

MINUTES OF MEETING
REUNION WEST
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

The regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Reunion West Community Development District was held Thursday, August 9, 2018 at 12:30 p.m. at the Heritage Crossing Community Center, 7715 Heritage Crossing Way, Reunion, Florida.

Present and constituting a quorum were:

John Chiste	Chairman by phone
Mark Greenstein	Vice Chairman
Jared Bouskila	Assistant Secretary
Peter Brown	Assistant Secretary by phone
Deborah Simmons	Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

George Flint	District Manager
Andrew d'Adesky	District Counsel
Steve Boyd	District Engineer by phone
Alan Scheerer	Operations Manager
Clayton Smith	GMS
Rob Stultz	Yellowstone Landscape
Josh Suriano	Yellowstone Landscape

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

Roll Call

Mr. Flint called the meeting to order and called the roll.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS

Public Comment Period

There being none, the next item followed.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS

Approval of the Minutes of the June 14, 2018 Meeting

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein seconded by Mr. Bouskila with all in favor the minutes of the June 14, 2018 meeting were approved as presented.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Public Hearing

A. Consideration of Resolution 2018-02 Adopting the Fiscal Year 2019 Budget and Relating to the Annual Appropriations

Mr. Flint: Next are two public hearings, the first one is to consider the adoption of the Fiscal Year 2019 budget and you have Resolution 2018-02 doing that and the other public hearing is a public hearing to consider imposing the assessments associated with the adopted budget, which is Resolution 2018-03.

We will go ahead and open the public hearing. Is there any public comment on the proposed budget for Fiscal Year 2019 or the Resolution?

There are copies of the budget in the back and it was also posted on the website previously. The Board approved what is called a proposed budget back in the spring, they are required to do that before June 15th of each year and that budget is sent to Osceola County at least 60 days in advance of the public hearing to consider its final adoption, which is today. The proposed budget as it stands right now does not contemplate any change in the per unit assessment amounts, they remain the same, for example for a single-family home the per unit assessment is \$471.06 and that would remain in place for Fiscal Year 2019. As the balance of Reunion West builds out we will need to relook at the per unit assessment amounts because the original planned number of units and how it is actually developing are different, the densities are lower so that is going to cause some pressure on the per unit amounts because you are dividing by a smaller number. We will need to relook at that in the following year as we get more information. We are using some carry forward to balance the budget about \$110,000. The District does have a healthy fund balance in reserves to be able to do that but again that is something that will need to be looked at next fiscal year. The other thing that is putting pressure on the District's expenses is the cost share agreement between Reunion East and Reunion West. That cost share agreement is based on the number of platted lots so as more lots get platted in West those costs are being shifted so that percentage a few years ago was 70% East and 30% West and it has been changing and the percentage for West has been getting higher and the percentage for East has been getting lower as lots have been platted in the West. For Fiscal Year 2019 the percentage is 56% East and 44% West. The per unit amount in this budget is remaining the same with the caveat that it is possible and likely going into Fiscal Year 2020 that there will need to be some adjustment.

As far as the major expenses for West their percentage is increasing of the total cost but the cost those percentages are applied to are remaining fairly flat. The landscape contract they have agreed to hold their price, which is the biggest single contract that the District has and most of the other expenses are remaining fairly level as well.

Mr. Greenstein: There is minimal increases in the administrative area.

Mr. Flint stated administrative budget increased a little over \$1,000 and the maintenance budget has increased more but that is because of the cost sharing.

Is there any public comment on the budget? Hearing none, we will bring it back to the Board.

Is there any discussion or questions from the Board on the proposed budget?

Mr. Chiste: It looks reasonable to me based on the new allocation and the individual line items.

Mr. Greenstein: I agree. In reference to the resolution itself, there are blanks.

Mr. Flint: We don't fill in the blanks in advance of the public hearing in the event that you make any changes to the budget but the blanks in the resolution will be filled in according to the budget that is adopted so if you adopt it in its existing format those number will be filled in based on this document.

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein seconded by Mr. Bouskila with all in favor Resolution 2018-02 was approved.

B. Consideration of Resolution 2018-03 Imposing Special Assessments and Certifying an Assessment Roll

Mr. Flint: The next public hearing is to impose assessments related to the budget that was just adopted so this resolution imposes the operating and maintenance assessment and allows us to certify the tax roll to the County for inclusion on the tax bill. There are two exhibits to this resolution and the first is the budget you just adopted and the second one is the assessment roll, which lists all the properties and the amounts that are assessed based on the budget that was adopted.

Is there any public comment on the resolution imposing assessments? This is imposing assessments at the same rate as the current year. Hearing no public comment, is there any Board discussion on the resolution? There being none,

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein seconded by Ms. Simmons with all in favor Resolution 2018-03 was approved.

Mr. Flint: We will close the public hearings and move on to the next item.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Consideration of Extension of the Landscape/Grounds Maintenance Agreement with Yellowstone Landscape

Mr. Flint: The next item is extension of the landscape/grounds maintenance agreement with Yellowstone Landscape. Yellowstone has agreed to hold their price and this extends the contract for an additional 12 months through September 30, 2019. All other aspects of the agreement remain the same and the termination provisions, etc. all remain the same. All this is doing is extending the term of the contract.

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein seconded by Ms. Simmons with all in favor the 12-month extension of the landscape/grounds maintenance agreement with Yellowstone Landscape was approved.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Consideration of Easement Agreements Related to Construction of Neighborhood Monuments

Mr. Flint: Andrew has prepared the form of easements and this is related to the monumentation that the Board has approved to be constructed in Reunion West. Some of those monuments are not on CDD property and as a result we either need to have a license agreement or easement agreement to be able to construct those and maintain those going forward.

Mr. d'Adesky: This is our standard form easement that we have used on the East. The back details the four parcels, which have been identified on which the property will be placed. The purpose of the easement is extremely limited it is just for signage and monumentation purposes only. The easement will terminate automatically if we were to remove the monuments. We just present it to the Resort for consideration and comment and hopefully, for approval.

Mr. Greenstein: Just as a bit of background, Alan Scheerer and I went around the West side looking for the most appropriate areas to put the monuments. We staked them out. Have we received any feedback from anyone other than the folks we ran into when we were doing it?

Mr. Scheerer: No.

Mr. Greenstein: It makes sense, they are visible and in some cases the signage will be on both sides of the monument for traffic going in either direction.

Mr. Scheerer: We did reach out to a secondary company to see if they would be interested in doing the monumentation and they said it is not within their schedule to try to fit that in with all the work they are doing.

Mr. Flint: The Board has already approved doing this not to exceed \$90,000 and the POA will pay the difference. The POA has approved it, they are just waiting for us to send them an invoice.

Mr. Greenstein: The only other issue that surfaced that we didn't get a chance to talk about ahead of time is after we had designated the locations for the individual neighborhood monuments someone spoke to Alan about erecting a West side gate entrance sign similar to what we have in the front, which says Reunion Resort & Club.

Mr. Scheerer: We are checking as to whether or not it is feasible to put it in the small island right in front of the guardhouse and see if it will fit in there and if it can't fit that same size monument in there than maybe a skimmed down version of that but UCC Group hasn't gotten out here to survey that area and then we have to make sure the locates are not an issue in there.

Mr. Greenstein: I think we can proceed with what we are doing here because if the Master Association decides on the size of the sign, the location of the sign and the funding was to come from the Master Association then it is independent of any action we take here.

Mr. Flint: The only thing we will be taking on would be the ongoing ownership and maintenance of it. That would be minimal. The email indicated the POA had already approved some funding for it.

Mr. Scheerer: Yes, the Master actually agreed to instead of an additional \$90,000 to cover any additional cost that may go into constructing the monuments that Mr. Greenstein was just referring to.

Mr. Flint: It sounds like they would pick up the full cost.

Mr. Greenstein: It doesn't stop us from proceeding.

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein seconded by Mr. Bouskila with all in favor the easement agreements related to the construction of neighborhood monuments were approved subject to correction of scrivener’s errors.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Ratification of Agreements with UCC Group to Construct Neighborhood Monuments

Mr. d’Adesky: This is our standard form of contract, we use it for all our agreements, it contains indemnities, public records provisions and attached to that would be the bid documents and the bid forms. George will attach those as an exhibit. Do you have the exact value on that?

Mr. Flint: It was previously approved.

Mr. Scheerer: It was about \$167,000.

Mr. Flint: We would attach the proposals that you have already approved to this agreement so this would be subject to scriveners errors and submitted to UCC Group to execute. Now that the Master Association has approved the matching money we can move forward with executing the agreement.

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein seconded by Ms. Simmons with all in favor the agreements with UCC Group to construct neighborhood monuments was approved subject to scrivener’s errors and joint funding with the Master Association.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Staff Reports

A. Attorney

Mr. d’Adesky: We are moving ahead on the possible issuance of new bonds for Phase 4 Reunion West. The issue is in speaking with developer’s Counsel, there are tracts on which we believe assessments have not been levied in the past. Therefore, we would probably need an assessment hearing and we recommend that in anticipation of having to have that hearing for those parcels that if possible we continue this meeting for two weeks such that we won’t have to notice or call a special meeting to bring this up to declare an assessment hearing in order to allow us to begin that process. Our indication is that the developer would like to do this as quickly as possible.

Mr. Flint: We will need a Supplemental Engineer’s Report and an Assessment Methodology too, that is why he is suggesting two weeks. At the continued meeting you would

adopt two resolutions, one declaring assessments and the other one setting a public hearing to impose them and 30 days from then is when you would actually hold the hearing.

Mr. d’Adesky: There are three areas, two small platted areas that have 30 lots and there is one that has about 150 lots.

Mr. Flint: At the end of the meeting if the Board is amenable to that instead of adjourning, we will continue.

B. Engineer

Mr. Boyd: I will be working with the team on this next bond issue. Was the boundary amended for all the property west of 545 and south of Sinclair Road? My map that I’m working with is the old K-Hill Parcel but there is a gap between the K-Hill Parcel and S.R. 429/545 interchange but it was some land that was outside the District. I’m going to have to check and we may have to expand the boundary to include all of that subdivision.

Mr. d’Adesky: We are going to need to check on that.

Mr. Flint: The first thing we are going to have to do is verify that the property is within the District and then move forward with the assessment hearing. Amending the boundaries is not a quick process.

Mr. d’Adesky: That takes months with Osceola County. I will get back with Steve on the boundary.

Mr. Flint: Do you want to give an update on the signalization since that is a shared item?

Mr. Boyd: We have been challenged there in the contractor is struggling with a backlog problem of mast arm deliveries. The schedule they gave us that I reported to Reunion East last month was delivery of the mast arms around September 1st and completion of the signals around mid-October. We are still looking at those timeframes at this time.

C. Manager

i. Action Items List

Mr. Flint: We covered both items, the signalization and the monuments that were listed on the action items list.

ii. Approval of Check Register

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein seconded by Mr. Bouskila with all in favor the check registers for June and July were approved.

iii. Balance Sheet and Income Statement

A copy of the balance sheet and income statement were included in the agenda package.

iv. Status of Direct Bill Assessments

A copy of the direct bill assessment status report was included in the agenda package.

v. Approval of Fiscal Year 2019 Meeting Schedule

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein seconded by Ms. Simmons with all in favor the Fiscal Year 2019 meeting schedule reflecting meetings on the second Thursday of the month at 12:30 p.m. at the Heritage Crossing Community Center was approved.

vi. Field Manager's report

Mr. Scheerer: At the last Reunion East meeting we had a resident who was concerned about speeding throughout Reunion as a whole specifically on Grand Traverse Parkway. I was directed to meet with him after that meeting, which I did and he is here today. His son has worked for Grainger for quite some time and is relocating and he came up with the idea that he could get us a good sign that would reflect the speed of vehicles traveling down the road. The actual sign he suggested was a SafePace 600 15-inch digital sign, solar powered. Unfortunately, he son left Grainger but I reached out to the manufacturer and for almost the exact same price they provided us a quote for a SafePace 600 15-inch variable message sign at \$5,363.12. This particular sign in itself does a number of things. This particular sign if you sign up for the data package that goes along with it you can go up to the sign, download any information you want, make changes to the sign and there is another cost for a cloud based bundle that you can do remotely from your office, you can log in and change information on the sign, change the speed of the sign, the message from slow down to speeding to something similar to that. It was suggested that we look at approximately five locations within both East and West. On the West there are two locations on Grand Traverse, we also talked about on the East it was suggested that

we place one coming from West to East by the water park as you come over the bridge and it was suggested maybe something like Excitement Drive and Reunion Boulevard. We have the per unit price, we have the bundle package per unit if that is something the Board would be interested in doing. The other option was to come back with a lesser version of this one. You will also see a SafePace 100, 11-inch radar sign and the only difference in this sign and the 600 is the message is fixed, it specifically says, you are speeding. We can program the sign and put whatever the speed limit is, 25 as you come over the bridge and if we put 35 or 40 mph speed limit on that you can change that information. Again, it offers the same data package, which I think we would need so we can track some data and make the changes we need. The only difference is with this particular option you physically have to go to the unit, plug in your computer and download the data. If the Board thought it was reasonable for us to do a cloud based bundle then the number per device is located on that. We couldn't change the message but we could download speeding and change the speed limit if we had to. I don't think we will because it is going to be a fixed sign throughout Reunion. Some of the benefits of having the data information is you can take that information, download the speeders, how many vehicles came through and the average speed and maybe we could go to our security staff or law enforcement and say we have a problem, here is the information we have collected and that is available as well. The other thing is you can see if the signs are even effective. Are you changing the minds of people as they are driving through the community? Coming over the bridge we would hope to see that there is a big change there because when you are coming over at 35 and 40 and see the speed limit is 25 they are going to slow down. We want to make sure that wherever the signs are placed they are actually affecting the drivers' habits as far as speed enforcement goes.

We brought back two proposals and we are going to present the same proposals to East for consideration as well. We could add 5 or 6 or if you wanted to do a test we could just do a couple and see if we are making any headway with speed enforcement.

Mr. Greenstein: I think we have a few locations we are solid on and there are others that we will determine over time. No. 1 as Alan pointed out I think we are going to test this first, the number of locations will be determined, it should be treated as a shared expense between East and West because it is common good, people drive from East to West and West to East. I would like to propose that the West side will agree to treat it as a shared expense and leave it up to the

East Board to go through the details and make the decision on whether to be a test, how many units to buy and the West side locations will be included because it will be considered a shared expense. We won't look at it twice and have two separate contracts.

Mr. Chiste: I agree with that concept.

Mr. Scheerer: The 600 is a 15-inch display and the 100 is an 11-inch display.

Mr. Flint: Both of them will reflect speed and if you are exceeding the speed limit they will strobe.

Mr. Greenstein: Similar treatment since it is kind of a package we are doing another item not on the agenda but going to be discussed at the East meeting would be transition from a Prox card but basically from swiping a card versus an RFID reader. In other words, having a transponder in the vehicle so a resident can just drive past, get close to it and the gate automatically goes up. They don't have to maintain cards. We are going to be looking at that in detail at the East side and this is a shared expense item, we agree to share the expense for this and if the West will basically let the East Board look at the issue and take the lead on the issue then that is what I recommend on that one.

Mr. Chiste: Are those HOA costs or CDD costs?

Mr. Flint: The CDD owns the roads, they own the guardhouse and through an agreement with the HOA the HOA is staffing the security, but we pay a portion of that cost. I would see it as a CDD expense. We don't know what those numbers are yet so out of fairness on that issue you may want to bring it back at the next meeting because we don't have an order of magnitude for West to understand what the impact is going to be on their budget.

Mr. Greenstein: Even though we have a detailed proposal concerning the radar signs I would still come back on the West for a ratification approach on the speed limit signs and we can do the same with the transponder system even if it is a shared cost.

Mr. Chiste: Do you have any idea of the cost on the transponder system?

Mr. Greenstein: I was given \$28,000 and that included four or five gates. We may have to look at the fifth gate because it is not an access gate it is internal to the Resort, but we only have one bid and I immediately indicated that we have to get another one. It should be in the \$25,000 range.

Mr. Chiste: I agree with Mark's concept of let's move these both through on the East side and let's bring it back here for ratification.

On MOTION by Mr. Chiste seconded by Mr. Greenstein with all in favor staff was directed to present the bids for the radar signs and transponders to the East side and if approved bring them back to the West side for ratification.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Other Business

There being none, the next item followed.

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Supervisors Requests

There being none, the next item followed.

ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Next Meeting Date

Mr. Flint: We are going to continue this meeting for two weeks.

Mr. d’Adesky: If it turns out that we can confirm that we need an expansion we will call off the meeting in two weeks. We have to expand before you have an assessment hearing.

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein seconded by Mr. Bouskila with all in favor the meeting was continued to August 23, 2018 at 12:30 p.m. in the same location.



Secretary/Assistant Secretary



Chairman/Vice Chairman