

**MINUTES OF MEETING  
SOUTHERN HILLS PLANTATION I  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT**

The Board of Supervisors of the Southern Hills Plantation I Community Development District held a Regular Meeting on May 11, 2026 at 10:00 a.m., at the Southern Hills Plantation Clubhouse, 4200 Summit View Drive, Brooksville, Florida 34601.

**Present:**

John McCoskrie

Chair

Richard Pakan

Vice Chair

Margaret Bloomquist

Assistant Secretary

George Ostensen

Assistant Secretary

**Also present:**

Chuck Adams

District Manager

Grace Rinaldi

District Counsel

Joe Calamari

District Engineer

Alex Kurth

Premier

Brett Sealy (via telephone)

MBS Capital Markets, LLC

Kendall Hahn (via telephone)

MBS Capital Markets, LLC

Jay Gardner

Resident

**FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Call to Order/Roll Call**

Mr. Adams called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. Supervisors McCoskrie, Pakan, Bloomquist and Ostensen were present. Supervisor Tomashosky was absent.

**SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Public Comments (Agenda Items)**

Mr. McCoskrie stated Jay Gardner agreed to defer his comments to later in the meeting. No members of the public spoke.

**THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Continued Discussion/Update: Revised  
Amortization Schedule Removing  
Escheated Parcels**

Ms. Hahn distributed the "Southern Hills Plantation I CDD Restructuring/Refunding Discussion" handout and stated she and Mr. Sealy will present updated numbers to the documents in the agenda and have a few points of discussion.

Mr. Sealy stated MBS Staff has been working with the Board on potentially restructuring/refunding the Series 2011 A-1 bonds. Information regarding Staff's review of underlying credit and economics dynamics pertaining to the proposed restructuring/refunding was previously provided. Input from the Board was obtained and questions were answered. Ms. Hahn handed out a presentation, which incorporates all the discussions, so the Board can pose additional questions and make a determination as to what direction it may want to go in.

Referencing slides, Mr. Sealy stated some Series 2011A-1 Bonds Overview is redundant in terms of maturity dates and coupons. The outstanding principal amount of the bonds, including the escheated lots is \$3,705,000, which is the post May 1 amortization installment outstanding principal balance. The principal amount excluding the escheated lots is \$3,395,000.

Mr. McCoskrie pointed out that the maturity date is 2035, not 2047. Mr. Sealy stated the typographical error will be corrected. He reviewed the Trust Estate Account Balances as of May 4<sup>th</sup>. The revenue account balance provides for the \$107,445 in interest due on November 1, 2026, with the remaining balance therein representing surplus. Staff noted a balance in the prepayment account that, conceptually according to the documents, should have been utilized to prepay principal as a result of those proceeds being payment proceeds from certain lots that elected to prepay their assessments. So, that balance is retained therein and theoretically will be utilized here in the near future to call bonds. The Board will note in the materials going forward that MBS Staff assumed that was going to occur as that is what is specified in the documents and there is a limited balance in the cost of issuance account.

- **Estimated Debt Service Schedule**

Mr. Sealy presented Slides 3 and 4. the Current Debt Service including the Escheated Lots, and noted the correct maturity date of May 1, 2035, and the Current Debt Service excluding the Escheated Lots.

Asked about the purpose of the slide excluding the escheated lots, Mr. Sealy stated it is to show the principal amount of bonds that would be refunded based upon MBS's understanding that the bondholders would agree to cancel the principal amount associated with the escheated lots if the remaining bonds were refunded at par. Asked if that means they would be willing to cancel the escheated lots without payment, Mr. Sealy stated that is his understanding based upon the correspondence between Trustee's Counsel and District Counsel. Mr. McCoskrie stated, if the CDD refinances the bonds at par, they are willing to cancel the 47 escheated lots debt associated with those simply by the fact that the bonds are being re-issued.

Asked if the CDD will be paying off the escheated lots, Ms. Hahn stated, in this case, if MBS were to refund them, then the \$310,000 associated with the escheated lots would be cancelled. Asked if that is because the CDD would be paying them off, Ms. Hahn stated the CDD would not be paying them off; rather, MBS would be refunding outstanding par at the \$3,395,000. Ms. Rinaldi stated Trustee's Counsel advised that, if the CDD proceeds with a restructuring, they would be willing to accept a new amortization schedule. Asked if they are only willing to accept the paydown on the escheated lots if the CDD refinances, Ms. Rinaldi replied that is the understanding from the conversations.

Mr. Pagan thinks if they take funds out of the trust to pay down the escheated lots, it would basically exhaust the debt service reserve fund, meaning they would be unsecured for the next nine years. He asked if the bondholders are willing to do that. Mr. Sealy stated MBS has not discussed it with bondholders but has been working with District Staff regarding their conversations with the bondholders. He cannot speak to what they have conceptually agreed to. It is Staff's understanding that they will agree to cancel the \$310,000 allocable to the escheated lots if the CDD is willing to refund the remaining balance of the bonds; the principal associated with non-escheated lots at par. This is why MBS is differentiating the two debt service schedules. One is the existing debt service schedule as it currently exists, albeit there is some disagreement as to whether or not principal and interest is being paid on the \$310,000; this is why two different debt service schedules are being illustrated. Regarding whether the bondholders are willing to take a loss on that portion, Mr. Sealy stated they would be taking a loss on that portion to the extent that is what has been conveyed in the correspondence with Trustee's Counsel; they would be writing off \$310,000 of the principal amount of the bonds and the CDD would be refunding the outstanding balance of the \$3,395,000. Asked if this means the CDD has an additional \$310,000 that can be used to buy down additional principal, Mr. Sealy stated that is correct.

Mr. Sealy stated the analytical considerations, the balances in the various trust accounts, were updated, as it is after May 1<sup>st</sup>. So, the refunding, as previously discussed, the principal associated with the non-escheated lots does not produce a positive net present value savings; however, it does produce a slight reduction in debt service. The annual reduction as a result of the refunding, partially because of lower interest rates and primarily as a result of bringing some of the trust estate proceeds forward as a source of funds towards the refunding, generates about \$29,000 per year in reduction or about 5.86%.

- **Estimated Refunding Amounts**

Mr. Sealy reviewed Slides 6 and 7, reflecting the Estimated Restructuring/Refunding Results, and noted that the annual reductions are slightly overstated, primarily because the \$107,000 in the prepayment account was not utilized to call bonds. There are essentially 10 less assessable lots by virtue of their prepayment. So, the new debt service on the bonds will be spread over less units and the net reduction will be actually less at under 6%. Mr. Sealy believes the first part of this is to get clarification on what bondholders have suggested that they are willing to agree to and, once that is clarified, Staff can confirm that the numbers/analytics are correct and will discern how to address the credit items that have been raised.

Mr. Pakan noted that, if the Board opts to do nothing, the max debt service amount is \$529,000, and if it refinances, the amount \$439,000; a \$90,000 difference, which is a result of a number of issues including the prepayments.

Mr. Sealy discussed the maximum annual debt service, escheated lot principals, cap on the reserve funds, actual savings amount, and what happens if the CDD does not refinance. Regarding the impact on the annual assessment if a restructuring were done and the refunding was effectuated at the estimated interest rate and issuance was within that refunding or generates an additional \$250,000 in construction proceeds for the repair/restoration project without increasing the annual assessments, Mr. Sealy stated there is some question as to what lots would be assessed for that \$250,000 in additional construction proceeds. If the 495 assessable lots would be subject to the additional annual debt service from the \$250,000 in new construction proceeds, it would increase the annual assessments above the current levels.

Discussion ensued regarding whether to proceed with the restructuring, the impact of the restructuring on assessments, the new debt service reserve fund, the cashflow analysis, escheated lots, interest rate, issue date and if there could be a change in the Trustee. Asked for Management’s recommendation, Mr. Adams voiced his belief that the Board should proceed with the restructuring because it will codify the escheatment issue.

**On MOTION by Mr. McCoskrie and seconded by Ms. Bloomquist, with all in favor, proceeding with the MBS restructuring plan, excluding the escheated lots, was approved.**

▪ **Public Comments (Agenda Items)**

**This item, previously the Second Order of Business, was presented out of order.**

Mr. McCoskrie stated he previously circulated an email from and then met with Mr. Gardner and his spouse, who had concerns about the current procedures for when a resident

sees an alligator, such as who determines it is a nuisance. In this case, they called the HOA, which was short-staffed and an assistant called a trapper as opposed to calling The Florida Fish and Wildlife Commission (FWC). There does not seem to be any formal alligator protocols.

Mr. Gardner stated there does not seem to be a process for identifying dangerous alligators. He thinks the idea that someone can just call in a nuisance alligator and a trapper comes to remove it is concerning. He recalled the confrontation with the trapper, who he felt was rude, and noted that he would not show identification or a permit and threatened to call the Sheriff. Mr. Gardner thinks it would have been better if the FWC was contacted as they can determine if an alligator is a nuisance. In his opinion, none of the alligators in the pond are a nuisance and stated there are no records of alligator attacks in the County. He thinks there should be a formal alligator removal process.

Mr. McCoskrie thinks individuals should not call trappers. He respects wildlife as much as anyone, but it seems District Counsel might need to address this.

Ms. Rinaldi stated it is encouraged that, if someone is concerned about wildlife alligators that they contact the FWC, which has processes and standards for what constitutes a nuisance alligator. It is within their jurisdiction to review and determine whether that alligator is a nuisance and should be removed. It is not something that is within the CDD's purview to take on or have authority to determine. For liability reasons, the Board does not want to dissuade anyone from calling if they see an alligator or other wildlife that they feel might pose any type of threat but, rather, to contact operations to ask for the FWC's contact information.

Since the CDD owns most of the ponds, Mr. McCoskrie wondered if it would be appropriate for District Counsel to draft a memo to the HOA regarding the nuisance alligator process and disseminate it to the residents.

Discussion ensued regarding how best to handle incidents involving local wildlife, including deer and snakes, the FWC and the HOA's authority.

Ms. Rinaldi will circulate a handout about alligators and wildlife and the FWC's contact information to the HOA.

**FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS****Update/Discussion/Consideration: Premier Lakes, Inc. Items**

- **Lake Maintenance Reports – April 2026**

Mr. Kurth stated the technician’s focus has been on routine maintenance and keeping algae under control, as there has been growth due to warmer temperatures. There were sightings of submerged and floating weeds in Lakes L-8BB, L-5GG, L-5HH which were treated. Crews will continue monitoring the lakes. Regarding the grass carp for Lake L200AA, there was a delay but a delivery to stock the fish is expected within the next 14 days.

**FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Update/Discussion/Consideration:  
Steadfast Environmental, LLC Items**

- **Landscape Maintenance Reports – April 2026**
- **Outfall Review and Cleaning**

Mr. McCoskrie recalled the Board previously approved Steadfast traveling up the two creeks. Steadfast cleared out debris and submitted photographs of their work. Steadfast is willing to clear brush from Lake L-5FF, the retention area to the left of the tee box on #16, and inspect the outflow structures. A bid of \$4,300 was received. 26 structures need to be checked.

Mr. Calamari stated he inspected half the 26 structures and they seem to be in very good condition. He will inspect Lake L-5FF this week. Mr. McCoskrie stated the additional work can be postponed, including clearing Lake L-5FF, as Steadfast has done a good bit of work this spring.

**SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Consideration of Recommendation from  
Shared Costs Committee FY2027 Cost  
Sharing Analysis**

Mr. Adams presented the Shared Cost Proforma Approved by the Committee on April 23, 2026, which is the updated worksheet originated by Mr. Pakan. Staff added a column for the 2026-2027 fiscal years and inserted increases across items that were in the shared pod in prior years. The totals are slightly under 10%, which is the 10% max cap per year. In the most recent Committee meeting, everyone was in agreement with the numbers and with proceeding.

**On MOTION by Mr. Pakan and seconded by Mr. Ostensen, with all in favor, the Shared Costs Committee FY2027 Cost Sharing Analysis, was approved.**

**SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Continued Discussion/Update: Conveyance  
of Pond 5ii**

Ms. Rinaldi stated the three lights from Pond 5ii were relocated back to the residents' private lot and the deed has been recorded and sent to the HOA for their files. Asked if the CDD is currently the owner of Pond 5ii, Ms. Renaldi replied affirmatively.

**EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Update: Boulevard Mainline Irrigation Line Replacement Project**

- **Consideration of Steadfast Alliance Estimate # EST-SCA3935 Repair 3 Mainline Breaks Along Blvd.**

Mr. Ostensen presented Steadfast Estimate # EST-SCA3935 for \$9,830 to repair three existing mainline breaks along the Boulevard. He asked if the replacement has to be split across two fiscal years. Mr. Adams stated he can look into obtaining a five-year note and bill the repayment obligation to the operating budget.

**On MOTION by Mr. McCoskrie and seconded by Mr. Ostensen, with all in favor, Steadfast Alliance Estimate # EST-SCA3935 to Repair 3 Mainline Breaks Along the Boulevard, in the amount of \$9,830, was approved.**

Mr. Ostensen stated he would like to reduce the four crossings in the Boulevard to two. He will ask Scott who to contact to accomplish that, as it would bring about cost savings.

Mr. Ostensen presented Pure Paint Florida Estimate #9221754 for \$1,787 to wash and seal the columns at the front entrance.

**On MOTION by Mr. McCoskrie and seconded by Mr. Ostensen, with all in favor, Pure Paint Florida Estimate # 9221754 to wash and seal the columns at the front entrance, in the amount of \$1,787, was approved.**

Mr. Ostensen presented a revised proposal from Festive Glow for an additional \$200 to complete the landscape light project, bringing the total cost of the project to \$5,505.

**On MOTION by Mr. McCoskrie and seconded by Mr. Pakan, with all in favor, the revised Festive Glow proposal for an additional \$200, bringing the total amount of \$5,505 to complete the landscape light project, was approved.**

**NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Acceptance of Unaudited Financial Statements as of March 31, 2026**

Mr. Pakan presented the Unaudited Financial Statements as of March 31, 2026.

**On MOTION by Mr. McCoskrie and seconded by Mr. Ostensen, with all in favor, the Unaudited Financial Statements as of March 31, 2026, were accepted.**

Mr. McCoskrie stated Penault LLC, completed the culvert cleaning and is moving and relocating dirt from the culverts. A concrete spillway is being undermined by water flowing underneath it on the east side. Penault submitted a \$4,870 bid to install additional riprap at the head of the spillway to prevent further erosion. He recommended approval and stated Mr. Calamari has been involved in the process and the work meets his requirements.

**On MOTION by Mr. McCoskrie and seconded by Mr. Ostensen, with all in favor, the Penault LLC estimate to fill an undermined spillway with foam for erosion repair, in the amount of \$4,870, was approved.**

Mr. McCoskrie stated a Southern Valley Loop homeowner, near L-161AA, is trying to build a pool, but his neighbors are preventing access to the area between their homes. He is asking for permission to allow heavy equipment on the backside lake bank for access to place the pool equipment on his property and to remove it when the work is complete.

Ms. Rinaldi stated Staff would want the District Engineer to review the area to see if it is suitable for heavy equipment to traverse. If so, and if the Board wishes to grant authorization, Staff would prepare a Temporary Access Agreement between the CDD and the resident allowing use of the property for the purposes of accessing their property. This typically requires a deposit as well as any restoration to CDD property. Mr. McCoskrie stated the CDD would only want a certificate of insurance (COI) and Agreement from the resident’s contractor to grant permission. Mr. McCoskrie directed Mr. Calamari to inspect the area and report his findings to the Chair and District Counsel.

**On MOTION by Mr. McCoskrie and seconded by Mr. Ostensen, with all in favor, allowing a homeowner at 4723 Southern Valley Loop to use the Lake L-161AA bank for access to transport heavy equipment for a pool project, subject to the District Engineer’s review and approval, was approved.**

**TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Approval of April 13, 2026 Regular Meeting Minutes**

The following changes were made:

Line 51: Change “Co-forma” to “Pro-forma”

Line 54: Change “5<sup>1</sup>/<sub>8</sub>%” to “5.8%”

Line 65: Change “Mr. Calamari” to “Mr. Kurth”

Lines 142 and 143: Change “the 50’ to 60’ ribbon” to “the ribbon”

Line 169: Insert "on A2" after "\$310,000"

Line 191: Change "935" to "9/30 2025 Audit"

**On MOTION by Mr. McCoskrie and seconded by Mr. Pakan, with all in favor, the April 13, 2026 Regular Meeting Minutes, as amended, were approved.**

**ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Other Business**

There was no other business.

**TWELFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Public Comments (non-agenda items)**

No members of the public spoke.

**THIRTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Staff Reports**

**A. District Counsel: Kilinski | Van Wyk PLLC**

Ms. Rinaldi stated her office emailed information about upcoming deadlines for ethics training, Form 1 filing, and the candidate qualifying period for the General Election.

- **Discussion/Update: District Boundaries**

**B. District Engineer: Coastal Engineering Associates, Inc.**

There was no report.

**C. District Manager: Wrathell, Hunt and Associates, LLC**

- **NEXT MEETING DATE: June 8, 2026 at 10:00 AM [Presentation of FY2027 Proposed Budget]**
  - **QUORUM CHECK**
- **Performance Measures/Standards & Annual Reporting Form (for informational purposes)**

**FOURTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Supervisors' Requests**

There were no Supervisors' requests.

**FIFTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Adjournment**

On MOTION by Mr. McCoskrie and seconded by Mr. Pakan, with all in favor, the meeting adjourned at 11:23 a.m.

  
Secretary/Assistant Secretary

  
Chair/Vice Chair