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, **August 12, 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 Church	Chairman
Billy Gibbons	Vice Chairman
Helana Cormier	Assistant Secretary
David Bauer *by phone*	Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

Marilee Giles	District Manager, GMS
Katie Buchanan	District Counsel, Kutak Rock
Freddie Oca	Riverside Management
Keith Hadden	District Engineer
Jay Soriano	GMS

The following is a summary of the discussions and actions taken at the August 12, 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. Three Board members were present constituting a quorum. Mr. Bauer participated by phone.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS **Audience Comments**

Ms. Giles opened the public comment period for agenda items only. Ms. Giles noted there were several audience members in attendance and there were copies of the agenda provided. She added comments are limited to 3 minutes. Ms. Giles clarified that the public comment period is open for all audience members, not just residents and is limited to comments on the agenda. She added there is a public hearing for public comments.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS **Approval of Minutes of the June 10, 2025 Meeting**

Ms. Giles presented the minutes from the June 10, 2025 Board of Supervisors meeting for approval. Ms. Cormier asked if there was any way to strike the word “pond” in the tenth order of business, second paragraph.

On MOTION by Mr. Church, seconded by Mr. Gibbons, with all in favor, the Minutes of the June 10, 2025 Meeting, were approved as amended 4-0.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS **Consideration of Proposals**

A. Fence Install Around Amenity Center *(under separate cover)*

Ms. Giles stated there are two proposals. Mr. Soriano presented the 2 proposals. He explained this was for the fencing and a verbal proposal. He explained the specifics of the proposal, and other possibilities and there was time for this to be completed. He stated he was comfortable finding more proposals and getting a written proposal. He outlined and discussed the costs. Mr. Soriano will ask for the proposals to section out the jobs, supplies, labor, warranties, and costs. He explained what the warranty would cover.

After discussion this item was tabled, and Mr. Soriano will bring back more proposals to include labor and materials.

B. Recoat Zero Entry at Splash Pool *(under separate cover)*

Mr. Soriano explained the proposals with Blue Solutions is for $7,200 for the grinding and to smooth and put in new concrete material. He noted he is waiting for another proposal. Ms. Cormier asked for clarification this was just for the splash pad area. He commented it was, and this is the same company that has done most of the other work.

A motion was made by Mr. Church.

It was asked if Mr. Soriano was comfortable with this. He explained he was, and they have worked with other Districts. The Board felt companies get comfortable. He discussed the timeline and getting other proposals. There was not a second to the motion. Ms. Giles stated the motion dies.

Mr. Soriano explained the amount of work to be completed. He asked if the Board would like for him to explore other proposals. Ms. Cormier stated it was good to keep everyone honest. She asked if they would be willing to throw in anything extra. Other jobs were discussed.

It was asked about having them repaint the area that faded. He added most of our agreements include a warranty within one year. It was asked if there were other companies that are used. He discussed the license work and other contractors. Crown was discussed and getting the lowest price was not always the best quality.

The first motion died, and another motion was needed. After discussion the motion was made with at not to exceed of $7,200. Mr. Church offered to work with staff. Ms. Cormier stated she would like to work with staff.

On MOTION by Ms. Cormier, seconded by Mr. Church, with all in favor, the Blue Solutions for a Not to Exceed of $7,200 and Authorizing Ms. Cormier to Work with Staff, was approved 4-0.

***Supervisor Bauer left the meeting at 7:45 p.m.**

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS **Discussion of Conservation Easement for Upland**

A. Partial Release of Easements

Ms. Giles stated this item is for the easement of the conservation area. She reviewed the June 7th, and the July 8th letter with the maps.

Ms. Buchanan explained this is a two-part item. The first is the consideration of whether the District would like to accept ownership of the 211 acres of property that has already been classified as a conservation easement. She explained that the CDD accepting ownership of the conservation easement land appears consistent with the PUD language, if it matters.

She noted the second part of the consideration is the request from the landowner in connection with what the owner refers to as upland parcels 1-4. She explained the landowner has expressed an interest in converting parcels 1-4 into a conservation easement. But to do so would require a release of a very old CDD construction easement from 2006 and consent from the CDD that the District will no longer levy special assessment on the area if it is converted into a conservation easement. She explained that there was no penalty to the execution of the joinder because the CDD only levies special assessments on developable property, not lands within a conservation easement. She noted it makes sense to work from broader to most narrow. She asked for Board suggestions.

Ms. Cormier made comments on the letter, expressing concerns that the offer to convey the conservation easement area was all or nothing. She asked if the CDD could potentially negotiate terms of the conveyance. Ms. Buchanan stated the Board could say decline the offer as made and counter with the acceptance of 211 acres but not the bridge, or accept the conveyance under the condition that the bridge would be repaired repaired. She noted that she had previously discussed those options with the landowner's lawyer, and he stated that his clients would not entertain those requests. She added that as of the meeting, the landowner was not open to those possibilities.

Ms. Cormier stated she had requested to meet with the county. She noted the county has not been able to give her a response on this meeting. She added there was verbal communication, and that she represented herself as a resident and not a representative of the Board. She noted the 2nd letter she did represent herself as a Board member and it was noted a lot of this land isn't designated when it comes to walking trails, the bike trails and the different paths. She noted she sent 2nd letter and received some answers but not all.

She noted they had several problems which included the walking trails not being defined, a bridge owned by the developer that has not been maintained, the path that cannot be accessed for children to get to school, and areas that did not get platted the way they should have been. She stated this is more than what the Board does tonight with the vote, and she wanted to ensure things are done properly.

She commented on the zip file with the release of the construction easement and joinder were written very broadly. Ms. Buchanan clarified that the documents were forms officially adopted by the St. Johns River Water Management and incorporated into its official rules. They are required by St. John's River Water Management District for a conservation easement on the property. She added there are restrictions on what can and cannot be done on the property. She noted Rolling Hills is not currently the property owner, and the construction easement release and joinder would only become effective if parcels 1-4were put into an easement.

Ms. Cormier stated the documents have wording that does not seem to be in the best interest to move forward. She stated she wanted answers from the county on what needs to be defined in our PUD and what land is supposed to be here, designating areas.

Ms. Buchanan stated the per the terms of the easement language, release of the construction easement happens automatically when the District's capital improvement project is complete. She did not think the Board should fight about this issue. She noted it was executed in 2006, and the goal was to cover the entirety of the property to ensure that there was an easement in place for all CDD construction projects. But in this case, the water management wants a clear title and has requested the easement release. Ms. Buchanan explained that there's a difference between the full development being complete and the Board's capital improvement projects being completed.

Ms. Cormier stated the construction was not 100% complete and ask if they could wait. She added they were in a hurry to get this done. Ms. Buchanan stated she wanted to be clear there was a difference between the development being complete and the District's construction project being complete on the parcels 1-4. The easement would only be released as to those small areas of land

Ms. Cormier noted there are still 29 entitlements that are possibly easement entitlements in the uplands, and the developer still has it on the market to sell, so they are not done yet. Ms. Buchanan stated that does not mean the District would be doing work for those 29 plots.

Ms. Cormier commented on the conversation about the cell tower. The lease of the uplands and the location of the cell tower were discussed.

Ms. Buchanan stated she has no feeling on what the Board does but will follow the will of the Board. She expressed concerns that the concepts were becoming intertwined and confused, and she wanted to take some time to focus on what these documents accomplish and what the concerns are as they relate to the documents.

It was noted there should be focus on the documents, separating them and addressing them one by one. She explained the PUD is a development approved document that provides guidance to the landowner on how they will develop the property. She added it is a county entitlement that has responsibility, not the District. She added this is tied to the District's capital improvement plan. She noted Ms. Cormier has pointed out they are not consistent and clear.

Mr. Soriano noted another problem from operation side. He stated the county could come back after we take ownership and meeting will have to occur to ensure we have ownership of the trails. He commented on guidelines on how the District would have to proceed with the trails.

Further discussion ensued on ownership and the assurance the trails would belong to the CDD, the next steps, conveyance, wetlands, timeline on the issue, litigation, permits, and there is not a guarantee.

Ms. Cormier stated in talking with Ms. Beth with the county, it was asked if there was any way the engineer, and the developer, would be able to have the plats, and the marking off the trails, and giving the time to figure it out before a decision is made. She asked the engineer if he had any maps that would show where the trails should be. She asked the engineer about the maps.

Mr. Hadden stated he had never seen a map of the trails but knew there were there due to his usage. Mr. Soriano stated it is a big area, and it would take time to get out and create the maps.

Ms. Cormier asked the Board to give her more time with the county and wanted the understanding a decision cannot be undone. She stated this is close to her heart and she would like to be the point of contact to continue working with the legislators and others. She added she would make the motion to table this until the next meeting and be the contact person.

Ms. Buchanan asked for a better understanding of concerns relating to accepting the land. The repairs were discussed, the lack of interest, condemning the bridge, and the desire for all the land. It was noted the CDD wanted to accept the land. The developer does not want to repair the bridge

Discussion ensued on the bridge maintenance that needed to be done to the bridge, and there would not be movement by the developer until the Board made the decision, the access to the walking trails for the children to get to the school, process for a 30-day temporary busing until the issue is resolved, and history of action on the bridge. It was noted this will take everyone working together to resolve the issue.

Ms. Buchanan noted there are Board members that do not want to take on the repairs of the bridge. She was concerned if the Board continues to table this, the landowner may choose to revoke its offer to convey the land. There were several other comments made on the money to be made, mitigation issues, the timeline for this process, and holding this in escrow.

Other concerns were documented on the special assessments, and establishment of a conservation easement. The process was explained after the documents were approved and how it is conveyed and to guarantee the land that is within the boundaries impose a conservation on the tract and comes to the District. If the Board consents to the release and subordination, that consentaccept it is contingent on the imposition of a conservation on the tract.

Ms. Buchanan stated the Board would like an option to have the easement. Ms. Cormier stated in February 2025 on the access agreement on using the word create and allow them to create the access agreement. This statement will guarantee access to the property.

Ms. Giles asked if the Board would like to approve in substantial form and allow Ms. Cormier to work with staff. The Board would like it stated they want it conveyed to the District but if the county condemns before the transfer there would be stipulations. The process of condemning the bridge was further discussed and taking the easement with the bridge.

The Board discussed the costs, the safety, the liability and new legislation of bridge repair. The process was further discussed and LANDCO's involvement. It was noted the Board wanted to ensure there is a guarantee this comes to the District. Ms. Buchanan stated they just wanted to agree to move forward with an agreement.

Ms. Cormier requested wording in the motion to make sure if it's conveyed to an easement that we still have access to walking areas. This topic was further discussed and the final decision. This is in reference to June 7, 2025 letter of intent.

Mr. Gibbons clarified he is not opposed to the acquisition of the property, but the is opposed to the extra steps of having staff involved. It is understood this will come back to the Board for final approval and discussed in the next meeting.

> On MOTION by Ms. Cormier, seconded by Mr. Church, with Ms. Cormier and Mr. Church in favor, and Mr. Gibbons opposed. Authorizing Staff to Work with Ms. Cormier to Work Toward and Agreement to Convey the Conservation Easement to the District, was approved 2-1.

B. Joinder, Consent and Subordination

Ms. Giles stated on the July 8th correspondence it was stated the District is willing to authorize the releases and the subordination instruments subject to confirmation that they are contingent upon the imposition of the conservation easement which will be offered to the CDD.

> On MOTION by Ms. Cormier, seconded by Mr. Church with all in favor, to Authorize the Releases and the Subordination Instruments

> subject to the Confirmation they are Contingent Upon the Imposition of the Conservation Easement Which will be Offered to the CDD, was approved 3-0.

The Board asked about the timeline. The process and scoring of the land parcels were discussed.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS **Acceptance of Fiscal Year 2024 Audit Report**

Ms. Giles stated this is for the acceptance of the 2024 Audit Report. She highlighted the 4 letters that address the independence auditor's report. She added it is the opinion of the auditors the CDD is complying. The letter added there were no deficiencies identified, and the District complied with all requirements. The different areas of the report were reviewed and there were no findings or recommendations made. It was a clean audit.

She noted it has been submitted to the Auditor General's Office.

> On MOTION by Mr. Church, seconded by Mr. Gibbons, with all in favor, Accepting the Fiscal Year 2024 Audit Report, was approved 3-0.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS **Public Hearing Adopting the Budget for Fiscal Year 2026**

A. Consideration of Resolution 2025-04, Relating to the Annual Appropriations and Adopting the Budget for Fiscal Year 2026

B. Consideration of Resolution 2025-05, Imposing Special Assessments and Certifying an Assessment Roll for Fiscal Year 2026

Ms. Giles stated this would be a public hearing on the budget and special assessments.

Ms. Buchanan gave an overview of the resolutions adopting to the District's budget and amendments that could be made. She noted the assessment resolution to impose special assessments and certifying the assessment role. She noted this includes operations, maintenance, and debt assessments and will be added to the tax roll. She noted there is no increase in assessments.

Ms. Cormier asked about the bonds. It was noted the budget contains all information on the bonds. Interest rates, term bonds, and mortgage rates were discussed. Ms. Buchanan gave an overview of the call protection policies. She noted it would be $300,000 to refinance and is not costs efficient.

Ms. Giles gave an overview of the budget for all funds. She noted there were minimal changes and there is no increase in assessments.

Ms. Giles asked for a motion to open the public hearing.

On MOTION by Mr. Church, seconded by Mr. Gibbons, with all in favor, to Open the Public Hearing, was approved 3-0.

Ms. Giles asked for any audience comments. Hearing no comments, she asked for a motion to close the meeting.

On MOTION by Ms. Cormier, seconded by Mr. Church, with all in favor, to Close the Public Hearing, was approved 3-0.

Ms. Giles asked for approval of the Resolution 2025-04.

On MOTION by Mr. Church, seconded by Mr. Gibbons, with all in favor, Resolution 2025-04, Relating to the Annual Appropriations and Adopting the Budget for Fiscal Year 2026, was approved 3-0.

Ms. Giles asked for approval of the Resolution 2025-05.

On MOTION by Ms. Cormier, seconded by Mr. Church, with all in favor, Resolution 2025-05, Imposing Special Assessments and Certifying an Assessment Roll for Fiscal Year 2026, was approved 3-0.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Staff Reports

A. Attorney

Ms. Buchanan stated she had nothing further to report.

B. Engineer

Mr. Hadden stated he had no further comments. It was discussed if it was safe and how to answer questions from the community and what was the plan with the bridge. He noted he was instructed to close the bridge. He discussed the safety of the bridge. He made the statement he will not say it's fine, due to liability. He did say he has walked the bridge many times.

Ms. Cormier asked if there was anything he could put on the bridge so that others will not go on it. He discussed ownership of the bridge and the CDD does not own it, and he cannot do anything unless directed by the owner. Mr. Soriano made comments about liability by getting involved in the other outside areas of the CDD.

C. Manager

1. Discussion of Fiscal Year 2026 Meeting Schedule

Ms. Giles stated the fiscal year 2026 meeting schedule did not contain any conflicts with major holidays. She added the schedule could remain the same on the 2nd Tuesday of every month in the same location at 6:00pm. She asked for any questions and if none for approval.

On MOTION by Mr. Church, seconded by Mr. Gibbons, with all in favor, the Fiscal Year 2026 Meeting Schedule, was approved 3-0.

2. Goals and Objectives

Ms. Giles reminded the Board this is a new requirement in July of 2024 for the District to establish goals and objectives that are measurable. She recommended keeping it simple. She provided the drafted goals and noted they are on track to meet the 2025 goals and objectives.

It was noted posting of the results were needed by December 1st.

On MOTION by Mr. Church, seconded by Mr. Gibbons, with all in favor, the FY 2026 Goals and Objectives, were approved 3-0.

D. Operations/Amenity Manager

1. Report

2. Monthly Quality Inspection Report

Mr. Oca reviewed items that were being worked on to include the tree trimming at the pool areas, and the tennis courts, light installation, landscaping issues, gym equipment, and Christmas decorations. It was asked by the Board if they could send bids out for landscaping. It was requested by the Board to have a clock in the pool areas.

Mr. Oca reviewed the Glo-Bug Proposal that would provide professional lighting for various holidays. Mr. Soriano noted they could get other proposals.

Other discussed as for doing just the amenity center, locations to light, starting with main areas and moving forward, warranty, working of the lights going out and how others are affected, and costs. Ms. Buchanan noted they needed an agreement.

On MOTION by Mr. Gibbons, seconded by Mr. Church, with all in favor, the Proposal from Glo-Bug for $13,856, was approved 3-0.

Mr. Oca reviewed the air conditioning unit issues and looking at other options for units. Mr. Soriano reviewed cost comparison for playgrounds, quote dropped off for $20,000 plus other labor and part costs that will add up. Mr. Oca noted the Board wanted comparison of playgrounds that have $90,000 playgrounds, but there wasn't one in the area.

He discussed specifics and cost of picnic tables and park benches.

Ms. Cormier mentioned the commercial playground the schools had issues with not being able to monitor the children. She asked that they be mindful of that as they do these playgrounds. Mr. Soriano discussed working with the county.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Supervisors Requests

Mr. Church asked about an RFP for landscaping. Mr. Church commented on the sprinklers not working. Other issues were on sodding, contracts, RFP process, details of the RFP, the current contract expires next year, and the notice to be provided. Other issues discussed were the buyout, how to proceed with the notice.

Mr. Soriano discussed the threshold, the scope of services, walk throughs, labor, costs, and he noted the formal process is not required. The budget and timing were discussed. Mr. Church stated he did not understand why to keep a company they were not happy with. The notice, the award, and the contract were further discussed.

The Board asked for a scope of service and RFP brought back to the next meeting. He will email the Board for review. The Board directed staff to go out for an RFP.

> On MOTION by Mr. Church, seconded by Mr. Gibbons, with all in favor, the Direction for Staff to Notice RFP for Landscape Maintenance, were approved 3-0.

Mr. Church requested painting of the curb on the islands with reflectors.

Ms. Cormier made a request for the sand pile up and for landscaping to clean up. She commented about adding it to the scope of services.

She asked about the ponds and work orders for the algae reviewed.

She asked about the agenda document and the reason for the different date and when received. She requested the agenda page be sent to supervisors as soon as it's available.

Mr. Gibbons stated in the Adams section the trees are dead and wanted to know who is responsible. Staff will work to identify the contractor. Irrigation was discussed.

Mr. Gibbons asked about the access cards for children. He discussed children using the parents' access. He requested a notice to be sent to the community.

Mr. Gibbons asked about the status of the insurance claim for the roof. Mr. Soriano stated a claim was sent out and they are waiting on responses.

Mr. Gibbons asked about the status on the follow-up on the replacement of light poles and faded street signs. Mr. Soriano explained the options for replacement. He asked about notification of county. He requested to start with what they have already and not wait on the process.

Mr. Gibbons asked about the installation of additional cameras. Staff will begin looking at this issue for discussion in the next shade meeting.

Mr. Gibbons asked about the status of the broken lap lane cable. This is being repaired.

The Board requested proposals for installation of a dog park.

Discussion was held on amendment 2 and if it applies to the ponds in the District. Public access for fishing was discussed. Ms. Buchanan commented they are not intended for recreation services. She asked if the Board would like to change the policy. Mr. Gibbons asked about signs that could be placed on ponds. Trespassing and access easements were discussed.

Ms. Cormier asked about to follow up on the pool sign and a recent incident that occurred.

She asked to have markers on the pool.

Ms. Cormier asked about the age limit of the gym be increased to allow aged 12 and up with an accompanying adult 18 years and older. Some Board members were concerned about the safety issue. It was noted a public hearing would not be needed for this. Ms. Giles stated they could adopt proper language for the amenity policy if the Board wished. Requested a large clock at the pool.

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Audience Comments

Ms. Giles asked for audience comments.

Audience member (Kevin Craig) commented on the pricing of fitness center and equipment, and noted he had contacts for pricing.

ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Financial Reports

A. Balance Sheet & Income Statement

Ms. Giles presented the balance sheet and income statement for July 31, 2025.

B. Assessment Receipt Schedule

Ms. Giles referenced the assessment receipt reflecting 100% collected.

C. Check Register

Ms. Giles presented the check register for $181,321.29 for May, June and July.

Ms. Cormier commented on page 234 descriptions for invoice for facility maintenance for April 2025 issue.

She noted on page 343 comments on a charge high school swim team usage agreement, and she didn't see that come before the Board. It was stated this came before the Board.

She commented on page 374 and the date of June 2025 and 2 different initials for a 3-hour charge, but basically same items being done.

She commented about information from person and the attempts to contact.

On MOTION by Mr. Gibbons, seconded by Ms. Cormier, with all in favor, the Check Register, was approved 3-0.

TWELFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Next Schedule Meeting: To Be Determined at the Rolling Hills Amenity Center

Ms. Giles stated the next meeting is scheduled for October 14, 2025 at 6:00 p.m. at this location.

THIRTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Adjournment

Ms. Giles asked for a motion to adjourn.

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

Signed by:
Marilee Giles
A38999D0EDC14F4...

Secretary/Assistant Secretary

DocuSigned by:
08660523118D4DD...

Chairman/Vice Chairman