages and including the space between the tennis courts on this list.

D. Tennis Court Landscape Demo

E. Tennis Court Relandscape

Mr. Laughlin presented a proposal for the tennis court landscape demo, which was for the removal of all of the landscaping around the tennis court and a proposal for the tennis court relandscape. They were not at the point of replanting. Mr. Leary pointed out for the tennis court landscape demo; he wanted to be clear about the problems that they were trying to solve. Mr. Laughlin indicated that the drainage needed be solved. Putting in the landscaping was an aesthetic matter. Mr. Davis pointed out that they needed to wipe out all of the existing landscaping in order to fix the drainage. Mr. Yuro noted that the roots were definitely an issue. Mr. Davis indicated that the biggest issue was whether to remove the two trees or just trim the roots. Mr. Leary felt that they needed to break it out into bare essentials, fix the existing courts and define it clearly. Mr. Laughlin pointed out that maintaining the landscaping falls under maintaining what they currently had, as they were just demoing it and re-building it. He would include this on the capital improvement list, under tennis court median renovation and include the basketball court rebuild. Mr. Davis noted that whichever project they do, they should go through the effort of improving the drainage, to extend the life of the replacement.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Contracts Review

There being no comments, the next item followed.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Supervisors' Request

There being no comments, the next item followed.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Public Comments

No public was present.

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Approval of Consent Agenda

A. Minutes of February 19, 2026 Meeting

B. Financial Statements as of February 28, 2026

March 26, 2026

Sampson Creek CDD

C. Check Register

Mr. Laughlin presented the minutes of the February 19, 2026 Board of Supervisors meeting, Financial Statements as of February 28, 2026 and Check Register for March 26, 2026, totaling \$113,020.32.

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

ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Proposals for Security Services

The Board entered into a Closed Session to discuss the proposals for security services at 9:07 p.m. The Closed Session ended at 9:23 p.m.

On MOTION by Mr. Yuro seconded by Ms. Weitzel with all in favor the proposal from Central Security for seven days per week security services with no car and unarmed guards in the amount of \$84,448 was approved.

TWELFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

**Next Scheduled Meeting – April 16, 2026
@ 6:00 p.m. @ St. Johns Golf & Country
Club Meeting Room**

Mr. Laughlin stated that the next meeting was scheduled for April 16, 2026 at 6:00 p.m. at this location.

THIRTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Adjournment

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

Signed by:

9A989FE97A6A46D...
Secretary/Assistant Secretary

Signed by:

E55AE2DB2E4542E...
Chairman/Vice Chairman