

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 on Thursday, June 13, 2019 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
Debbie Musser	Assistant Secretary
Michael Mancke	Assistant Secretary by phone
David Burman	Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

George Flint	District Manager
Andrew d'Adesky	District Counsel
Steve Boyd	District Engineer
Alan Scheerer	Field Manager
Rick Feather	Developer

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

Roll Call

Mr. Flint called the meeting to order and called the roll. A quorum was present.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS

Public Comment Period

There not being any, the next item as followed.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS

**Approval of the Minutes of the May 9,
2019 Meeting**

Mr. Flint: Did the Board have any comments to the minutes, which were provided in your agenda package? Hearing none,

On MOTION by Mr. Burman seconded by Ms. Musser with all in favor the minutes of the May 9, 2019 meeting were approved, as presented.
--

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**Consideration of Resolution 2019-11
Approving the Proposed Fiscal Year
2020 Budget and Setting a Public
Hearing**

Mr. Flint: I provided the Proposed Budget to the Board Members that were present in person and I will email it to the Supervisors who are attending by phone.

Mr. Scheerer: Stacie emailed it to them.

Mr. Flint: Okay. The Statutes require the Board to approve a Proposed Budget by June 15th of each year. It's the starting point of the budget process, but was not binding on the Board so you can make changes. If there is a proposed increase, there is a timeframe that the Board must make a decision on what would be included in the mailed notice. That will need to be considered and we can talk about that process. What we provided to you and what we recommend is the Proposed Budget. However, I recommend the Board taking additional time to review some of the assumptions that are included in regards to the number of units to be developed, etc. The Board would have an opportunity at the July meeting to modify this before the actual mailed notice goes out. As far as the development, there are only a couple of parcels remaining in Reunion West that have not been developed and as a result, we revised the number of units. If you go to Page 3, you will see at the top, the first table is for 2020 shows the number of units at 1,985, which totals 3,749 Equivalent Assessment Units (EAUs). You can see the gross per unit assessment needed to fund the \$1.38 million in assessments. The next table shows the current year, which was based on 3,194 units. So you can see there's a difference of 1,200 units and about 1,000 EAUs. So, as a result of the reduction in 2020 in the number of EAUs, that's driving the per unit assessment to increase. If you look at the top of Page 2 of the budget, we included a transfer out to the Renewal and Maintenance (R&M) Fund. Up to this point, we have not been funding that R&M Fund in Reunion West. So those are the main drivers of the per unit assessment increasing for homes within Reunion West. The last table on Page 3 is a comparison of the current year to the proposed for next year. You can see that the assessment for a single-family home would increase by \$265.21. Again, this is a preliminary Proposed Budget. We want to take the opportunity between now and the July meeting to refine it to the extent it needs to be and the Board will have another opportunity in July to amend this. However, we have to meet the June 15th deadline for approval of the Proposed Budget today.

Mr. Chiste: George, do you remember over the years we talked about the disproportionate allocation between Reunion East and West? Have we continued to true that up this year?

Mr. Flint: Yes. If you look at Page 2, the Shared Cost Table, based on what is currently platted, the true-up is 56% for Reunion East and 44% for Reunion West. I think we were expecting it to be a little closer to probably 50/50, but with the hospital and the Spectrum project, those percentages are almost the same as they were in the current budget, but it will adjust over the next few years.

Mr. Chiste: Okay.

Mr. Flint: But as we stand right now, they are fairly close to the current budget.

Mr. Chiste: Perfect. Thank you.

Mr. Flint: That's over the last few years. It will impact the Reunion East and Reunion West budgets because the Reunion West percentage increased and the Reunion East percentages decreased as more lots have been platted in Reunion West. It also forced this per unit assessment to increase. So, the combination of the allocation based on platted lots and the development of Reunion West, combined with lower densities than what was originally planned and the funding of the Renewal and Replacement (R&R) Fund.

Mr. Greenstein: We will have time between now and the July meeting to take a close look at this and be able to provide a cheat sheet of the main drivers for the increase so everyone understands it and feels confident that everyone is paying their fair share.

Mr. Flint: Right. It may come down, but I don't expect it to go higher than what we are showing in July. For the Final Budget, we are recommending that the public hearing be at your August 15th meeting. So, you have all the way until the public hearing, but if you wanted to reduce it, you can do that; however, whatever is noticed after the July meeting serves as your ceiling. We could lower it in August if the information that was brought forward allowed us to do that.

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein seconded by Mr. Burman with all in favor Resolution 2019-11 Approving the Proposed Budget for Fiscal Year 2020 and Setting the Public Hearing for August 15, 2019 at 12:30 p.m. at the Heritage Crossing Community Center, was adopted.

Mr. Flint: I apologize again for getting this out to you at the last minute, but it is complex with trying to make all of the adjustments as a result of recent development.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Consideration of Request for Closure of Spine Road Bridge Access for Reunion Village

Mr. Flint: This is more of an issue for Reunion East because it is located in Reunion East, so Reunion East would actually have to vote on it. However, I included it on the Reunion West agenda because I think it's a Reunion wide discussion item. If you look in your agenda, you will see a proposed site plan for Reunion Village. This is the property that parallels I-4.

Mr. Feather: I have a bigger map that I can provide to you.

Mr. Flint: That would be great. We have Rick Feather here from the developer to present the request. Our understanding is that the County is asking for approval from the Reunion East CDD to close off the Spine Road Bridge to emergency access only.

Mr. Feather: Right, so what we are trying to achieve is once we start developing and build this section, if we put a road there it's going to be a massive incentive for a lot of folks to cut through the subdivision because it goes right in front of the hospital at the end of it. Also, there will be future restaurants in the same area. So, in order to cut this cut through traffic down, we propose placing an emergency access gate at the beginning of the bridge, another turn into the subdivision in the residential area and turning this section into a park area. We will build a subgrade so that it can handle emergency vehicles. It will be compacted and certified to accommodate fire trucks and things like that. We will also put emergency access locks on the gates so if for some reason, emergency vehicles will need to cut through there, then they can easily accomplish that.

Mr. Mancke: Would you expect to turn over the gate and apparatus to the CDD for operation and maintenance (O&M)?

Mr. Feather: Yes.

Mr. Greenstein: This is the bridge to nowhere. Can you discuss whether there are any other facts that lead to this decision and if there is communitywide interest beyond the issue of traffic control? We only have the issue of everybody coming through the Sinclair Road gate and cutting through Reunion. It happens, but I think people know it's not the shortest shortcut in the

world. It's amazing how the traffic can moderate. It all depends on how severe the problem is on I-4.

Mr. Flint: Or 429.

Mr. Greenstein: If it's a total closure, then yes you are going to have people lined up on Sinclair Road to get through Reunion because they are in severe need of a shortcut, but as a community we question that. This property is within the Reunion East CDD, but due to the fact it affects any part of Reunion, there's a sense for community and a need for access. Your Spectrum project is right on the other side of the bridge, so from a logistical and business standpoint, you would think folks who were living in this area would have access over that bridge into the rest of the resort. The fact that people are paying CDD assessments and are part of a community of interest, its residential. While I appreciate the traffic control issue to a degree, I think the community interest argument is superior to the need for traffic control. John, I didn't see whether or not you signed the declaration document or whether you were a witness to it, but can you share any background as to how this community became outside the gates?

Mr. Chiste: Are you are talking about Reunion West?

Mr. Greenstein: No. Reunion Village. This is an informational item for Reunion West, but we are not going to adjudicate this item now. We are doing it on the east side because it's on Reunion East property.

Mr. Chiste: Mark, it's always been that way since the beginning. We never took any of the vegetation associated with that because it's always been described that way from the time we got possession of the property.

Mr. Greenstein: Don't you think it would be in our best interest as a community to re-evaluate what we are doing, whether its Encore as a developer or Kingwood as the successor who has some control or some input to that declaration?

Mr. Chiste: What I know is the developer isn't going to be able to extend those kinds of dollars for that road, but if the CDD wants to figure out a way to extend that across, it could. We don't have the ability to raise any additional dollars.

Mr. Greenstein: I'm not sure I understand.

Mr. Flint: The road is there.

Mr. Greenstein: Are you saying that there are private roads within Reunion Village? You are not using CDD funds to do the roadway within Reunion Village?

Mr. Chiste: It's not for that purpose.

Mr. d'Adesky: Do you mean the emergency access road, John?

Mr. Chiste: Yes.

Mr. d'Adesky: Just to clarify, isn't the grade, width, everything on the road going to be up to normal standards?

Mr. Feather: Yes, but there won't be, for example, storm drainage, curbing, asphalt or anything like that. It's basically compacted dirt, rock and sod on top.

Mr. Flint: Where does the pavement stop?

Mr. Feather: The pavement stops at the property line.

Mr. Flint: How far is it from there to the bridge?

Mr. Feather: Maybe 100 feet.

Mr. d'Adesky: Okay. So, we are talking about 100 feet?

Mr. Greenstein: We have this traffic issue, but I can't believe the traffic issue is the superior issue or whether it's the main driving issue. You have a bridge that was built with all kinds of plans. The original planned document for Reunion had an outdoor amphitheater in that area, but it was zoned for residential as well as commercial, which is fine. We will discuss it in more detail.

Mr. Chiste: Mark, just so you understand, the lots that are going to be provided over there, are not going to be resort rental homes like what you are seeing in Reunion per se. On the other side, there are going to be single-family homes. We probably have limited access to utilize everything associated within Reunion because it's a little higher on that side.

Mr. Greenstein: John, you just disenfranchised me and everybody else who is a permanent resident of Reunion.

Mr. Chiste: Sorry.

Mr. Greenstein: That's alright. I know there's a market for vacation or resort homes. I think the population is growing, but that's another issue. There will be more detailed discussion at the Reunion East meeting so I don't have anything further to say. I was trying to find out what was driving the decision for this community to be outside the gates. In my opinion, it should be inside the gates and security should be between the commercial side and residential side. At the back of the hospital, we should put up a security shack.

Mr. Flint: There is one planned for that location.

Mr. Greenstein: That's where it should be, but that will cut people off from going to the resort. It has nothing to do with the CDD. The resort is going to want those folks to become members of the Club. Obviously, unless you tell me otherwise, no deal was struck.

Mr. Chiste: So there is none.

Mr. Greenstein: There is no deal. Not like Spectrum, but we have new owners now. I hope the new owners would engage in some dialogue with Encore to determine if there is a better way to develop the property. Not change the plans so much, but the way you are classifying it.

Mr. Chiste: Mark, I can assure you that the CDD is not going to dictate the type of owner that is going to own in that area. We are not coming to the CDD and asking for the primary resident owner or whoever is going to build the homes over there. What I can tell you, though, is there is no agreement between the potential buyer of that property or any of those clubs for those individuals to utilize the existing Reunion Club or have access to it.

Mr. Greenstein: Right and that's fine. Again, this is not a discussion from a CDD standpoint. From a timing standpoint, we can have this discussion at any time because it's not a Reunion West issue. It's a Reunion East issue.

Mr. Chiste: Sure.

Mr. Greenstein: But because everyone who lives within Reunion Resort & Club, whether they are a member or a resident, view the entire property as being one entity. There are different legal distinctions obviously.

Mr. Chiste: I appreciate that, but right now, you also have a road to nowhere. Right?

Mr. Greenstein: Yes, but hopefully, it would be a road to somewhere.

Mr. Chiste: But I'm saying, what is being developed over there, there's no correlation between that and what's going on at the Reunion East Resort & Club. I'm not even associated with that.

Mr. Greenstein: This is not the time to get into it.

Mr. Chiste: Okay.

Mr. Greenstein: I just wanted to get some background and let the West side know. Unfortunately, we don't have too much resident participation from the West side, but they would see that we are interested. They should be interested in the issue as well.

Mr. Feather: So the dilemma that I'm facing is the County requested a letter from the CDD.

Mr. d'Adesky: They started doing that at other CDDs.

Mr. Flint: It's the other CDD.

Mr. d'Adesky: Not this CDD. They started doing that with several different ones and its very interesting because we technically don't have any authority, but they are asking for it anyways. They are doing it in Celebration and in a couple of other communities. Part of that is we are going to be maintaining the O&M infrastructure, like I mentioned, the gate apparatus. They want to know if you are willing to maintain this and deal with it in that manner or are you going to try to deal with it in a different manner?

Mr. Burman: It's probably an issue for that permit as well.

Mr. d'Adesky: Exactly.

Mr. Flint: Why don't we move on.

Mr. Greenstein: Yes. Thanks John.

Mr. Chiste: Thank you.

Mr. Flint: You probably want to keep those maps. Are you okay with proceeding with the agenda?

Mr. Chiste: Okay.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Consideration of Amended Engagement Letter with Lathan, Shuker, Eden & Beaudine, LLP for Legal Services

Mr. d'Adesky: We are doing an inflationary increase since we haven't increased our fee since 2014 and costs increased. It's all related to benefits from what I'm told.

Mr. Greenstein: So what is the increase?

Mr. Flint: \$10 an hour.

Mr. d'Adesky: Which is less than 5%.

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein seconded by Mr. Burman with all in favor the Amended Engagement Letter with Lathan, Shuker, Eden & Beaudine, LLP for Legal Services was approved.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Staff Reports

A. Attorney

Mr. Flint: Do you have anything else, Andrew?

Mr. d'Adesky: No. I am contacting the developer shortly, but I'm just cataloging some of the conveyances we need to clean up. Two roads are misplaced that I know of and I think a couple of other tracts need to be cleaned up, but I expect to get that completed in the next 30 days.

B. Engineer

There not being any, the next item as followed.

C. District Manager's Report

i. Action Items List

Mr. Flint: We have the Action Items List. For the neighborhood monuments, Alan, I heard you talking about the status of that.

Mr. Scheerer: Yes. I received an email from Graham. The County determined that they are going to address each monument on a separate permit.

Mr. Flint: So they want a fee for each permit.

Mr. Scheerer: Yes, each one. I received some comments from Graham. One was they wanted a copy of the Master Site Plan, which I located and gave to them. One of the other comments was the drawings need to reference 2017, Sixth Edition, Florida Building Code. An additional one referred to the overall Site Plan and a parcel ID number not being correct. Graham sent me a text message indicating that there may be a concern with two of the monuments because they fall within 5 feet of the property line to a private residence. I think it's for Golden Bear, Tradition and Castle Pines. They are working on all of that right now and we are going to have to do one monument at a time.

Ms. Musser: The next time they do that, it needs an address.

Mr. Scheerer: They already went through the addressing and that's resolved. There has been addressing assigned to each one of the monuments already.

Mr. Flint: The next two items are Steve's. What is the status of the parking spaces for the mail kiosk?

Mr. Boyd: We are still working on that. I thought we had enough background information without needing any additional surveying, but we do not so I'm going to ask, for

the next 30 days, if we can use some of the funds you allocated for us to complete that and commission some small survey work if we need to expand it. From a budget standpoint, we can finish the design. I will bring you a proposal next month.

Mr. Flint: Is the Board okay with that? We approved a not-to-exceed of \$10,000 for the engineering work. You can use a portion of that for surveying.

Mr. Greenstein: How much are we talking about?

Mr. Boyd: There's probably about \$5,000 worth of surveying. That's almost the minimum to get someone mobilized at all locations.

Mr. Flint: Does that also apply to the traffic lanes on Sinclair Road?

Mr. Burman: Or the widening at the front gate?

Mr. Boyd: Yes.

Mr. Greenstein: Is it for both of those projects or is it \$5,000 each?

Mr. Boyd: I'm not sure if it's going to be \$5,000 each. I'm hoping to get \$5,000 to \$7,000 for all of it.

Mr. Greenstein: We look at you to get things like this done for us at the lowest possible cost, but obviously we are not going to get anything done if we don't have the survey so I propose we approve the expenditure for a survey.

Mr. Chiste: We are going to need it.

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein seconded by Ms. Musser with all in favor approving \$5,000 to \$7,000 for surveying work for the parking spaces for the mail kiosk and additional entrance land at the Sinclair Road gate was approved.

Mr. Flint: Next is the Warrant Study for the four-way stop at Traditional Boulevard and Golden Bear.

Mr. Boyd: I totally dropped the ball on that one. I was supposed to get you a warrant analysis. I don't do them, but a Traffic Consultant would. I will get in touch with Traffic Consultant firms to find out when we can get that done.

Mr. Flint: Are there any questions for the District Engineer? Hearing none,

ii. Approval of Check Register

Mr. Flint: I provided the May Check Register to the Board for the General Fund and payroll totaling \$12,046.30. We need a motion to approve it.

On MOTION by Mr. Burman seconded by Mr. Greenstein with all in favor the May Check Register was approved.

iii. Balance Sheet and Income Statement

Mr. Flint: No action is required. If there are any questions, we can discuss those.

Mr. Chiste: I have no comments.

Mr. Greenstein: We are good.

iv. Status of Direct Bill Assessments

Mr. Flint: We are good through the end of June. Everyone is paid until this point.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Other Business

There not being any, the next item was followed.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Supervisor's Requests

Mr. Flint: Is there any other business? Hearing none,

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Next Meeting Date

Mr. Flint: The next meeting date is July 11, 2019.

ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Adjournment

There being no further business,

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein seconded by Ms. Musser with all in favor the meeting was adjourned.


Secretary/Assistant Secretary


Chairman/Vice Chairman