

**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 on Tuesday, **August 11, 2026**, 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
David Bauer <i>by phone</i>	Vice Chairman
Helana Cormier	Assistant Secretary
Kevin Craig	Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

Marilee Giles	District Manager, GMS
Wes Haber <i>by phone</i>	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 11, 2026, 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 6:01 p.m. and called roll. Three Supervisors were present in person constituting a quorum. Supervisor Bauer joined by phone.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS

**Audience Comments (Regarding Agenda
Items Listed Below)**

Ms. Giles opened the public comment period for agenda items only.

Resident (Greg Marter) asked if the public gets three minutes at the beginning and end of the meeting. Ms. Giles reviewed Resolution 2014-01 which is the publics opportunity to be heard. This District did adopt the three-minute rule.

August 11, 2026

Rolling Hills CDD

Resident (Elisabeth Ngoune) stated they are concerned about the physical condition of the property at 3258 Bradley Creek Pkwy and ongoing property maintenance. Mr. Soriano noted this Board can't address HOA concerns, but she can contact the county.

Resident stated they attended the last meeting and today's meeting was scheduled then. He asked why it takes four days prior to the meeting to update the Board. Ms. Giles noted it is posted on the Districts website, and they can send an eblast.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS**Approval of Minutes of the July 21, 2026 Meeting**

Ms. Giles presented the July 21, 2026 meeting minutes and asked for any comments, corrections, or changes. She noted there are recommended changes from Supervisor Cormier. Ms. Cormier had a correction on page 2 – 3rd order – noted this was an altered notary page for four different documents that were emailed from the developer's attorney to the CDD attorney and management company for their approval. There was no response on email, but it was then recorded with the Clay County public records. It was recorded with the altered notary page and that document on the clerk of the court. Ms. Giles noted those corrections are on that, that was submitted to the county. Mr. Bauer clarified for the record that the alterations were simply just the signature title and nothing that had to do with the body of the legal document was changed, nothing other than the signature title and that is it. It was recorded with the blessing of both attorneys. Ms. Giles will replay the recording and capture the part to explain the correction to the document. Ms. Cormier requested that highlighted section be moved underneath the box. Ms. Giles will listen to see if Ms. Cormier stated it before or after the motion and then apply it there.

On page 6, 12th order C – Ms. Cormier noted when given the rules of procedures, she asked a question about the document that should have been filed. Somebody went back and looked and apparently decided form 8B had not been filed from the 2024 meeting minutes and they added those.

On MOTION by Mr. Church, seconded by Mr. Craig, with all in favor, the minutes from the July 21, 2026 meeting, were approved in substantial form with corrections spoken on the record 4-0.

August 11, 2026

Rolling Hills CDD

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**Acceptance of the Minutes of the July 21, 2026
Audit Committee Meeting**

Ms. Giles presented the July 21, 2026 meeting minutes and asked for any comments, corrections, or changes. The Board had no changes to the minutes.

On MOTION by Mr. Church, seconded by Mr. Craig, with all in favor, Accepting the Minutes of the July 21, 2026, Audit Committee Meeting, were approved 4-0.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**Consideration of:****A. Engagement Letter with Grau & Associates for Fiscal Year 2026 Audit**

Ms. Giles presented the engagement letter with Grau & Associates for FY2026 audit on page 20 of the agenda package. The engagement letter documents and confirms the auditor's objective and scope to audit the financial statements for the District for the year ending 09/30/2026.

On MOTION by Mr. Craig, seconded by Mr. Church, with all in favor, the engagement letter with Grau & Associates for Fiscal Year 2026 audit, was approved 4-0.

B. Agreement with Clay County for Clay High School Swim Team for Use of the Amenity Facility**C. Agreement with Clay County for Middleburg High School Swim Team for Use of the Amenity Facility**

Ms. Giles stated Supervisor Cormier had expressed concerns with some of the language in the agreement so that was sent to District Counsel to review and make changes. The school board took two agreements and combined them into one which threw the page numbers off also when exhibits were added. Those were corrected and updated as well as some of the language where it refers to the licensee. The strongest change was about the volunteers and those preparing meals to be in accordance with Florida law and other applicable regulations as it pertains to volunteers and preparing food. Ms. Cormier expressed an issue for clarity on wishing there was something representing the Rolling Hills CDD other than using the word District. Mr. Haber stated they can go through the documents and replace the word District with Rolling Hills CDD.

Ms. Cormier noted there are two different schedules. Make sure everyone is mindful of what day of the week they are doing their meets on and if there are timeframes that they are there.

August 11, 2026

Rolling Hills CDD

Jay stated they did ask for updated schedules because the first ones were overlapping. He noted 4:30 is usually the warmup time. Ms. Cormier asked if an end time needs to be added.

Ms. Cormier suggested attaching a copy of the amenities policy as an exhibit. She noted when this is given out to parents to sign and all they have is a link, there should be at least a copy of the amenities policies so the school board and everyone that signed the contract would have seen what they are agreeing too. Right now, they are signing a document and it doesn't have our policy and procedures. Jay stated that can be thrown in as an exhibit. It does not change the legal liability on them. Mr. Church suggested adding those pages onto it.

Ms. Cormier noted if requested by the District the swim team could provide a minimum of 5 volunteers for one resident event arranged by the District and provide at least 10- volunteer hours each week during the term of this agreement which may include resident events referenced above. She noted this would have been a great time that they could have been asking for those swim lessons or those jump lessons so our residents could have been enjoying the jump pads that they have never been able to use officially. A way to negotiate that in this timeframe for those volunteer hours to be utilized so the students or community would have been able to do. Jay noted realistically it's only the coaches, not the volunteer kids. We still have the problem of using the block as required to have a coach here not the volunteer high school kids.

Ms. Cormier questioned if the statements on page 29 section 4 contradict each other. In the event any damage to the District's facilities or land occurs, the District should notify the Licensee of such damage and should allow the Licensee's agents or employees the opportunity to examine the damage prior to repair. The licensee agrees the District can promptly make whatever repairs are necessary. She asked how the \$1M on the insurance policy and all the sovereign immunity limits affect everything. Mr. Haber provided an explanation.

She questioned #10 that states the swim team roster must be provided to the District and to the coaching staff. Jay noted they have rosters, so they know who to expect and who is on property. It's tough with swim meets because they don't have the ability to know who is going to come in.

On exhibit B #11 Mr. Soriano suggested adding wording that allows the school district or individual swim teams to hire their own security guard.

Ms. Cormier noted Middleburg's contract says to go to Clay High School in care of the swim team. Ms. Giles noted page 43 has a typo that needs to be corrected. The Clay High School

August 11, 2026

Rolling Hills CDD

one goes to Clay High School and Middleburg goes to Middleburg. Ms. Giles asked for approval in substantial form with the changes spoken on the record.

On MOTION by Mr. Craig, seconded by Mr. Church, with all in favor, the agreement with Clay County School Board for the Clay High School swim team for use of the amenity facility with the three changes spoken on record and authorize the Chair to sign this, was approved in substantial form 4-0.

Ms. Giles asked for approval of the agreement with Clay County School Board for the Middleburg High School swim team to use the facilities.

On MOTION by Mr. Church, seconded by Mr. Craig, with all in favor, the agreement with Clay County for Middleburg High school swim team for use of the amenity facility, was approved in substantial form with four corrections spoken on the record and authorized by the Chair to execute.

D. License Agreement for Tennis and Pickleball Program

Ms. Giles presented the license agreement for the tennis and pickleball program with the correction made to read Clay County instead of the county listed before. Same agreement with just that correction. Ms. Cormier suggested leaving the front courts for Jimmy to be able to use and saving the whole back court for the families. Jay noted having the residents in the front would be better.

On MOTION by Ms. Cormier, seconded by Mr. Craig, with all in favor, the license agreement for tennis and pickleball program, was approved 4-0.

Ms. Cormier asked if the schools swim coach had any other questions. The swim coach asked if the swimmers are allowed to start swimming in a couple days or? Ms. Giles noted they will make the changes tomorrow immediately and will have the Chair execute his page then it will be sent to Christina immediately and it will be left up to her to get the signatures.

August 11, 2026

Rolling Hills CDD

E. Proposal for Repair of Monument Signs (*under separate cover*)

Mr. Oca noted the contractor said the company that the materials came from would no longer be able to do it so they are getting more quotes from a different vendor. This item was tabled.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Ratification of Agreement with Riverside Management Services for Facility and Field Operations Management, Janitorial and Other Maintenance Services for Fiscal Year 2027

Ms. Giles stated this was approved at the June meeting so just looking for ratification. It has already been signed by the Chair.

Ms. Cormier stated I have a question on that, trying to understand this; when the proposal came to us there was included in the document and it was a proposal based an amount of money and it was explained to me that you have to have the amount of money because we are preparing for the budget we are doing but we still didn't have the actual contract and all the different information and all the stuff. How come it actually gets signed and now we are just ratifying it whereas we thought we were approving and I asked questions on this. They said the proposal for the amount had to come first so that you can make sure you have the money and then they can prepare the contract. But why does the contract get signed, I mean this is dated the 21st which is the same date we had a meeting in July. Why couldn't this have been in our Agenda packet so that we could have reviewed it before he actually signed it?

Ms. Giles explained we don't normally have agreements in the Agenda packet because we typically have more than one agreement. So when you think about the slide repairs we had multiple proposals for the board so we couldn't have prepared the agreement ahead of time because we didn't know who the board would select for that. Same thing for the landscape proposals you got. I think you got five or six of those. We couldn't prepare that agreement ahead of time not knowing who you would select. So, with RMS it is continued every year and they provide a new proposal for you. The district has typically allowed the Chair to sign items in between meetings and bring them back for ratification. Recently when you became so concerned about signing the agreements in between, I made the decision to stop signing them and to get specific guidance from this board that allows the Chair to sign them in between the meetings. This was before your concern of the Chair signing agreements in between meetings.

August 11, 2026

Rolling Hills CDD

Mr. Soriano stated the biggest point with that was we were trying to finalize the amount. When you guys agreed to that we actually changed the amount so meaning if we had a contract, it wouldn't have been able to have been signed then. We took money away too; we adjusted they would no longer be doing pool services. So, then we bring it back with the contract without the pool services which adjust not only the amount but the scope.

Ms. Cormier state I hear what you are saying, I understand what you are saying. But just like when we approve something in substantial form because we have most of us sitting there before us, we could have done that same thing on the day that we had the meeting. Because that is one of the issues that I had on this one all along is that y'all had that automatic renewal.

Ms. Giles stated it is not automatic. This Board can look at the proposal from RMS and say no go out for bid.

Mr. Soriano stated you guys voted on it wasn't automatic, you guys voted on it accepting it.

Ms. Cormier yes but I'm tracking that I asked it to go out for bid.

Mr. Soriano stated you did ask about it but the Board decided not to, you guys voted on it and accepted it.

Ms. Cormier stated so I was and I went back and looked at the minutes and I pulled back both agendas from June and July and with this one being signed on the same night as our July meeting I don't understand why this wasn't presented to us.

Ms. Giles stated that is just the effective date it was approved. You are focused on the date there on the first page?

Ms. Cormier stated yes why couldn't this have been an Agenda item?

Ms. Giles stated that date was inserted when the Chair signed it based on the approval date at that meeting. It has an effective date of August 1st.

Chairman Church stated that wasn't when I signed it.

Ms. Cormier stated us as the Board should have been able to have seen the document at the July meeting.

Ms. Giles stated I can start bringing generic agreements for RMS every year.

Mr. Soriano stated I think it is exactly the same as years past.

August 11, 2026

Rolling Hills CDD

Ms. Giles stated it is the same. A couple years ago Supervisor Cormier wanted the specific scope of services added. I think it was 2 or 3 years ago we added more details to what each employee did.

Mr. Soriano stated we would take out things from the scope of service before it had pool maintenance now, we would take that out, those type of things. It has been the same the last couple of years.

Ms. Giles stated the date at the top is the date it was approved and right below it shows the effective date of when the agreement starts.

Ms. Cormier stated so everything I went back and looked at in the June agenda that was the Riverside Management proposal in that June agenda. And when I looked at the July minutes there was nothing in that or in the agenda for the July that would have brought this, I just feel that this should have been brought to us.

Ms. Giles stated you are saying since he signed this July 21st.

Ms. Cormier stated yes, he signed it that night.

Ms. Giles stated I will pull the Docusign records.

Chairman Church stated there is no way I signed it that night.

Ms. Giles stated it doesn't have a date time stamp. What makes you think he signed it that night?

Ms. Cormier stated so looking at the date that it was done on the twenty first, the same date of the meeting but you are right the Docusign it does not have the date the time on it. One of the things I did not like seeing in this contract is on page 63. Where we are approving general maintenance services shall be invoiced at \$50.00 per hour and pressure washing services will be invoiced at \$55.00 an hour, together with any approved reimbursable expenses. Ms. Cormier expressed concern regarding the additional costs.

Mr. Soriano stated that those rates were included in the pricing letter previously presented to and approved by the Board.

Ms. Cormier stated that she was reviewing the agenda and wanted to know where the information was located. She explained that the Riverside Management Services agreement listed the amenities manager, operations manager, full maintenance, janitorial services, lifeguard, facility assistant, and facility maintenance, with the corresponding amounts.

August 11, 2026

Rolling Hills CDD

Mr. Soriano explained that the amounts represented the maximum the District could be charged annually. If fewer services were performed, the District would be charged less. He stated that the District had never paid the full contract amount because Riverside Management Services regularly completed the work for less than the maximum authorized amount. He asked whether Ms. Cormier was referring to the hourly breakdown that made up the \$27,000, \$17,000, and \$40,000 amounts.

Ms. Cormier stated that she did not know and referred to page 63 of the agreement.

Mr. Soriano explained that the information was included in the agreement and that facility maintenance was listed at \$50 per hour for a specified number of hours. He stated that the aggregate amount was based on the number of hours included in the District's weekly budget. He further explained that he had previously encouraged the Board to increase the maintenance hours to allow additional personnel to complete more work throughout the week, as the District did not have a full-time maintenance employee.

Ms. Cormier stated that she understood the explanation regarding facility maintenance but questioned the hourly charges. She stated that the contract she was reviewing listed \$50 per hour for general maintenance and \$55 per hour for pressure washing services. She expressed concern that the agreement specifically stated the District would pay those hourly rates for the services.

Mr. Soriano explained that pressure washing was not included in the regular maintenance contract and would be considered an additional service. He compared it to landscape services, where certain work was billed separately from the regular contract. He stated that pressure washing had previously been requested for the bridge and that he had explained those additional charges to the Board.

Mr. Craig asked whether those were the rates Riverside Management Services would charge, and another member stated that the hourly amounts could vary depending on the scope of work. It was further discussed that the maximum amount was established in the District's budget and that certain services could involve different hourly charges.

August 11, 2026

Rolling Hills CDD

Mr. Soriano clarified that the hourly rates would not change and that the overall dollar amount was what was included in the budget. He explained that the District would not necessarily pay the full amount annually because the charges depended on the services requested and performed. He stated that the additional \$17,000 was included within the maximum amount the District could authorize.

Mr. Craig stated that the question was simply whether the facility services would be charged at the hourly rate, and another member confirmed that they would.

Ms. Cormier referred to Item Four on page 63, which stated that facility maintenance and repair services, including general maintenance and pressure washing services, would be compensated at the hourly rates set forth, plus reimbursable expenses. She emphasized that the language did not identify the charges as a not-to-exceed amount but instead stated that the services would be compensated at the specified hourly rates.

Ms. Giles confirmed that those were the hourly rates Riverside Management Services would charge.

Ms. Cormier reiterated that, because the District had a contract with Riverside Management Services, any work performed under that provision would be billed at the listed rates.

Mr. Soriano explained that landscape contracts also contained hourly charges for additional services but that the District established a maximum monthly amount based on the anticipated hours and services. He stated that the same approach applied to the Riverside Management Services contract and that the previously approved proposal letter included the \$50 hourly rate.

Ms. Giles directed the Board to page 81, where the \$50 hourly rate was also identified. She confirmed that Ms. Cormier was reading the agreement correctly and that Riverside Management Services would charge \$55 per hour for pressure washing.

August 11, 2026

Rolling Hills CDD

Ms. Giles noted that pressure washing involved additional equipment and would not necessarily be billed at the regular maintenance rate. Chairman Church stated that the District could hire someone else to perform pressure washing services.

Ms. Cormier stated that having the document available to read and ask questions helped the Board make better decisions. She referred to page 69 of the agreement and noted that the District Managers and various individuals associated with RMS and GMS, including Darren Mossing and Allison Mossing, appeared to have overlapping roles within the companies. She requested clarification regarding Section 29, specifically the meaning of an arm's length transaction and how that provision applied to a CDD.

Mr. Haber explained that Section 29 addressed the relationship between the two parties to the agreement, the CDD and RMS, and established that neither party was a subsidiary of the other nor related in that capacity. He stated that when the CDD negotiated the agreement, it was acting in its own best interest, just as RMS was acting in its best interest. Both parties had the opportunity to have independent counsel review the agreement before execution. He explained that an arm's length transaction meant the parties were independent and had negotiated the agreement fairly, without being related or influencing the terms of the agreement. He added that this was a commonly used contractual provision.

Ms. Cormier thanked Mr. Haber for the explanation and questioned how the agreement could be considered an arm's length transaction given the relationship between GMS and RMS. She specifically referenced Darren Mossing serving as president and owner, the overlap between the two companies, and GMS serving as the District's custodian of records. She asked how these relationships did not create a conflict with the arm's length transaction provision.

Mr. Haber explained that his office was responsible for preparing and reviewing the agreement on behalf of the District to ensure that it was drafted in the CDD's best interest. He acknowledged that there was some commonality between GMS and RMS but emphasized that GMS was not a party to the agreement. He clarified that the agreement was between the CDD, acting through its Board of Supervisors, and RMS. He stated that although GMS and RMS had common ownership and a business relationship, the CDD had independent legal counsel

August 11, 2026

Rolling Hills CDD

reviewing and preparing the agreement on its behalf, which ensured that the arm's length transaction provision was not violated.

Ms. Cormier questioned the fact that Mr. Soriano worked for GMS while also serving as the operations manager for RMS. She acknowledged that his involvement provided an additional benefit to the community but expressed concern that the overlapping roles could create an issue with the arm's length transaction provision. She stated that she did not understand how the arrangement would not become a violation of that provision.

Chairman Church commented that their understanding was that the arrangement did not violate the provision because Mr. Soriano was not a member of the CDD Board.

Mr. Haber explained that the arm's length transaction provision related specifically to the negotiation of the agreement and the independence of the parties in establishing its terms. He stated that the provision was intended to ensure that the agreement between the CDD and RMS was negotiated independently and was not influenced by a relationship between the contracting parties. He further explained that if Ms. Cormier had concerns regarding staffing and how the companies operated, those were matters the Board could appropriately address. However, he did not believe those concerns established that the arm's length transaction provision had been violated.

Ms. Cormier asked whether Mr. Haber could research the matter further to make certain that the arrangement was appropriate.

Mr. Haber responded that he would be willing to research the issue if Ms. Cormier could specify exactly what she wanted reviewed and if the remainder of the Board agreed with that direction. He explained that he wanted to ensure his office was using its time and resources efficiently and suggested that an associate might assist with the research under Ms. Buchanan's oversight to help control costs. He requested that the specific question be identified and that the Board confirm whether it wanted his office to proceed.

Ms. Cormier thanked Mr. Haber and clarified that her request was to research the relationship between RMS and GMS, particularly because a GMS employee was performing

August 11, 2026

Rolling Hills CDD

work under the RMS contract. She stated that the overlapping relationships between the sister companies raised concerns about whether the arrangement complied with the arm's length transaction provision.

Ms. Cormier also referenced Section 34 of the agreement, which provided that the agreement would automatically renew for additional one-year terms unless terminated in accordance with its provisions. She noted that the District had not put the RMS contract out for bid for as long as she could remember. She stated that she wanted to ensure that the overlapping roles and relationships between the companies did not create a contractual issue and that the Board was being fiscally responsible with taxpayer money.

Mr. Haber acknowledged Ms. Cormier's concerns and explained that the arm's length transaction provision was specifically applicable to the terms of the agreement. He reiterated that the agreement had been negotiated between the CDD and RMS as independent parties, with both having the assistance of counsel. He stated that if a dispute arose regarding the interpretation of the agreement, the provision established that neither party would be disadvantaged by an interpretation based on which party drafted the agreement.

Mr. Haber further explained that the provision addressed the negotiation and interpretation of the agreement rather than the staffing arrangements or relationships between RMS and GMS. He stated that he was comfortable advising the Board that the staffing concerns raised by Ms. Cormier were separate from the narrow purpose of the arm's length transaction provision.

Mr. Haber also addressed Ms. Cormier's concern regarding automatic renewal and stated that the agreement contained a termination provision beneficial to the CDD. He referred to Section 14 of the agreement and began reviewing the language concerning the District's ability to terminate the agreement.

Mr. Haber continued his explanation of Section 14, stating that the District could terminate the agreement without cause by providing 30 days' written notice. He clarified that although the agreement was being ratified, he was not suggesting that the Board should terminate it. Rather, he wanted to emphasize that the Board retained the ability to terminate the agreement

August 11, 2026

Rolling Hills CDD

at any time, for any reason, and that the automatic renewal provision did not guarantee RMS continued renewals. He explained that if the Board believed it could obtain a better agreement from another qualified company, it had the right to pursue that option. He stated that the District was not locked into the agreement and offered to assist with additional research if the Board desired.

Chairman Church stated that, in their understanding, the arm's length transaction provision was not relevant to the relationship between GMS and RMS because the two companies were separate entities and only RMS was a party to the agreement with the CDD.

Ms. Cormier questioned how the relationship could be considered irrelevant if a GMS employee was receiving the benefit of the RMS contract.

Chairman Church responded that the contract was with RMS.

Supervisor Bauer stated that his concern was not necessarily with the contract itself but rather with how the contract was being staffed. He questioned whether GMS was staffing the RMS contract and explained that he was trying to understand the arrangement because the Board knew who held the contract but wanted clarification regarding who was actually performing the work.

Ms. Cormier stated that she was not comfortable with the automatic renewal provision and the fact that the contract had never gone out for an RFP.

A Supervisor responded that the Board could send the contract out for proposals or terminate it at any time.

Mr. Soriano stated that Ms. Cormier had previously requested that the District go out for an RFP and that the Board had voted against doing so. A Supervisor confirmed that the request had been made and that the remainder of the Board had declined to proceed.

Mr. Soriano explained that the contract could be reviewed every month if the Board wished and that the District was not obligated to continue using RMS. He stated that if the Board did not want RMS providing services, it could make that decision. He further explained that

August 11, 2026

Rolling Hills CDD

staffing concerns were separate from the contractual relationship and that although he was employed by GMS, he also performed work under the RMS contract. He stated that if the Board no longer wanted him providing services, that could also be addressed.

Ms. Cormier stated that her concerns involved the overlapping relationships between the companies. She explained that when the District retained legal counsel, the expectation was that counsel would represent the District's best interests, and she continued to question the intertwined relationships between the companies involved in providing District services.

Mr. Soriano responded that District Counsel was performing the duties required of its office and had explained the matter on multiple occasions. He stated that other management companies operated under similar arrangements, including companies that provided amenity management services through related entities. He referenced Greenpoint as an example and explained that such companies also participated in RFP processes. He stated that determining whether a conflict existed was a legal matter for District Counsel to review. He then questioned whether Ms. Cormier believed he was doing something improper during Board meetings or in the work he performed for the District.

Ms. Cormier stated that she did not believe the District was receiving the quality of work it was paying for.

Supervisor Bauer stated that they wholeheartedly disagreed with Ms. Cormier and believed RMS was doing a great job. The Supervisor stated that significant improvements had been made since the company began providing services. He stated that he had spent years advocating for improvements within the community because the District had operated under a financial deficit for an extended period. He explained that the District was now in a better financial position and had the resources necessary to address community needs. He expressed concern that the management company was being unfairly targeted despite its efforts and the improvements that had been made.

A Supervisor asked whether the Board could move forward with the agenda item.

August 11, 2026

Rolling Hills CDD

Ms. Giles stated that the decision was up to the Board, and a Supervisor confirmed that the Board could proceed.

Ms. Giles requested a motion to ratify the agreement with RMS for on-site services for Fiscal Year 2027.

A motion was made and seconded to ratify the agreement with RMS for on-site services for Fiscal Year 2027.

Before the vote, Ms. Cormier stated that she had a few additional questions regarding Exhibit A, specifically the communication updates. She referenced the resident's earlier comments concerning updates to the email distribution list and bulletin boards and requested that those responsibilities be completed.

Ms. Cormier reiterated that she wanted to ensure those communication responsibilities were being fulfilled. A Supervisor stated that Freddie would send an email blast to the community before meetings.

Ms. Cormier also referenced Section O of Exhibit A concerning the issuance of access cards to eligible residents for the amenity center. She stated that she wanted to ensure that responsibility was being completed as well. She explained that the communication updates and access cards were the remaining items in the agreement about which she had questions.

With no further discussion, the Board voted on the motion.

August 11, 2026

Rolling Hills CDD

Ms. Cormier questioned section 29 on page 71. Mr. Haber noted the two parties to the agreement the CDD and RMS are not subsidiaries of each other or anyway related. When the CDD is negotiating this agreement the CDD is looking out for its best interest. RMS is looking out for their best interest. Both had an opportunity to have Counsel review it on their behalf and sign an agreement that works for both parties. Ms. Cormier asked how it works with the arm's length transaction and with GMS and RMS and the overlap of Darrin Mossing being the president and owner, all of his intertwining with those two companies and GMS being Rolling Hills CDD the custodian of record. Mr. Haber noted because the CDD has his office preparing and reviewing the agreement on the Districts behalf, they have the ethical duty to ensure that the agreement is drafted in a fashion that is in the CDDs best interest. Ms. Cormier questioned that Jay works for GMS but is the operation manager for the operational part for RMS and does that capacity. How does that not start get convoluted on violating that arm's length transaction? Mr. Haber explained the arm's length provision relates to the negotiation and each party independent as it relates to the specific term in the agreement, an agreement between the CDD and RMS. How they staff it wouldn't necessarily be related to the arm's length transaction. Ms. Cormier stated the question to research would be the correlation between RMS and GMS and because a GMS employee is doing the work

August 11, 2026

Rolling Hills CDD

of part of the RMS contract. Since there is an overlap of all of these intertwining of these District companies to make sure they are not violating that arm's length transaction and to make sure they are not causing an issue with section 34. Mr. Haber provided an explanation. Mr. Church noted he doesn't think it is relevant only from the standpoint is the two entities are completely different entities and only RMS is the one that is in part of the contract with the CDD Board. The other entity is not relevant. Ms. Cormier stated she is not okay with the contract having the automatic renewal and the contract never going out for an RFP. Mr. Soriano asked Ms. Cormier if she thinks he is doing something in the meetings or doing something wrong in the work that he does for the Rolling Hills CDD. Ms. Cormier stated she doesn't think they get the quality of work that they pay for. Mr. Oca disagreed wholeheartedly. Ms. Cormier commented on page 74, exhibit A item e – communication updates to residents. Ms. Giles noted they agreed that Freddie will send an e-blast to the community prior to the meetings. Page 74, exhibit A item c – Issuing access cards to eligible residents. Ms. Giles asked for a motion to ratify the agreement with RMS for the onsite services for FY27.

On MOTION by Mr. Church, seconded by Mr. Craig, with Mr. Bauer in favor and Ms. Cormier opposed, the agreement with Riverside Management Services for the facility and field operations management, janitorial and other maintenance services for fiscal year 2027, was approved 3-1.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Public Hearing Adopting the Budget for Fiscal Year 2027

A. Consideration of Resolution 2026-08, Relating to the Annual Appropriations and Adopting the Budget for Fiscal Year 2027

Mr. Haber stated these resolutions serve two purposes. The first of which is to adopt the CDDs final budget. The second resolution is the assessment resolution levy's the assessments and allocates the amount that each home/property owner will pay to fund the budget.

Ms. Giles provided an overview of the budget. This budget was approved at the June meeting. It has three funds, the general fund, the debt service fund and the capital reserve funds. The assessments will remain flat meaning no increase. She asked for a motion to open the public hearing.

August 11, 2026

Rolling Hills CDD

On MOTION by Mr. Church, seconded by Ms. Cormier, with all in favor, Opening the Public Hearing, was approved 4-0.

Ms. Giles stated the public hearing is open for comments or questions on the budget. Hearing no comments, Ms. Giles asked for a motion to close the public hearing.

On MOTION by Ms. Cormier, seconded by Mr. Church, with all in favor, Closing the Public Hearing, was approved 4-0.

Ms. Giles stated for the Board at this time they are considering Resolution 2026-08 relating to annual appropriations and adopting the budget for FY27. This is the Boards opportunity to make comments or ask questions. If not, she asked for a motion to adopt the resolution.

Ms. Cormier stated on page 3 of the budget, field repairs and maintenance and same line item for the amenities going up. These are items that get paid when Riverside does the work or if they are sent out. Jay noted the increase is not solely related to Riverside. The increase is also due to supplies. That line doesn't just pay for staff. It pays for everything they do. She asked why the engineering line item went up. Ms. Giles stated there are several engineer reports that a District could be required to complete. An annual engineers report which Rolling Hills is not required to have by their bond series. The next one is the public facility report that is due every seven years, the last one was done in 2022. The two other reports driving that cost is the pond bank inspection report and by your St. Johns River Water Management permit that is required to happen every two years. That cost is anticipated in 2027. The other big report started in 2022 as required by Florida Statute and it's a 20-year analysis report on the stormwater and waste management. It is due every five years by Florida Statute. Also, they have gone from six meetings to 12 meetings. The Board asked in the narrative to add a little more detail about the reports the engineer is required to do. Ms. Giles asked for a motion to adopt Resolution 2026-08.

On MOTION by Mr. Church, seconded by Mr. Craig, with all in favor, Resolution 2026-08, Relating to the Annual Appropriations and Adopting the Budget for Fiscal Year 2027, was approved 4-0.

B. Consideration of Resolution 2026-09, Imposing Special Assessments and Certifying an Assessment Roll for Fiscal Year 2027

August 11, 2026

Rolling Hills CDD

Ms. Giles stated on page 116 is Resolution 2026-09. Mr. Haber reviewed this resolution for the Board and as a reminder this simply says this resolution allows the county to place the assessments on the tax roll and to be collected on the annual property taxes. She noted unless there are any comments or questions, she asked for a motion to adopt Resolution 2026-09.

On MOTION by Ms. Cormier, seconded by Mr. Craig, with all in favor, Resolution 2026-09, Imposing Special Assessments and Certifying an Assessment Roll for Fiscal Year 2027, was approved 4-0.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Public Hearing for the Purpose of Adopting Amended and Restated Rules of Procedure; Consideration of Resolution 2026-10

Ms. Giles stated the purpose of this resolution is adopting the amended and restated rules of procedures. Mr. Haber provided an overview of Resolution 2026-10. Ms. Giles asked for a motion to open the public hearing.

On MOTION by Mr. Craig, seconded by Ms. Cormier, with all in favor, Opening the Public Hearing, was approved 4-0.

Ms. Giles stated the public hearing is open for any public comments as related to Resolution 2026-10. Hearing no comments, she asked for a motion to close the public hearing.

On MOTION by Mr. Church, seconded by Ms. Cormier, with all in favor, Closing the Public Hearing, was approved 4-0.

Ms. Giles stated this resolution is on page 120 of the agenda package.

Ms. Cormier – page 128, section a - how long do they keep the agenda packages? What amount of time are the records held. Ms. Giles stated they keep records forever.

Ms. Cormier - page 133, public comments at the end of the meeting are struck out and being removed. Ms. Giles stated she is not sure why that was marked out on the format in preparing an agenda. Mr. Haber noted the law requires only that you allow public comment on agenda items. The rule was changed to be compliant with Florida law. But, the Board can continue to have public comments on any topic at the end of the meeting. Ms. Giles stated the Chair and counsel provided

August 11, 2026

Rolling Hills CDD

input to the District Manager on what they want on the agenda. If that is what the Board and the Chairman want on the agenda, they will keep it. The Board agreed to leave public comment at the end.

Ms. Cormier – page 191, Rule 3.10 Contractual Services, asked what section 1 is covering. Mr. Haber stated there is no law or federal law that obligates the District to follow any specific process like there are for other things such as maintenance, construction, professional services like an architect or engineer. Certain contractual services are exempt from any formal procurement. Ms. Giles noted this Board can go out for bid on any services.

Ms. Cormier – page 192, Rule 3.11, asked counsel to explain what this means about the protest with respect to proceedings. Mr. Haber stated when you are doing a type of procurement that is obligated to a formal process, you must give proposers protest right. He provided further explanation. Ms. Giles noted unless there are anymore comments or questions, she asked for a motion to adopt Resolution 2026-10.

On MOTION by Mr. Church, seconded by Mr. Craig, with all in favor, Adopting Amended and Restated Rules of Procedure; Consideration of Resolution 2026-10, was approved in substantial form with changes on the record on page 12. 4-0.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Discussion of Rolling Hills Ranch Preliminary Plat

Ms. Giles noted this was sent to the Board last Friday and adjusted the agenda package to include it. No action is necessary. It is just for information at this time. Ms. Cormier commented on the land, part of it shows up as Rolling Hills CDD and the other part has Pulte's name on it. Mr. Soriano stated it is a mistake by the property appraiser's office. Katie has spoken with them and is aware of it. It is just where the homes are going. The rest is conservation easement. Ms. Cormier asked when the rest of the common bonds will be conveyed. Mr. Haber explained section IV on page 200 of the agenda package.

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Staff Reports

A. Attorney

Mr. Haber didn't have anything to report but offered to take questions.

August 11, 2026

Rolling Hills CDD

B. Engineer

Mr. Hadden had nothing to report but offered to take questions.

August 11, 2026

Rolling Hills CDD

C. Manager**1. Consideration of Fiscal Year 2027****a. Meeting Schedule**

Ms. Giles noted several months ago the Board asked to transition from every other month to once a month. The meeting schedule sticking to the second Tuesday of each month is on page 220 of the agenda package.

On MOTION by Mr. Craig, seconded by Mr. Church with all in favor, the FY2027 Meeting Schedule, was approved 4-0.

b. Goals and Objectives

Ms. Giles noted on page 222 are the goals and objectives that staff put together for Rolling Hills CDD.

On MOTION by Mr. Church, seconded by Mr. Craig, with all in favor, the FY2027 Goals and Objectives, were approved 4-0.

D. Operations/Amenity Manager**1. Report**

Mr. Soriano provided some updates from the Operations Report on page 226 of the agenda package. He discussed the LGI lot. Mr. Church noted they need information of what LGI is going to help with in the next 30-45 days. Jay will get quotes for adding irrigation to the big lot behind the mailboxes in the LGI area. Jay provided an update on the playground. Supervisor Craig and Jay will come up with some options for the park and present them to the Board.

2. Monthly Quality Inspection Report

There being no comments, the next item followed.

ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**Supervisor's Requests**

Ms. Cormier stated the sand on Rolling View Blvd is still piled up. Asked to have it cleaned up and removed since the construction is done. Mr. Soriano noted public works should clean it up. She spoke about something being updated in the procedures for the community on the RFPs going out on certain things. She asked for an update on Woodbridge and the pond back there. Mr. Oca noted Lake Doctors cleaned it all up Monday. She asked for an update on the bridge on Sandridge.

August 11, 2026

Rolling Hills CDD

Ms. Giles followed up with Ed and kept Kevin and staff on the cc line. He says he is still working with Lowes Hero department for pricing on that. No timeframe yet. Ms. Cormier noted residents are screaming because with school starting and there are comments about the concern of are they hindering the safety for people walking and the pedestrian usage on Sandridge and there is not sidewalk on the other side. She noted she has not replied to anything on FB.

Mr. Craig stated it is in process. Ms. Giles stated she has not received any phone calls or concerns from any residents.

Resident stated he was one that commented and complained. He spent 21 years in the military, and nothing has ever moved that slow. Jay noted the CDD has only owned this for a couple of months. Board members couldn't do anything to that point because it wasn't the CDDs. They got it in mid-May. Ms. Giles explained how the Board obtained ownership of the bridge. Ms. Cormier feels their attorney did not negotiate on better terms for the District.

Ms. Giles stated if anyone sees anything that is broken or needs staff attention, please do not wait for a meeting. Their contact information is on the CDD website or email one of the five Supervisors. They will be happy to explain how the CDD got that bridge, the condition of the bridge and the way forward for that bridge.

An audience member stated there have been times that he wanted to address things and nobody was in the office. He asked what a feasible time response is from GMS or a Board member.

Mr. Bauer thanked an esteem colleague for always wanting to down their management company and lawyer that actually does look out for the CDDs best interest. It is absolutely terrible. Yes you are one vote that if you actually got your way, would increase the property assessments for every house in this neighborhood. He noted they are doing a great job. Ms. Cormier stated that was so off. Mr. Bauer stated it is off because you don't agree with it. Ms. Cormier stated no, why would we want to raise the fees? Mr. Bauer stated no one else on this board agrees with your tactics and what you are doing. You want to attack everybody on this board, our management company, our lawyers, and everybody we work with at every meeting we have. I can only speak for myself but would like to include the entire board by saying we are tired of it. The tactics of you attacking every person, our engineer, our lawyer, our management company, and everyone that works with us. You attack them every meeting for some odd reason. Ms. Cormier stated I have the right to be dissatisfied with the services we pay for. I do not ever want to increase our fees. It is a shame our developer did not contribute the funds to this community so that we were not in the situation that

August 11, 2026

Rolling Hills CDD

we are in. But again it is the attorney that allowed different things to be happening throughout this time. Thank you for your comments and your thoughts, and we are going to continue to agree to disagree.

TWELFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Audience Comments

Ms. Giles opened the public comment period limited to three minutes.

Resident stated you have to have somebody that is going to make that squeaky wheel louder so things can move. It seems like you have a company that has a little brother over here and they are paying him. He believes on a yearly basis or every 2-3 years they should get new bids on things. Spoke about having to wait 3 hours before the Board will hear him in public comment.

Resident asked do we have any plans after the donated funds and labor on the bridge repair to give to the county to maintain. Ms. Giles stated the county doesn't own that entire path of the sidewalk. The Board asked staff to prepare a letter to the county asking the county to take that bridge and the county said no. Mr. Craig noted they explored the possibility of demolishing the bridge in an attempt to get the county to take some ownership in looking that this could potentially be a liability for the neighborhood. Supervisor Craig is the liaison for this project.

Resident (Craig Hart) stated he was under the impression that they had already secured the donations from Lowes and just waiting on approval. Mr. Craig noted they voted to approve the donation.

Resident (Jeff) asked if all the expenditures are broken down in the pdf online.

Resident stated they are glad they are finally getting a park at Paddle Creek. Suggested an aluminum fence across the front to secure the children from running out in the road. Jay noted the fence that is going around the playground is the lower fence. He asked if there is any idea of when this road will go all the way down. Will the new area connect all the way through?

THIRTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Financial Reports

A. Balance Sheet & Income Statement

B. Assessment Receipts Schedule

C. Check Register

Ms. Giles presented the financial reports which include the balance sheet and income statement for the period ending July 31, 2026 on page 230 of the agenda and is followed by the

August 11, 2026

Rolling Hills CDD

assessment receipt schedule showing that the District is 100% collected. The July check register in the amount of \$84,231.45 is on page 250 of the agenda package.

On MOTION by Mr. Craig, seconded by Mr. Church, with all in favor, the Check Register, was approved 4-0.

FOURTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**Closed Session: Security***

Ms. Giles asked the residents to step out into the hallway for the closed session. When discussion is over, the residents will be invited back in. If a motion is made, it will be made on the record in the public.

The closed session ended and the public was invited back into the meeting. Ms. Giles stated the Board discussed some security matters, and no decisions were made at this time.

FIFTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**Next Scheduled Meeting: To Be Determined**

Ms. Giles announced the next scheduled meeting is October 13, 2026 at 6:00 p.m. at Rolling Hills Amenity Center.

SIXTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**Adjournment**

Ms. Giles moved to adjourn.

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

Signed by:



A38999D0EDC14F4...
Secretary/Assistant Secretary

DocuSigned by:



08669523118D4DD...
Chairman/Vice Chairman