MINUTES OF MEETING ROLLING HILLS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

The regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Rolling Hills Community Development District was held Tuesday, February 11, 2025 at 6:00 p.m. in the Rolling Hills Amenity Center, 3212 Bradley Creek Parkway, Green Cove Springs, Florida.

Present and constituting a quorum were:

David ChurchChairmanBilly GibbonsVice ChairmanHelana CormierSupervisorDavid BauerSupervisorSusan GibbonsSupervisor

Also present were:

Marilee Giles District Manager Katie Buchanan *by phone* District Counsel

Freddie Oca Riverside Management
Jay Soriano GMS Operations Manager

Keith Hadden District Engineer

The following is a summary of the actions taken at the February 11, 2025 regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Rolling Hills Community Development District.

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS Roll Call

Ms. Giles called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and called roll. Five Board members were present constituting a quorum.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS Audience Comments

Ms. Giles opened the public comment period for agenda items only. She noted there were copies of the agenda on the table provided in the room. She added the Board had adopted Resolution 2024-01 that allows public comments to be limited to 3 minutes.

Resident had a question on the Item IV Consideration of proposals for the amenity center area beautification and exactly what it was. Mr. Soriano noted this will be discussed in the meeting. Ms. Giles noted this had been discussed in prior meetings and the Board had requested additional renderings of the area.

Resident asked about grass area in the back and if you could park on this area. Mr. Soriano provided an overview on the parking and stated they would start to enforce towing. He asked community members to report concerns to Mr. Oca. Mr. Soriano made comments on specific issues with parking and towing and if it continued, he would speak with them and the warnings would stop and they would be towed.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS Approval of the Minutes of the December 10, 2024 Meeting

Ms. Giles presented the minutes from the December 10, 2024 Board of Supervisors meeting and asked if there were any comments, corrections, or changes. She noted corrections were sent to staff via email prior to the meeting from Ms. Cormier to make a change on a name and it will be corrected before the Chairman signs.

On MOTION by Mr. Church, seconded by Mr. Gibbons, with all in favor, the Minutes from the December 10, 2024 Meeting, were approved 5-0.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Consideration of Proposals for Amenity Center Area Beautification

Mr. Soriano presented the proposal for the amenity center area beautification. He noted prior renderings were given by Ruppert Landscape and the pricing was extremely high at \$28,000 for the golf waterfall area in the front. He explained the Board has requested to go out for better pricing, with their contracts they were not bound by using Ruppert Landscape, and he could go to someone else.

Mr. Soriano spoke with another company and noted they were reputable, and he reviewed the pricing by plant. The other company (Pat's Nursery) said he could be the costs of plants by about \$50, with the largest on St. Augustine was \$503 a pallet, they were a little closer to \$450.

He explained the difference in cost but was concerned about warranty issues with 2 contractors working in the same area and if plant were to die, then he would not be able to hold a

claim. For that reason, he did not recommend that process. He noted they went back to Ruppert and came back at \$12,000 with removal of some plants, and tropical plants. He explained some of the tropical plants and concerns with freeze burn and will look dead, burn and other issues. He recommended keeping a small amount along the fence line.

Discussion ensued on concerns along the fence, snakes, the amount of work with \$5,000 for grate work, digging, equipment, and moving of rocks. Mr. Soriano noted his concerns with the cost even with the big drop. He noted he still felt it was a little high and wasn't sure what the Board would want to do. He stated he wasn't sure the Board was 100% on getting rid of the idea of the waterfall, and potential golf down the road. He was concerned with spending \$10,000 - \$12,000 or more on a project and then down the road stating they wanted to get the waterfall working. He noted they were not getting rid of the waterfall but trying to get it working. This is not including the motor; it is just for landscaping. Board stated they remembered speaking about it but not remember seeing the numbers or a proposal. He noted the pumps were another concern, and these costs were on landscaping alone. There was further discussion on the pump numbers for re-doing the motor. They understood Mr. Soriano was going out to speak with someone else to look at it.

Ms. Cormier asked what area this was specifically covering so the audience would understand the specifics. Mr. Soriano explained this was the little waterfall area and noted years ago the original plan was not just the little waterfall, but there was going to be a garden area as well. He added some of this got dropped out with the original developers. There was always the thought they could bring this back.

Ms. Giles asked Mr. Hadden if he still had the renderings. Mr. Hadden noted that back when Lucas designed it, and he was not involved with that. Discussion ensued on the original plots there was a sign that showed the empty lots and at one time there were renderings posted of what it looked like. Ms. Cormier noted she had seen it in 2017, and it was in the garbage can.

Mr. Soriano provided updates on the 1 pump they had the most problems and a quoted with had materials, labor and removal of sod for \$6,744.16 that was given to the Board almost 4 years ago for work to the same area. Board member requested Blue Solutions come out to look at the area.

Discussion ensued on getting Blue Solutions out, quote would be higher now, could be back to \$20,000 for just landscaping, some pricing possibilities, the type and size of plants to be used, the most expensive being the jasmine, the warranties, palm tree replacements, and Mr.

Soriano's experience with them replacing, the look when you enter the community, and needs to be fixed.

Mr. Soriano asked if the Board wanted to move forward with the lower proposal. They discussed the crepe myrtles along the fence, cutbacks last year, the possibility of giving Mr. Oca a not to exceed amount, cutting back plants, getting rid of the crepe myrtle and putting something in its place, current renderings, dates of the last renderings.

Ms. Giles asked the Board if they wanted to open this to public comments at this time. Ms. Cormier asked for the process to be explained so the audience could understand. Ms. Giles explained the process of audience comments and made clarification of the public comment period at the beginning allowing public to speak on agenda items. She stated public comments are closed for Board discussion and will be open during Item 7. Concerns were expressed on being able to see the agenda prior to the meeting, and it was explained the agenda was on the website. There was some confusion on the public comment period and Ms. Giles explained the public comment period was closed at this time and will reopen on Item 7. Audience continued to try and ask questions.

Ms. Giles asked for Board questions on the proposal for area of beautification. Board comments were made on needing the beautification completed, the plants, costs, eliminating some and looking at other alternatives. Mr. Soriano reviewed the different types of plants, the cost, the growth expectation, and it was noted the renderings have a lot more tropical. Mr. Soriano noted the tropical plants will be removed and replaced with basics which are mostly green. It was asked if they did not have an updated rendering at this time. He noted there were not pictures on the renderings. Mr. Soriano explained they will not do renderings each time and will not continue to negotiate on pricing each time. It was recommended to do a not to exceed amount.

It was asked about the waterfall area and if there was a concern if new plants are put in and then work is starting on the waterfall pump. Mr. Soriano explained they would not be taking anything out doing work in the landscape area, the concern was the costs of doing both together. The concern was all the landscaping being done and then contractors fixing the pump and tearing up the landscaping.

Mr. Soriano noted they will run a new electrical line, but this will not affect the landscaping due to the locations of the pumps being under water. Ms. Giles asked if the Board wanted to do

the pump first, could they do that. Mr. Soriano explained the process of the pump placement and how the work would be completed.

The Board was concerned with this going on for so long and decisions need to be made to move forward. Mr. Soriano stated he felt the Board was more worried about the waterfall and not the landscaping. He added this direction was given to us for the beautification at the last couple of meetings. The Board noted it as a combination of both and fixing both. Mr. Soriano stated if the Board could give a not to exceed and take care of the pump first. Ms. Cormier stated this was the biggest thing that items do not work property, and they get flooded out with the design that is in there and so correcting the design once and for all because we don't want to redo it. It was stated the biggest issue is the power source and not having power to run both submersibles.

Other topics were the costs, ideas of a pump house around the area, a not to exceed amount needed, taking care of the pump first and then the landscaping, correcting the design, and how to split the cost for pump and beautification.

Discussion ensued on a not to exceed of \$18,000 and if that would cover the labor and pumps. Mr. Soriano stated if they wanted to do them together, but he suggested doing \$10,000 and landscaping. Ms. Giles suggested splitting the two companies. Mr. Soriano suggested 1 with a not to exceed of \$10,000 and 1 for \$8,000 and that he would need to get with Blue Solutions. Concern was noted on the pump installation, possibilities of a pump house and planting to hide that.

They reviewed the water pump and the design being the reason for flooding and not the pump themselves, so if the electrical design was changed the pumps will last longer. The pump life and the pipes were discussed and repairs as a part of the work. Submersibles were a continued concern. The costs of the landscaping and pumps were discussed and what would be a good number for a not to exceed amount.

Ms. Giles asked for a good number for the Board. Mr. Soriano stated his concerns with the landscaping to hide the structure with bushes and then add the bushes later. He noted he would work with Blue Solutions for quotes on a pump and not submersibles and try to get the best number possible. He recommends 2 different motions for \$10,000

Mr. Soriano recommended two different motions. He explained the process to move forward. After discussion the Board made the decision to go with Ruppert and have a not to exceed of \$10,000. Ms. Cormier asked about the timeline to be completed before or after the pump. Mr.

Soriano stated he would contact Blue Solution to meet him onsite and hope to have a quote for electrical and piping and then give Ruppert the green light to proceed with landscaping. If there will need to be a lot of digging, then he will ask they work with Ruppert and have Katie to draft an agreement.

On MOTION by Mr. Gibbons, seconded by Mr. Bauer, with all in favor, the Proposal for the Amenity Center Area Beautification with a Not to Exceed Amount of \$10,000, was approved.

After discussion the Board made the decision to go forward for the above ground pump with a not to exceed of \$10,000. Mr. Soriano explained they would not include Blue Solutions in the motion and if he could get a better deal he would go with that company. He will ask about a closure for the pump area. Discussion ensued on the size and specifics of motor, if they could have the small enclosure, filtrations, the size, and the costs. It was explained if they could get the costs under \$10,000, they would get the best pricing. The motion was made with a not to exceed amount.

On MOTION by Mr. Church, seconded by Mr. Gibbons, with all in favor, the Amenity Center Fountain Pump Repair Not to Exceed \$10,000, was approved.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Staff Reports

A. Attorney

Ms. Buchanan had nothing further to report.

B. Engineer

Mr. Hadden noted he was in attendance to attempt to address all the questions and concerns from the last few months on the ponds. He reviewed some of the history that got them to this point.

Ms. Giles asked the Board if they wished to open to public comments. The Board requested this was for pond discussion only.

The meeting was open for public comments on the ponds.

Mr. Hadden provided an update on the emails the ponds and discussed the low water levels 6-8 weeks ago, noting then it rained, and the ponds were up, his on-site inspections, explaining the sodding is done from the top to normal water level, he explained that during his walk-through after

the rain the water levels were up to normal, and he added he was out there before he came to this meeting.

Mr. Hadden stated the purpose of the ponds is to take water from 139 roofs, roadways, only about 70 to take the water, the flow of the water into the ponds, the pond is new, other uses, the piping, spraying, the concrete structure PVC pipes, the grass, the rain, and the lifecycle of the ponds.

Residents made comments to the Board on emails asking for their help, last year there was a blue, algae free pond, their concerns and stated they were unhappy with the condition of the LGI pond with algae issues, water levels, and erosion issues. She added it needs to be restored to the original condition when they bought the property. She added she had researched the ownership and responsibility of the ponds, and it was a mess.

It was noted the residents paid money to be on the pond. She wanted it restored by the owners before it comes to the CDD. They asked about who was responsible and they expressed desire to have it repaired.

Mr. Soriano noted the pond is currently owned by the developer and the CDD will get control in the future. The resident disagreed.

Ms. Buchanan made comments that it was a little complicated. She stated they need to look at who constructed the ponds originally. She explained the history of the developer and the process for gaining control. The resident asked the Board for help and said that whoever is responsible for the erosion, the algae, the filling and packing of the pond banks but it was not done correctly. She asked for other ways the pond is supposed to be fed by permit. Mr. Hadden stated no, he had spoken with the St. John Water Management and confirmed it all. She noted it needed to be fixed before CDD ownership, she stated the rain affected all ponds, but their pond was different, and she wanted to know why.

Mr. Hadden commented he was familiar with ponds, that's what he did. He stated this was one of the newest ponds in the district, it was 14 feet deep and is pure sand and settles fast. He noted other ponds had been here for 15 to 20 years. He added he couldn't speak to the algae; he explained overtime the bottom of the pond will build up and there will be less percolating and fertilization. He wanted to take time and wait a few years. The resident wanted it fixed now; it was what they paid for, and commented it was disgusting. Mr. Hadden noted they bought the home and lot from LGI. It was stated this pond was not the same as the other ponds and was there something

different that occurred during the development. Mr. Hadden will bring to the next meeting the original soil report from 25 years ago. He noted there was a creek between her pond and others, and the soil type is different in her pond. He would need to see the specifics of depth. He was concerned he could not find a breach anywhere and there was not a leak there and there was not a leak in the control area. He stated other than evaporation and percolation it did not know what to explain the reduced water elevation.

Mr. Soriano explained through the emails that the pond is owned by the developer and the CDD will eventually get the pond. There was continued lengthy discussion amongst residents and staff regarding resident's unhappiness about the pond algae, water levels, and erosion.

Discussion ensued on the money to buy a house here, the problem with algae on the ponds, residents that spent extra money to be on the ponds, who's responsible for the ponds, needs to be restored to the condition when it was bought. Mr. Soriano noted the ponds are currently owned by the developer, and the district eventually will get ownership and responsibly for it. Resident noted the appearance of the pond was disgusting.

Mr. Soriano noted the Adams Pond was doing the same thing as was discussed at prior meetings more than a year ago and that was before it was conveyed to the district. He added they had Mr. Hadden out to look at it and there was erosion and there was a culvert. He noted once it started raining, they didn't see a problem. He added there were other issues, and with his prior experience with ponds when there is a leak, and they empty and will drop quick. He added he does not think there is a problem, but he relies on an engineer. He added there were other problems, but once they developed homes on the area and it filled up and the covers were removed, which they still have that. It was asked in the newness of the pond will the percolation be affected.

Mr. Hadden commented that the lots have more soaking and given time they will all work the same. He stated before the final payment the county and he walked the pond area, and there was no erosion. He added the land was flat and that was before LGI ownership. A resident spoke about her property not being flat, and complained it was not done properly. Mr. Hadden noted the CDD Board cannot address the LGI problem. He added they can light fires with LGI. The resident stated they had sent emails and after the hurricane the pond went to overflow and within 4 months the level dropped below the original level. She added that is not normal and you do not have to be a scientist or engineer or to have a degree to realize that if you look at what happened in our pond, it's not normal, the erosion was not normal.

Mr. Soriano stated erosion, and algae were 2 separate issues and are not related. Mr. Soriano noted the county investigated the issued by county requirement, and the lots were flat. A resident noted this was incorrect, the city Board addressed the LGI problem, after the hurricane there were issues with dropping in the normal level, and erosion was horrible. He noted they did treat this pond, and there is not a requirement to treat with chemicals. Resident stated again the pond needed to be fixed. She noted even in drought there were continued issues. It was noted it can take years.

The resident commented on the decline of the pond and severe erosion. She noted whoever needs to fix the pond, before the CDD takes it over. She commented on the drought and water level and last year it was the same number of homes and now the issues.

Mr. Hadden stated it takes time, and it was noted the pond was not 100%.

Mr. Soriano stated if the pond wasn't working well, a broken pipe, a leak found from inspections already done by engineers, beyond that a visual inspection can be done but we can always ask LGI, but we cannot demand. He added they have done an inspection around the outside.

Mr. Hadden stated he would offer his services for free, I can come out with you, but I cannot tell you about why they are draining and the fluctuations. He added nobody on the Board or with GMS is trying to tell you they don't hear you. He added the developer was not legally responsible, however he might do it. He added nobody did cause the erosion, and it is not by negligence on their part. The resident wanted to know who is responsible for taking care of the erosion.

Mr. Hadden noted that honestly in his opinion, LGI has more responsibility for fixing your pond slope, because I know what it was when Vallencourt & Waltham finished. He added he would love to have all them all together and his opinion the erosion was not caused by the roofs because the edge of the roof is almost flat. The erosion was before you had sod in your backyard.

A resident asked about as specific roadway and issues. Further discussion was held on drains, roads, the roofs and the culverts are only on the front. Mr. Soriano noted they had started treatment with Lake Doctors. A resident stated it was low.

Mr. Soriano added a month ago they started getting emails on the issue and have been working to resolve. He did not think it will not affect the budget He repeated it was not committed to us yet, but they are treating and need a large amount of water. He added concerns with chemical treatments is a lot of water is needed. He noted the ponds are being treated under the CDD even

though it's not conveyed at this time. He added when they are seen treating other ponds, they make their way around them all.

Resident stated that because Mr. Hadden works for the developer and make designs for the ponds for the developer and is also employed as the engineer for the Board, that seemed like a conflict of interest. Mr. Hadden stated he worked and designed for several CDDs and several other developments, and typically GMS likes to keep the designs for continuity because he knows the history. He added ethically by the State of Florida he cannot tell one thing and then say different. He cannot say something different. The resident stated so you write a letter and say there is nothing wrong with the pond and that it should be the responsibility of the residents and for them to pay for the erosion. He added technically the erosion is on your property. He stated the roof is only on the slope. The resident stated then it should not be our responsibility. Mr. Hadden stated you own to the water. Mr. Soriano added you maintain to the water and that's a little different.

Ms. Giles asked what the residents wanted from the staff regarding this issue.

The resident made the comment on the ownership to the water, and they couldn't put a fence there, then who owns it and who is responsible. It was noted the developer currently owns that property, holds the permit and will have to address it. Mr. Soriano stated when the district owns it once things were working correctly, everything is draining correctly, ponds working, not an issue with low ponds and erosion, the water runoff is operating correctly, the water coming from resident's property is causing erosion on the CDD property. We have to work with the property owners to understand drainage and runoff, gutters and downspouts, he added they have to work with the homeowner to make sure they understand drainage and runoff. Resident added comments on gutter and downspouts and that is a lot different than what is happening now. He added they must fill in holes and maintain an average slope on the pond banks. The holes will not affect it and added St John's Management looks at the average all the way around the pond. He added if they were to take it over, they would be doing the same thing that LGI came out and did. Mr. Soriano's concern is that will go away until the pond is back up and running and operating normally.

A resident asked if it has been checked. The different types of ponds were discussed, and the drainage flow speed and it drains very quickly.

Mr. Hadden suggest a meeting with the 4 of them to look at the ponds, individual lots, get photographs, explain why it is going down so much. The resident stated LGI sold it to us, and it is

not okay, why it is going down, and it looks terrible. Mr. Hadden stated honestly the CDD Board and LGI walked the property no one was trying to do something to make a negative impact of you. He added he has an obligation and is trying to help you.

Ms. Cormier read and email from Mr. Hadden that stated with all due respect; the email that is referred to from Mr. Hadden to the Board states that he had walked the entire perimeter of the pond in question and there is no erosion around the 2 meters and the control structure. He stated the erosion is from the 2 rear lots, and one has had done repair work while the other homeowner has done nothing. The low water level is due to the dry season, the algae can be treated and will go away when the rain comes. He stated he will be available to walk the area with anyone that is needed.

The emails Mr. Hadden sent stated the erosion was caused by 2 rear lots and 1has had some repair work and the other homeowner has done nothing. Mr. Soriano stated he is not pointing just to the homeowners, but he noted LGI still comes out to assist those homeowners. Ms. Cormier stated she could not email this to the residents, but it would be up to Ms. Giles and staff. This was the response from our engineer. This was a chain of emails that was a response from the engineer forwarded from Mr. Hadden that responded to the staff stating he was back out there yesterday and the pond will be fine after the homes are build out and after we get some rain. The 2 areas of erosion are from water runoff from 2 lots and is responsibility of the 2 homeowners. It was noted he will be able to meet with you on-site.

Ms. Cormier stated the residents are upset by the engineer saying the is no erosion and then there is erosion. Ms. Giles asked Ms. Cormier if she met with Mr. Hadden to walk it, and she stated she did not get to walk it with Mr. Hadden. She added she walked it herself.

She added for the record the St. John's River Water Management has come out here to inspect the pond. They have said there are issues with the concrete structure where they did all that back fill and put the sod out. There are cracks in that, and there are straps where a repair job was done. It is not satisfactory to St. John's Water Management, the pond has been flagged, they have sent an email, it was the permit has not been turned over and wanted to speak about maintenance issues with the stormwater system on these projects, specifically on Pond 5. There was a correction made it was Pond #6.

Ms. Cormier continued reading and it was stated that he was aware the pond has been sold to Waltham Development Company however the permit has never transferred for condition

number 16 of the permit. It was asked if they could set a time to talk or let your local person reach out. He replied he was forwarding to Keith Hadden since he was not familiar or had the skill set needed, this will also be forward to another company that is working on mitigation issues.

It further stated that St. John's Water Management knows there are, there are complaints, problems with that pond, it's been red flagged, they will not convey it, and the pond permit is still under the Common Bonds Capital Partner Business, it is realized the property appraisers says it is still under Waltham. However, this letter that Mr. Hadden has said but the property was conveyed from Common Bonds to Waltham to facilitate the construction of the lots by Vallenourt and since the pond area permitted and owned by the CBCP. Since it will be conveyed to the Rolling Hills CDD, the St. Johns Water Management was not transferred to Waltham Development. So that process was skipped. It stated St. John's Water Management will not allow this permit to be transfer to anybody until they say the pond is approved.

Mr. Soriano stated this information will be extra information for Counsel and will help us to make sure it is corrected before we must deal with it. Discussion ensued on erosion, fall off, and losing their permit. He noted they want it to be dealt with before conveyance. It was noted they are in discussion with all parties and there is an awareness of the issues. Other issues were water pressure turned off, leaking pipe repair job was simultaneous with the pond issues, issues with the leaking pipe issues, a possible break under the road and that is county owned, LGI concerned with another area, drain to the culvert, everyone is working to correct this, responding to emails, and Sunshine law issues. Resident asked the Board to get the ball rolling for them to correct the issues. The Board asked the residents to take Mr. Hadden's offer.

Counsel added comments on the ponds, when the plats are done, and construction is complete. The Board has been asked for help and who is responsible to take care of the algae, erosion issues, rain periods, permits, the ponds need to be restored so that residents that may for the area get a clean pond, level of rain, depth of the pond, concern with the continued issues with the pond, past records on the ponds, types of soil, concerns with evaporation and percolation, and reduced water elevation.

C. Manager

Ms. Giles thanked the Board for completing of ethics training and completion of the form 1 no later than July 1st. She added the 4 hours of ethic training for this year is to be completed by December 31, 2025.

D. Operations/Amenity Manager

1. Report

Mr. Soriano reviewed the Operations/Amenity Manager's report to include the updates Blue Solutions working on the pool filter, old turn valves (13) repairs for \$900 per valve, the options for rebuild for \$150 per valve, warranty, and the worst valves will be started the first of this week with Blue Solutions.

A question was asked on downtime of the pool. Mr. Soriano explained the pool can be open and he further explained the process of the valves. He discussed the added security cameras and a map of the placements. He noted this would have to be further discussed in a shade meeting. He wanted to discuss adding further cameras according to the map. He asked for Board concerns to be sent to him. He would need a not to exceed amount. He asked the Board to review the map and make sure it reflects where they want cameras.

Mr. Oca reviewed his report to include past and upcoming events with food trucks, participation, coordination of inspections, landscaping, fitness center repairs, card access system, light pole replacement, LED lighting progress, landscaping and mulching installed, inspections, spring break attendants in the budget, bring in attendants now with the warmer weather, notice about gym, and cleanings.

Board question was asked on who was inspecting the irrigation system and how often. It was stated Ruppert inspected. Discussion ensued on how often they inspected and comments on issues with some specific areas, and contracts.

2. Monthly Quality Inspection Report

It was noted that monthly inspections should be completed.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Supervisors Requests

Mr. Church had no requests.

Mr. Billy Gibbons asked about updates on the access card system upgrade and timelines. It was noted this was in progress, doors replaced incorrectly, timeline for completion, pond issue

and dump truck damage ran over a sign and needs repair, pile of dirt pushed around, question about electrical issue of pool and a request was made for electrician for a proper inspection. Other comments were on several deck lights being out, tree lights, walkway lights, sconces out, other various spots where lights are out, and possible issue with the timers. He noted a complete walkthrough needs to be done with a complete investigation needs to be done.

Mr. Soriano noted some of the lights were on a different line and they will get somone out to check them.

Ms. Cormier commented on the pool, gate not locking, back bathrooms need to be stocked, and cleaned, young people's usage of amenities without adults, better monitoring to ensure the users are appropriate and are either residents or guests. She was concerned about this being addressed before spring break.

Mr. Soriano commented on the printer and the process for access cards, update information on residents, potential trespassing issues, and they can start the access cards for the children. Ms. Cormier asked if the updates had been made for correct information. It was noted the forms are updated with information when they come in for the app. She did not know the people by face as to who got suspension letters and wasn't sure if one of them may have been suspended. He noted some of them are updated and the problem is catching them and having a camera to prove the issue. He stated they do not have cameras everywhere and the residents was suspended and was not supposed to be at the amenity. The process of CCSO catching them and the families were suspended, and no payment has been received at this point. All families are still suspended.

She added comments on the flooring in the gymnasium and the rotted wood with the concrete. The floor was not just the water damage and there was concrete over the wood. Mr. Soriano stated the design was not done by him. He explained the dropping of weights, rubber flooring, the carpet, and causing issues with the flooring. She asked if it was repaired properly, it was not just the water, that was close to the bathrooms, other areas were a concern. Mr. Soriano stated the repairs have been made.

Ms. Giles clarified that the 3 minors are suspended for a year until October 14, 2025. The family members are suspended from all recreational facilities until the gym is re-opened, and 1/3 of the insurance is paid for each family. She explained the children were suspended for a whole year. Ms. Cormier asked if they could get pictures.

Mr. Soriano noted they do not have pictures of the minors, but the videos are available, and the access cards will assist with this issue. The CCSO process of having security photos was explained, cell photo may be taken, but should be reported to the CCSO, but they want to catch them on property. She asked for a data base as the district grows. It was noted this is public information and disciplinary hearings can be held, and all records are kept on file.

Ms. Cormier asked stated the concerns with the ponds have been discussed. She recapped that St. John's Water Management will be the one, when the pond is up to par, they will do everything when names are switched and will take time to figure out. The land is lower than the banks, we need to keep on it and will affect homeowner value.

She commented after review she saw some bills and invoices and saw a name, she asked who he is, and what is his position. Mr. Soriano explained he was the vice president for RMS and the person who signs off on the RMS invoices before they are sent out to the district. Ms. Giles stated he as Operations. Ms. Cormier asked if he was getting paid for operations. Mr. Soriano explained how his job worked, and how he is paid. He noted he was not onsite and Mr. Soriano was the Operations Manager for this site and puts in hours. Ms. Giles asked if she wanted a meeting with him. She did not. Ms. Giles explained you probably saw his signatures on invoices coming from RMS.

Mr. Soriano noted there will be a new person in that position of Operations Director for RMS soon. He is the Director of Operations and provided an overview of RMS and their roll.

Ms. Cormier asked about having a special meeting for the budget process. Ms. Giles noted they could have a meeting if they wished. She stated the budget approval is June 10th, and the adoption is August 12th. She did not anticipate any concerns with the budget. Ms. Comier wanted to address the issues and try to alleviate the long meeting. It was stated they can provide input in the April meeting and decide in April. Ms. Giles noted the normal increases in fuel and pay. She added comments about district counsel costs, paying Board members, notices, and costs.

Ms. Cormier addressed the sand and dirt that is up at the main road and the other areas.

Ms. Gibbons commented about check process and check register. It was noted this was much higher than normal. Ms. Giles explained the process and the payments to the 6 different bonds. She noted she will be glad to come out any time and meet with her. She added Ms. Gibbons was recommended as the go to for checking issue due to her background experience.

Mr. Bauer commented he noted today the volleyball poles are loose. It was noted the base is loose and this will be addressed. Another concern was the bridge, and it was noted this was not CDD property. He noted he has gone out and nailed Boards himself. He was told it could be Boarded up and closed. Discussion was held on students, busing, students walking, county work, cost for repair, pressure washing to look better, and cutting the overhang to get more sun.

Further discussion was held on nailing Boards down, concerns with students riding the bus, costs, the need for a new bridge, and the desire to keep the bridge open as long as he can. Mr. Soriano noted it is on private property and deeded to the county and the changes that will not accept the bridge work. Other topics were to reach out to the school Board to bring bus services to the district, liabilities, and get the parties talking to resolve the issues.

The Board informed staff that a district sign at the second pond, off Bradley Creek, was ran over.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Audience Comments

Ms. Giles asked for audience comments.

Resident requested community activities geared towards less active senior adults. District council explained the Florida statues on allowing bingo for fun but not for money on CDD property. Discussion ensued on laws and regulations on Bingo, any other games played for money, small gatherings, using the amenity center for a Senior Group and waiving the fee for a one-time trial basis. He noted he is trying for involvement for the older residents.

Mr. Soriano commented on the security issues and the money used for off-duty officers, the costs, and the responsibilities. Mr. Soriano discussed the off-duty officers for district property and what they do while here.

The resident asked about the food trucks costs. It was noted the district is not paying them or the use of a scheduler. He asked about the district paying a lady for the Christmas activities. It was noted the district paid for the bounce house, the DJ and the gaming truck.

He asked about the minutes and discussion about the amenity center beautification project on the website and where to find them. Ms. Cormier explained her comments were missing and were not on the website. She expressed concerns with the residents not having the agenda before the meeting. Ms. Giles explained the delay in the minutes the process of approving meeting

minutes and the process of posting the minutes to the website. She stated the residents can see the draft version in the agenda package and the Board then can approve them before they are posted.

Another resident asked Mr. Oca about access to the pool and getting the app and card. It was noted that several people really did not want to use the app, and it was explained that Mr. Oca could make a card.

Resident (Mr. Moore) had concerns about the speeding in the community, the survey, paying for survey and how long it's taking to have the signs posted and the on-going issue with speeding. Mr. Soriano noted a survey was done and the signs were changed out to reflect new speed limits. He added the county deals with speeding and the signs were distributed by the county. Further discussion was held on the signs and that there were still signs that need to be changed out. All 25 mph were changed out to 20 mph.

Mr. Soriano explained the new statute and the police department stating the process of enforcement and allowing them to lower speeds and the officers will not issue speeding tickets. Discussion was held on speeding issues, on the Board ability to approve having the off-duty officers address their times, paying for the off-duty officers, and step ups for problematic areas. It was noted this is not a CDD issue and the county should already be doing that. The boulevard was discussed, one way in and one way out.

Ms. Cormier discussed a letter from previous county commissioners that have said they were going to pay for that road to be developed. Mr. Hadden explained the road situation. It was noted that was not a CDD issue, but the connection of our community is a CDD issue. She stated she has advocated for this and understood the resident's pain and the homes needing the emergency exits and being at the mercy of the county. A comment was made on the signs blocking the sight. Discussed ensued on rules and the roadway issue.

Ms. Cormier added comments about addressing the concern with students and young people removing the blocks at the pool. She asked if they could poll the community to see if there is an interest in starting a RH Swim team or outside agency. Mr. Soriano noted they cannot approve anything different, but they can offer a swim team, and, in the past, there was not enough interest.

Discussion was held on the history of swim team and lack of participation, estimates on the costs of various activities. Mr. Soriano noted that typically this would involve stipends and paying the coaches with estimates of \$3,000-\$6,000 for a summer team, using local high school students, registration fees, timelines, participation, requirements for coaches, Mr. Soriano's history

of swim teams, insurance reasons, hiring a coach around \$2,000, cost for t-shirts and other costs, polling community on interest and actual participation, removal of covers, the swim lanes, clean-up of the pool house, minimal number for participation in the league, the amount of costs for the residents, and the age requirements. Ms. Cormier would like to pursue this interest. He stated that would need 15-20 people interest. Ms. Comier asked about a league and community interest and the process for joining the league here. He explained the meets, travel, awards, and other perks. He noted this is up to the Board and direction and he will find funds (\$200) to move forward. He added finding a coach and putting notices out to residents to see if there is interest in participation.

*Mr. Church left the meeting at 9:01 p.m.

Discussion was held on moving the blocks, the expense for the lanes, deterioration of the blocks, storage, having them during the swim season, removing when they are not used, children jumping off them, individual cost for joining a swim team, age group, and other topics on issues to face.

Mr. Soriano stated no motion is needed just guidance.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Financial Reports

A. Balance Sheet & Income Statement

Ms. Giles presented the balance sheet and income statement through December 31, 2024.

B. Assessment Receipt Schedule

Ms. Giles referenced the assessment receipt with collection at 97%.

C. Check Register

Ms. Giles presented the check registers for \$889,175.95. She noted this is higher than normal due to taxes being collected and paid out to the different accounts.

On MOTION by Mr. Church, seconded by Mr. Bauer, with all in favor, the Check Register, was approved.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Next Schedule Meeting: April 8, 2025 @ 6:00 p.m. at the Rolling Hills Amenity Center

Ms. Giles stated the next meeting is scheduled for April 8, 2025 at 6:00 p.m. at this location.

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Adjournment

Ms. Giles asked for a motion to adjourn.

On MOTION by Ms. Cormier, seconded by Mr. Bauer, with all in favor, the meeting adjourned.

-Signed by:

Marilee Giles

Secretary/Assistant Secretary

DocuSigned by:

Chairman Vice Chairman