



***Municipal Service District of Ponte Vedra Beach***  
***P.O. Box 1323 Ponte Vedra Beach, Florida 32004-1323***  
***(904) 285-2221 www.pvmsd.org***

## **MEETING MINUTES**

### **AUGUST 14, 2023**

The Trustees of the Municipal Service District held their monthly meeting on Monday, August 14<sup>th</sup> at the Ponte Vedra Beach Branch Library – FOL Room at 5:30 PM.

#### **TRUSTEES PRESENT**

Al Hollon – Chairman  
Kitty Switkes – Vice Chairman  
Rick Brown – Treasurer  
Charles Callaghan  
John Cellucci  
Brad Wester  
Michael White

Wayne Flowers – Attorney

Chairman Hollon called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. We will begin with the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

Chairman Hollon explained the public notice, order, conduct and civility. You will be given three minutes to speak if you turn in a speaker card.

#### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The Board of Trustees meeting minutes from July 10<sup>th</sup> were discussed. A motion was made to approve the minutes, they were seconded and unanimously carried.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Jay Montanus – 4805 Otter Creek Lane – She reported that she would like to see a no vote from the board on the PVIC plan. She reported that she comes from a real estate background and asked if the developer had provided any impact studies regarding traffic, water and sewer or any environmental studies that people can peruse to become more knowledgeable. Chairman Hollon reported that they would have to file something with the county as this board does not have authority on approval or disapproval. We have placed on our website a link to the application and posted the dates for the upcoming meetings. Ms. Montanus reported that she did come to the first meeting but it was cancelled due to too many people and she would like to see more information shared with the community. Chairman Hollon reported that the website has a link to the application with the county and the items you want to see would be there. Ms. Montanus reported that these items might not be there? Chairman Hollon reported that he does not know the answer. Regarding the meetings, they are not trying to put you at a disadvantage making you go to St. Augustine, but the Architectural Review Committee like the MSD are required to have their meeting within one mile of the

boundaries of the MSD. The planning and adjustment board are required to meet in St. Augustine at the auditorium. The Architectural Review Committee will be meeting at the Marriott. Ms. Montanus reported that nonetheless it is an observation and anything and everything should be public record.

Darby Brower – 220 San Juan Drive – Mr. Brower reported that he is here regarding the sidewalk and he would be in phase 2 and feels like we have never been heard. He believes that if you look at Rutile and Le Master the road is wide enough where you do not need a sidewalk. He reported that he is on the side that the sidewalk is proposed to be installed and feels that residents have not been heard and are being railroaded and this is being slammed down their throats. He wishes there was more transparency regarding a street being too narrow.

Kathy Gleason – 318 San Juan Drive – Ms. Gleason reported that she has written to you three times (January 30, 2022, May 16, 2023, and May 25, 2023) and brought the correspondence and would like them entered into the record of this meeting. Regarding the letters, Ms. Gleason reported that she has not received a response from her correspondence. Chairman Hollon reported that he sent her an e-mail. She reported that if the board votes in favor of the construction of the sidewalk tonight, it is doing so without the meaningful involvement of the residents of San Juan Drive or the community. The MSD held a meeting in January 2022 to get input from the residents. Less than two weeks later the Ponte Vedra Recorder noted that the MSD Board voted in favor of the sidewalk. How could this board possibly address the concerns of that meeting in such a short time. The MSD knows this is a controversial project and has hidden behind the Ponte Vedra Community Association (PVCA) which is inappropriate. None of the meetings were properly noticed and none of the minutes from those meetings have been made publicly available, and none of the concerns from those meetings have been addressed. The subject of the sidewalk should be put to a vote by residents of the district as this is taxpayer money and the taxpayers should have a say in how it is spent.

Jim Middleton – 327 San Juan Drive – Mr. Middleton reported he has lived here for 27 years and is in favor of the sidewalk as he has lived in sidewalk communities before. There are sidewalks on Solana Road and Ponte Vedra Blvd. and he reported that he does not see any impact on the property value of those homes because of the sidewalk. This is a safety concern, the road is narrow, and he does not see that changing. By putting it on the west side it impacts nine fewer homes. He reported that he hopes that the sidewalk gets to Pablo Road so it will complete a circle. There have been concerns about hole seven and the parking there and the sidewalk should address that issue.

Perry Bechtle – 555 Rutile Drive – He reported that he heard from one of the neighbors that there is going to be an attempted vote tonight to show support for the PVIC development. He reported that he would like to ask the board to hold on voting on this until there is more information on this application. He reported that we are very early in this process and the community is still meeting the PV Corp. Chairman Hollon reported that this is not on the agenda for tonight's meeting but will be for next month's meeting.

Homa Nezami – 1 San Juan Circle – Ms. Nezami reported that she read the entire proposal line by line and did not see any argument that this project will benefit the community. It will enhance the community with employment, and provide lodging for the TPC, Mayo and PGA guests. My objection to this is the employment they are mentioning is not the type of employment for residents of this community. We are professional, retired and second home residents. None of us are interested in working in hotels, restaurants, and shops. By admitting they are increasing employment they are admitting they are changing residential community to a commercial community. In the map they put the golf course in the project and this is to put in more housing. This PUD will cause a traffic nightmare. No one pays attention to the fact that companies like Apollo and Blackrock are looking to purchase real estate but they are not interested in purchasing single family home residential. As soon as you change it to commercial the developer will have very many buyers. The only thing we have going for us is the fact that we are a single family home residential. The only benefit is for the developer and this should be rejected. Vote no.

Gail Cooper – 219 San Juan Drive – Ms. Cooper reported that at the last meeting you mentioned that you were going to vote on the PVIC PUD. She reported that she is here tonight because she thought the PUD was going to be on the agenda for you to vote on it. She reported that she just found out it was not on the agenda and she asked when the MSD Trustees are going to vote on the PUD. Chairman Hollon reported that it will be on the agenda for the next month's meeting. Chairman Hollon reported that the ARC meeting is September 6<sup>th</sup> at the Marriott. She reported that all this information is changing and we as residents need to know when these meetings are going to occur and what time they are going to occur. This information is not transparent. Vice Chairman Switkes reported that she will take responsibility of the dates and will put this on the website. She reported that some of these changes, the county does not tell us. This is what we know.

September 6 – 5pm will be the Architectural Review Committee at the Marriott.

September 11 – 11am the Ponte Vedra Zoning will meet in St. Augustine and the PUD will not be heard until 1pm

September 11 – 5:30 pm is the MSD monthly meeting.

November 7 – Board of County Commissioners meeting and we do not have a time.

The August 17<sup>th</sup> meeting will now be on September 21<sup>st</sup> and this is a little piece of property behind the Carlyle.

Trustee White reported that we are doing our best to put information on our website so that residents are informed and we do not in any way shape or form control the administration of that process. The applicant is applying to St. Johns County and their staff schedules all these hearings. You should go to St. Johns County with all your questions. If venues change, if times change, we have no control over that.

Beth Bechtle – 555 Rutile Drive responded that the concern is that we heard at the last meeting you were going to vote on the PUD tonight. We do not want you to vote as you cannot vote on something you do not know what is going on. Chairman Hollon reported that it is on the agenda for the board to vote to support or oppose the PUD.

Sue Mossell - 558 Le Master Drive – She asked if you are going to vote at next month's meeting. Chairman Hollon reported that we are going to vote to support or oppose. Attorney Flowers reported that the board could also take no position. Trustee Wester reported we have a monthly meeting and saying we are going to vote at next month's meeting could change as of tonight we do not know what is going to happen in the coming weeks. As a board we just learned about these new dates that still need to be confirmed. Ms. Mossell asked that are you going to vote and take a stand together; it is a yes or no answer. Chairman Hollon reported that it will be on the agenda at the next meeting. She asked if this would be a vote in front of the public. Chairman Hollon reported yes and she reported that she is new and does not know how it all works. She asked does it really matter what the MSD board thinks? She asked if your vote matters to the County Commissioners? Chairman Hollon reported that he does not know what the commissioners think. She asked, should your vote be based on what the residents want? Chairman Hollon reported that we have various issues that opposing viewpoint that in our system someone must make a decision. It is the same as the County Commissioners. Ms. Mossell wants the residents to vote. Vice Chairman Switkes reported that if the dates stay the same the Zoning meeting is going to overlap our meeting and thinks it should not be on the agenda as the people in the community should be at the Zoning meeting and not worry about us. Ms. Mossell reported you are here to represent us and she would hope that you would take a vote to see what the residents want in their best interest.

Steve Bloomfield – 94 San Juan Drive- Mr. Bloomfield – Mr. Bloomfield reported there is a lot of confusion today about this meeting and reported that he had it marked down as a sidewalk discussion. Mr. Bloomfield reported that he sent e-mails to the MSD Trustees today and they all got

back to me and expressed his thanks for the quick turnaround.

Claudia Thomas – 342 San Juan Drive – Ms. Thomas reported she is a resident of San Juan Drive and lives on the west side and is taken aback by the whole sidewalk construction by lack of transparency, to hiring a company who did less than a thorough job regarding feasibility and the representation erroneously that the majority of residents are in favor of the sidewalk. She reported that she went door to door with a petition that nearly 70% of the residents who live on the west side in the first phase are opposed which contrary to what the board was told by some people. It is also frustrating to hear from people who live on the other side who are in favor of the sidewalk when it is not going to be in their front yard.

Russ Thomas – 342 San Juan Drive – Mr. Thomas reported that he echoes everything his wife said and he went back to look at the easement and there is nothing that talks about sidewalks and he will talk to a land use lawyer if he needs to. He reported that there is zero indication that you can construct a sidewalk. This report that you have done is just wrong. They want to put it 10 feet in and every utility box will have to be ripped out. Your own report shows that no one has been hit on San Juan. It is a ridiculous idea and completely unnecessary and why you are letting a handful of loud vocal residents on the east push this. It is not necessary, a waste of money and will destroy all our property for zero reason.

## **TRUSTEE REPORTS**

### **CHAIRMAN'S REPORT - CHAIRMAN HOLLON**

#### **REPUBLIC / SHERIFF PATROLS AND PAYMENTS**

Chairman Hollon reported that inflation went up 5.4% and for the 2-day service with Republic the cost will go up \$996.13 a month for a total of \$19,333.34. The sheriff's reports show there were 90 citations, mostly speed and running stop signs, 301 warnings and 34 parking citation. Vice Chairman Switkes asked if there was any other criminal activity. Chairman Hollon reported no.

#### **JEA / LANDSCAPE – VICE CHAIRMAN SWITKES**

Vice Chairman Switkes reported that for landscaping we cleaned up the intersection at San Juan and Ponte Vedra Blvd. and cleaned up the trees. She reported that she is going to add to the regular landscaping the right side (west) on Ponte Vedra Blvd. when coming from Duval. The water bill is fine, all the palm trees were trimmed in the islands and all irrigation is working with some minor fixes. The backflow preventors, four of them on the islands, are being tested this month and two more will be tested in October. All the bridges have been pressure washed and the monument is still to be pressure washed. Vice Chairman Switkes asked JEA about painting the fire hydrants, and they asked for addresses and she will provide them. A resident asked me about the water treatment plant at 2 Corona and asked JEA if this is being decommissioned or being sold and they reported no.

#### **TREASURER'S REPORT / STREET SIGNS– TREASURER BROWN**

Treasurer Brown reported that no unusual deposits or expenses last month. He reported that the ending balance on the Florida Prime Money Market was \$1.049 million with interest earned at 5.39%. The First Horizon Money Market is now closed and the balance has been moved to the First Horizon Checking. Treasurer Brown reported that he was notified about a street sign at the corner of Le Master and Solana is leaning and the post has been damaged and will be replaced. There was also a speed limit sign ajar on Morning Side Drive and they will straighten that sign up. A motion was made to approve the Treasurer's Report, it was seconded and unanimously carried.

#### **BEACHES ENERGY / WEBSITE – TRUSTEE CALLAGHAN**

Trustee Callaghan reported that he has been working with Beaches Energy (BE) and there are seven streetlights that are not working and they have fixed five of them. If you see a streetlight, broken, damaged or not working you can call 247-6171 and will be given a case number. You can also send an e-mail to [streetlights@beachesenergy.com](mailto:streetlights@beachesenergy.com). We are possibly getting four new streetlights installed. BE is going to survey the areas and see if they can be added. They will look to see if there

is a power source within 10 feet. If the power source is not within 10 feet, they will give us an estimate of the cost. There has also been some graffiti in the area, mostly at Micklers, and they have painted over the boxes. Since the graffiti is not vulgar it goes on their maintenance list and the painter is out of state. The website has been changed and he understands the frustration regarding the meetings and he will update the website with the new dates. Vice Chairman Switkes asked if BE is still confirming that all the poles will be replaced. Trustee Callaghan reported that Matt Brooks reported that all the poles will be replaced within the next two years.

#### **NEWSLETTER / FLAGS / INSURANCE - TRUSTEE CELLUCCI**

Trustee Cellucci reported that to be thinking about your article for the newsletter as he would like to receive them by mid-November. Some of the flags had to be retired and some of the brackets replaced. Regarding the insurance, he received a quote on the workers comp but nothing on the regular liability but increased it 10% for budget purposes.

#### **BEACH AND SIDEWALK– TRUSTEE WESTER**

Trustee Wester reported that the county is still working on making improvements at the San Juan beach access and a plan to prevent golf cart parking. No other updates on beach access and he will defer his comments regarding sidewalks to unfinished business. He reported that we our engineer expert from Kimley Horne here at this meeting if you have any questions. Trustee Wester reported that this is essentially our third meeting on this topic specifically as we have had two workshops and sidewalks are always an agenda item.

#### **TRUSTEE WHITE – CTTF / ROAD AND BRIDGE**

Trustee White reported that from the CTTF meeting today they reported that the survey they did received data from 3,208 individuals. He reported that he would like to present this information to the board when there is time on the agenda. There was discussion regarding the PUD application and the traffic impact. They understood that GATE is revising the application now and have not resubmitted this plan. The CTTF is going to wait until these resubmissions are entered.

Trustee White reported that the good news for all of us that is the county is the owner of the lagoons and the only one who has the right to amend anything. The St. Johns River Management and the DEP put a cloud on how to make changes and discharge water in the lagoons. The information we received back is that the person who is reviewing changes is going to be liberal regarding making improvements to the old parts of the drainage system where there are existing outfalls. Trustee White reported that he is trying to advocate for the county to step in and restore the drainage system that we have that is old. We have a green light now to push the county to make changes to old pipes that are broken that can be discharged in the lagoons. Trustee White reported that the county is hiring an engineer to do a feasibility study and he reported that he is going to try to participate and give improvements that we have identified in the MSD. Chairman Hollon reported that he is going to recommend in the current budget that we put a new line item for drainage for \$150,000. Trustee White reported that in the interest of getting things fixed, if we are contributing to this it will move us higher up the ladder.

Ms. Nezami – 1 San Juan Circle asked who owns the lagoons. Chairman Hollon reported to be clear, the ground beneath the lagoon is owned by the PVIC but the water is a state waterway. She reported that she asks this because on their plans there is a circle around the lagoons. Trustee White reported that on the PUD if they put it as a lake, it is a lake. She asked if they could fill up the lake and make it land. Trustee White reported that on the site plan if they show it as a lake or lagoon, they cannot develop it as anything but a lake or a lagoon. She asked that some parts of the lagoons are not marked and some are marked and we need to know this.

Jeff Scott- 360 San Juan Drive – Mr. Scott asked if we know where these drainage pipes are for the sidewalks. Trustee White reported that San Juan has a bunch of flooding areas but there was a feasibility study done which is not a final design and assume that in the final design all the issues

will have to be addressed.

Serena Bloomfield – 94 San Juan Drive – She asked who oversees all the growth in the lagoons. Trustee White reported St. Johns County. Trustee Wester reported that they have a lake doctor and he will investigate it and report back to Ms. Bloomfield.

### **ATTORNEY REPORT – ATTORNEY FLOWERS**

Attorney Flowers reported that last month he told the board that he is retiring at the end of the year and was asked by the board if he was interested in continuing to be the attorney and he reported that he is if the board wants him. He reported this would be with him and not his firm. If the board is interested then we need to do an engagement letter.

### **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

#### **JACK POPE POSITION – CHAIRMAN HOLLON**

Chairman Hollon reported that he will be meeting with Lex Taylor, County Attorney, Commissioner Joseph, and Howard White Thursday to try to pin down the finalization of this position. The MSD has special zoning requirements that are different from the county requirements and we are trying to hire someone who knows and understands our requirements to be a second eye. We have money in the budget to either hire someone or supplement a county employee.

### **CONSIDERATION OF CONSTRUCTION OF SIDEWALK ON SAN JUAN DRIVE**

Trustee Wester reported that there are two considerations for construction. Phase 1 is from Solana Road to Miranda Road. Phase 2 is a sidewalk from the Duval County line to Ponte Vedra Circle that will connect to the beach access. Phase 1 the MSD will be funding the survey and engineering and the county will be funding the construction which is the bulk. We have run some estimates and put out to four different firms that were recommended by St. Johns County to get some numbers and Kimley Horne is also following up with us on budgeting. The sidewalk will be in the county right of way (ROW) and will be five feet. The sidewalk will be done in multiple mini phases. There are 21 homes along San Juan which will be less 10 homes if it was on the east side. Trustee Wester is asking the board to carry forward the \$150,000 for the survey that will pick up all utilities and driveways which must be up to ADA standard. Trustee Wester reported that we have talked about this for years and all meetings have been publicly noticed and legally advertised. Trustee Wester reported that he cannot speak for someone that said they went door to door to seek opposition to the project, and what narrative or verbiage they carried forward or what bias they may have said regarding the sidewalk. Audience members said that is disrespectful. Trustee Wester reported that he cannot validate what was said. Russ Thomas asked if you considered someone getting smacked in the head with a golf ball. Chairman Hollon asked for order in the meeting. Trustee Wester asked for some order in the meeting. The sidewalk is not just a sidewalk for the residents on San Juan but an infrastructure for the whole community. We did a sidewalk study to see which side of the road it is best to put a sidewalk in the ROW. The survey and design will vet all the drainage. Edwin Santos, from Kimley Horne asked if there were any questions. Russ Thomas asked if the feasibility study contemplates the danger of pedestrian traffic being 10 feet closer to an active golf course. Mr. Santos reiterated what Trustee Wester said that the sidewalk will be in the county ROW. If a golf ball comes from private property and hits someone on public right of way that is between the person and the company. A sidewalk is to move pedestrian traffic off the road where they are more likely to be hit by a car to a safe dedicated facility. Ms. Gleason reported that your feasibility study did not mention the sidewalk running along the golf course and your answer is a legal answer. My question is why the MSD would put a sidewalk next to a golf course and put people at risk. Trustee Wester reported that this sidewalk is not going to meander on the golf course and will be in ROW. We do not want someone to be hit by a car before we react. Mr. Thomas said but they can be hit by a golf ball. Trustee Wester reported that he is not going to discuss someone getting hit by a golf ball. Chairman Hollon asked Mr. Thomas to stop interrupting. Trustee Wester reported that we are here to talk about sidewalks and not speculate about people getting hit by golf balls or speculate about someone getting hit by a car. We are here tonight to vote on securing funds for a survey and

everyone has had their say. Ms. Gleason said that you are making a financial decision to put the sidewalk on the west side because it is cheaper. Trustee White reported that the feasibility study states that it is on the west side. There still must be a survey done and design choices made. Mr. Santos reported that once we get the survey and utilities, we can look at meandering the sidewalk around those things. Once we get into the design, we can look at the actual layout. Trustee White reported that if we run into something on the west side, there is the possibility that we could do a mid-walk crossing but need more information. Trustee Wester reported that we are getting pedestrians off the roadway and the reason it is going from Solana to Miranda is that it hooks up with other sidewalk infrastructures. Trustee Cellucci asked Trustee Wester if Commissioner Joseph was on board with the sidewalk, and he reported yes. Ms. Thomas reported that she spoke with Commissioner Joseph and she was adamant that the sidewalk must be on one side of the road and not meander. Ms. Thomas reported that she spoke with Ellen Avery Smith, the attorney for the club, and she was adamant that having a sidewalk by the golf course is a problem. Ellen Avery Smith asked me to send her the feasibility study and she was adamant that it is a safety issue. Trustee Wester reported that at the last sidewalk meeting the MSD would work with the homeowners if there were impediments in their yard. Ms. Gleason asked if you have funding to fix people's property. Chairman Hollon reported that we cannot use public money for private property. Ms. Gleason is asking if Trustee Wester's comment is true. Trustee Wester reported that he was alluding to having the sidewalk go around trees. Trustee White reported that ROW is public property owned by the county. The county can spend money from line to line in the ROW. Trustee White reported that he believes we will have the ability to pay for anything that is in the ROW. Chairman Hollon does not know if that is the case and asked Attorney Flowers for his input. Attorney Flowers reported that he cannot answer this question in the abstract without knowing the design and exactly what you are talking about. He stated that a governmental entity cannot spend money to improve private property and that does not mean, however that as part of the design of the project, if you tear up a driveway, you must put something back there. Ms. Gleason asked Attorney Flowers if it has been said that the county owns the property or is it just an easement. Attorney Flowers reported that it is his understanding that the county owns the ROW. She asked if we had the documents and Attorney Flowers reported no. Vice Chairman Switkes reported that she should go to the property appraiser's website and pull up her property and it will show the ROW and get the survey of her property. Vice Chairman Switkes reported that the properties that she had looked at on San Juan Dr. the easement is 18 – 20 feet. Ms. Gleason just wants to know if the county owns that property or if it is an easement. Trustee Wester reported that it is county owned ROW and he said he has been wrong about things but he is right about that.

Chairman Hollon reported that we must move on to the budget as we have spent a lot of time on the sidewalk and at this time makes a motion to enter into a contract with St. Johns county for the construction of a sidewalk on the west of San Juan Drive between Solana Road to Miranda Road and we commit to spend no more than \$150,000 for the capital project and the board designates Trustee Brad Wester as the liaison between the board, the county and the contractor for that project. The motion was seconded. Vice Chairman Switkes asked if the motion is for the whole project. Trustee Wester reported that the motion is for us to get the survey and the initial design completed so that the county can get it out to bid. Trustee Cellucci reported that the motion has been seconded. Trustee Callaghan asked if this is the first phase and Trustee Wester reported correct. Trustee White asked if this will be brought back to be reviewed and discussed after the survey and initial design. Trustee Wester reported yes. Vice Chairman Switkes reported that we are not just voting for the design and survey but the full construction. Trustee Wester reported yes. The motion was passed 6-1 with Trustee Callaghan voting no.

Trustee Wester would like also to vote on the northern end sidewalk where we have the money in the budget to do the design, survey and construction as it is only 450 feet and it should be around \$125,000 for survey, design, permitting and construction to start immediately when we get the ROW permit. Attorney Flowers reported that he strongly suggests that the county does the construction of the sidewalk and it be funded by the MSD. Trustee Wester reported that he agrees. Trustee White

asked if we could approach the county to use the same format for Phase 1 where we pay for the design and engineering and approve a smaller number and then the county could offer to pay for the construction. Trustee Wester reported if that is the case and then the number would be \$50,000. Chairman Hollon asked Attorney Flowers with that amount of money would we need to do an RFP. Attorney Flowers reported yes. Trustee Wester made a motion to initiate the process for the sidewalk with the MSD funding the project. Attorney Flowers wants to clarify that his understanding was to approach the county to enter into a contract for phase 1 and that the county will do the entire project including the survey, design work and construction and we would provide them the contribution of \$150,000. Chairman Hollon reported that is correct. Attorney Flowers reported that this needs to be in the contract and Trustee Wester reported that is the format. Trustee Wester reported that it is the same thing at the county line, however the construction cost has been added. We can do the same and take the construction costs out and go to the county with that. Trustee Cellucci asked if there is anything new regarding the sidewalk on the Blvd. from Pablo to San Juan. Trustee Wester reported no but his hope is that by us doing the sidewalk at the county line that it would be a catalyst to get that sidewalk constructed but politically it has been pushed back. Jim Middleton asked Attorney Flowers if the county maintains the sidewalk once completed. Attorney Flowers reported yes. A motion was made for the board to spend up to \$150,000 to the county for the soft costs of the sidewalk from Duval County line to Ponte Vedra Circle. It was seconded and carried with a vote of 6-1 with Trustee Callaghan opposed. Vice Chairman Switkes asked if we will be contacting Jacksonville Beach to complete the additional sidewalk. Trustee Wester reported yes.

Gina Luigiabliss – 8 Ponte Vedra Circle reported that she has flooding in her yard due to the new homes being built behind her in Duval County and she does not know what to do. Trustee White reported that he will contact her.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **2023 BUDGET DISCUSSION – TREASURER BROWN**

Chairman Hollon reported that Treasurer Brown and the secretary have submitted a budget where the reserves are still above \$200,000. Attorney Flowers reported it is the board's decision how close you want the reserves to be to \$200,000. At the September 11<sup>th</sup> meeting you will have a public hearing where you will vote on the budget and the millage. You will have a second meeting and between those two meetings we must do advertising where if your millage is higher than the rollback rate it will be considered a tax increase. This decision will have to be made at the September 11<sup>th</sup> meeting and the final budget hearing will be on Wednesday, September 20<sup>th</sup> at 5:30pm. Trustee Callaghan and Trustee Cellucci will not be in attendance at the final budget hearing. Chairman Hollon reported that we will have to adjust the reserves. Attorney Flowers reported that you will have to vote on a budget tonight and it must be posted on the website 72 hours before the public hearing on September 11<sup>th</sup>. Chairman Hollon requested that we put the overage in the clean-up fund. Secretary Jurenovich reported that it will not change the reserves and must be in a budgeted line-item category. Chairman Hollon reported that we will move it to Law Enforcement as this number fluctuates monthly. Secretary Jurenovich needs to submit to Trustee Callaghan the tentative/draft budget for the website. Vice Chairman Switkes reported that she is increasing the landscape monthly cost from \$725 to \$835 and was not sure if she needed board approval for that. The number she submitted for budgeting is correct. Attorney Flowers suggested if you are increasing the amount then you should do a motion. A motion was made that starting in October to raise the monthly landscape cost from \$725 to \$835 for labor and including the additional area at San Juan and Ponte Vedra Blvd by the county line. It was seconded and unanimously carried. Vice Chairman Switkes made a motion to adopt the budget as discussed with a millage of .27 where we are spending \$1,780,092 with the adjustment of \$9,724 to law enforcement coming out of the contingency reserve. The motion was seconded and unanimously carried.

### **CONSIDERATION OF NO PARKING ON SAN JUAN – CHAIRMAN HOLLON**

Chairman Hollon reported that we will table this to next month.



**KEY DATES**

County Commissioners meetings August 15<sup>th</sup> and September 5<sup>th</sup>

Next MSD meeting will be September 11<sup>th</sup> at 5:30pm FOL room PVB Branch Library

**ADJOURN**

A motion was made to adjourn; it was seconded and unanimously carried.

Submitted, Ann Jurenovich, MSD Secretary

January 30, 2022

Dear Ponte Vedra Beach Municipal Service District Trustees:

I have resided at 318 San Juan Drive for the past 10 years. I am aware that many vehicles exceed the speed limit on our street and do so while navigating around construction and landscape trucks parked on both sides of the street. Vehicles not only speed down San Juan Drive, they frequently ride up onto our lawns (often without slowing down) in order to get around cars and trucks parked on the street. A car came across our lawn last spring and took out our mailbox. The mailbox was hit so hard that it landed in the middle of our neighbor's front yard. (As an aside, I understand that on street parking is not allowed on Ponte Vedra Boulevard, which is a much wider street with a lower speed limit in some places. Query: why is on street parking allowed on San Juan Drive?)

When I first moved to San Juan Drive, and for several years thereafter, the sheriff regularly had a car sitting just north of our house. This presence was a real deterrent to speeding cars. I rarely see a car in that spot now. This comment is in no way a criticism of the sheriff's office. However, it does demonstrate that enforcing the speed limit is essential to keeping our street safe.

I understand that some San Juan Drive residents have expressed frustration with this situation. I also understand that a sidewalk has been proposed as the solution. I wrote a letter to the Ponte Vedra Community Association in July 2021 expressing my concern that this solution is being pursued without all relevant information being provided to the residents of San Juan Drive. I am not sure to what extent my concerns were shared with the MSD, so I am writing to the MSD directly.

Reasonable people are in favor of safety. However, no reasonable person should be asked to weigh in on the proposed solution without having access to all relevant information. I think that all residents of San Juan Drive should have full access to the following information:

- Exactly what are the safety issues on San Juan Drive (i.e., vehicles exceeding the speed limit, construction and landscaping trucks blocking the line of sight, etc... )?
- What other cost-effective, less intrusive improvements to San Juan Drive (i.e., enforcing the speed limit, lowering the speed limit, installing speed bumps, photo radar with enforcement, installing more stop signs, etc...) are available to address the problem and, specifically, why are they not being pursued first? Exploring these options first is absolutely imperative, given the fact that houses on San Juan Drive are close to the street and a sidewalk will most definitely adversely effect the residents' privacy.
- Has widening San Juan Drive and installing a curb been evaluated and, if so, what were the results?
- Have any studies (safety or otherwise) regarding San Juan Drive been conducted (or in the process of being conducted)? If so, where can residents view the details of these studies?
- Does the state or county have specific criteria for determining where sidewalks are required? Or recommended?
- Why is San Juan Drive being singled out?
- Why is the 300/400 block of San Juan Drive being singled out?
- On which side of San Juan Drive is it being proposed that a sidewalk be installed and why?
- How many feet from the street would the furthest line of the sidewalk be?
- How much would the sidewalk cost and who will be expected to pay for it?

- Who will bear the costs of repairing residents' property disrupted by installing a sidewalk (i.e., sprinkler systems, driveway pavers, lawns, mailboxes, etc...)?
- Who would be responsible for maintaining the sidewalk (i.e., cracks, settlement, etc...)?
- Who would be liable for those injured on the sidewalk?
- What are the contents of all discussions with the Ponte Vedra Inn and Club regarding a sidewalk on San Juan Drive? Putting a sidewalk along side an active fairway is a significant liability issue. A sidewalk in that space encourages walkers, bikers, babies in strollers, skateboarders, etc... to use it for recreational purposes and affirmatively communicates to them that it is safe. Even if signage were placed in the area to warn about errant golf balls, it would not be adequate to overcome the liability issue. If someone is hit by a golf ball in that space, will the PVIC be compelled to add netting along the areas where the golf course abuts San Juan Drive (like it did on the 1st fairway of the Ocean Course)? If this has not been discussed, why not?

I have read the minutes of the MSD Trustee meetings and, while there is a general discussion of a sidewalk on San Juan Drive, clear answers to the questions identified above would be extremely helpful.

I sincerely appreciate the service provided to the community by the MSD and its Trustees and thank you in advance for giving thoughtful consideration to my concerns.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathy Gleason

May 16, 2023

Dear Ponte Vedra Beach Municipal Service District Trustees:

I am a resident of San Juan Drive and am very concerned about the sidewalk being proposed by the MSD. As you may recall, I wrote a letter to the MSD, dated January 30, 2022, expressing my concerns. Chairman Hollon responded to my letter by email. In that email he stated that the MSD was contracting with an engineering firm to address many of the issues raised in my letter and until that was complete he would defer getting into any details. Since I have not been provided with any additional details, I can only assume that the engineering firm is Kimley Horn and that the Draft Sidewalk Feasibility Study, dated April 2022, posted on the MSD's website is the work product that was intended to address the issues raised in my letter. I have read the Feasibility Study and I can assure you that it does not address the vast majority of the issues and questions that I posed in my letter. I am attaching a copy of that letter and once again ask the MSD to provide a substantive response.

In addition, after reviewing the Feasibility Study I have even more questions to which I would like a response.


- The study states that the MSD is considering a sidewalk on San Juan Drive from Solana Road to Ponte Vedra Boulevard "as desired by the neighborhood residents." I assume that a survey conducted by the Ponte Vedra Community Association forms the basis for that statement since you referenced it in your email to me. The Ponte Vedra Community Association has member survey results on its website, which I have reviewed. Not all San Juan Drive residents are members of the association and, therefore, would not have been included in those surveys. I am also aware that the Ponte Verda Community Association canvassed the 300/400 block of San Juan Drive regarding traffic, safety and a sidewalk. Since not all San Juan Drive residents are members of the association and only the 300/400 block was canvassed, none of those surveys cover all of the residents on the length of San Juan Drive from Solana to Ponte Vedra Boulevard. If any of these surveys form the basis for that assertion, why aren't all residents of San Juan Drive being included in the consideration set? Has the MSD conducted its own survey of the residents of San Juan Drive? If so, what are the results of that survey?
- The study summarily recommended the west side of San Juan Drive for a sidewalk, since it poses the fewest conflicts, without providing any supporting data for this assertion. Did the MSD suggest to Kimley Horn that the west side of the street was preferable? I pointed out in my letter the hazards posed by a sidewalk on the west side of the street running along side an active tee box and fairway (Ponte Vedra Inn & Club Ocean Course #7). The Feasibility Study does not mention this hazard at all. Was this discussed with Kimley Horn? If not, why not? Has anyone else evaluated this risk for the community?

Thank you in advance for giving thoughtful consideration to my concerns.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathy Gleason  
318 San Juan Drive  
[kathygleason727@gmail.com](mailto:kathygleason727@gmail.com)

CC: Krista Joseph, St. Johns County Commissioner, District 4  
Scott Pearson, President, Ponte Vedra Community Association

**From:** Kathy Gleason kathygleason727@gmail.com 

**Subject:** Re: SJD Sidewalk

**Date:** May 25, 2023 at 7:00 PM

**To:** Alva Hollon alhollon@bellsouth.net

**Cc:** johnmwhitepvmsd3@gmail.com, 544tide@gmail.com, bwester@drivermcafee.com, rcbrownpv@gmail.com, jaccnslt@aol.com, switty111@hotmail.com, pvmsd@comcast.net, scott pearson scottmpearson@gmail.com, bcc4kjoseph@sjcf.us



Chairman Hollon,

As I indicated to you, I was out of town and unable to attend the MSD meeting on May 22nd to discuss the issues on San Juan Drive. I am attaching my statement that I would like entered into the record of that meeting. I also like to point out that the meeting was held on the same night as the Ponte Vedra High School Graduation and that the meeting was not properly noticed to the community. I find all of these issues very troubling and once again implore you and the MSD Board of Trustees to respond to the questions and concerns raised in my letters and the attached statement.

Kathy Gleason

Statement for  
MSD M...ing.pdf

My name is Kathy Gleason and I reside at 318 San Juan Drive. I am unable to attend tonight's Town Hall meeting in person, but would like to have my comments heard.

First, I would like the MSD to clarify whether the sidewalk is being proposed for recreational purposes or in response to safety concerns on San Juan Drive. This is important because we need to know what problem is being solved by a sidewalk.

- The Kimley Horn Feasibility Study states that the sidewalk is being proposed for "recreational pedestrians and bicyclists." I understand that if we were planning a community from scratch, a sidewalk would certainly be in the consideration set. However, old Ponte Vedra was not designed that way. Retrofitting San Juan Drive with a sidewalk is a decision that should not be taken lightly, since it adversely affects the residents' privacy and the use and enjoyment of their property. The bar ought to be very high in making this decision and I do not agree that we have crossed that threshold.
- If the sidewalk is being proposed for safety concerns, specifically what are they? I believe that speeding and on street parking create the issues that residents are concerned about. There are other cost-effective, less intrusive solutions to these issues that should be evaluated and presented to the community first, such as:
  - greater enforcement of the speed limit
  - installing photo radar with enforcement
  - lowering the speed limit
  - prohibiting on street parking
  - installing speed bumps or rumble strips
  - installing more stop signs
  - widening the street

Second, I would like to know the basis for the statement in the Kimley Horn Feasibility Study that MSD is considering the sidewalk installation "as desired by the neighborhood residents." This is important because I do not believe that all of the residents of San Juan Drive have been represented in this discussion. In fact, the notice of this meeting was only sent to the members of the Ponte Vedra Community Association. Not all residents of San Juan Drive belong to that association.

- If the MSD is relying on survey data provided by the Ponte Vedra Community Association, it is important to note that all residents of San Juan Drive - from Solana to Ponte Vedra Boulevard - were not represented in that data. The Ponte Vedra Community Association conducted a member survey on street safety in 2018 and canvassed only the 300/400 block of San Juan Drive regarding traffic, safety and a sidewalk in 2021. Neither of these surveys cover all of the residents of San Juan Drive.
- If I am wrong and the MSD has directly surveyed all of the residents of San Juan Drive, please make that data publicly available.

Third, I would like to know if the hazard posed by placing a sidewalk directly adjacent to an active tee box and fairway - specifically Ponte Vedra Inn & Club Ocean Course #7 - was professionally evaluated. The Kimley Horn Feasibility Study does not mention this hazard at all.

- This is important because as taxpayers we need to know if the County will be liable if someone is injured by a golf ball while on a sidewalk in that space.
- We also need to know whether the Ponte Vedra Inn & Club will be compelled to add netting along the areas where the golf course abuts San Juan Drive - like it did on the 1st fairway of the Ocean Course - if someone is hit by a golf ball while on a sidewalk in that space. This would absolutely change the character of our neighborhood and detract from beauty of our street.

Finally, I have written two letters, one dated January 30, 2022 and one dated May 16, 2023, to the MSD regarding the San Juan Drive sidewalk initiative and I request that they be entered into the record of this meeting.