

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, December 12, 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 by phone
Xabier Guerricogoitia	Boyd Civil Engineering
Alan Scheerer	Field Manager
Residents	

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

Roll Call

Mr. Flint called the meeting to order at 12:30 p.m. and called the roll. Three Board members were present, and two attended via phone, constituting a quorum.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS

Public Comment Period

Mr. Flint: This is an opportunity for any members of the public to provide comment to the Board on anything on the agenda, or not on the agenda, you'd like to bring to the Board's attention. Any public comment? Hearing none,

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS

Approval of the Minutes of the October 10, 2019 Meeting

Mr. Flint: Did the Board have any comments or corrections to those?

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein seconded by Ms. Musser with all in favor the Minutes of the October 10, 2019 Meeting Minutes were approved, as presented.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Consideration of Resolution 2020-01 Approving the Execution of the Reunion Fairways 17 & 18 Phase 3 Plat

Mr. d'Adesky: This is our standard form. We reviewed the plats and we have no legal objections to the them. The Engineer had sent them and they did not provide any objection, therefore we recommended the approval. This is a requirement. Also, it requires a dedication resolution before they will approve the plat. So, we would recommend approving.

On MOTION by Mr. Chiste, seconded by Mr. Greenstein, with all in favor, the Resolution 2020-01 Approving the Execution of the Reunion Fairways 17 & 18 Phase 3 Plat, was approved.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Discussion of Sidewalks

Mr. Flint: This is an item that was added to both the Reunion West and Reunion East agenda. And it primarily relates to the issue that I think both Boards have discussed. The issue is of the lots that have no sidewalks in front of them. You have a developed lot with a home, then you may have one lot, or two lots without anything with no sidewalk. Then the sidewalk starts again. And I understand this issue was brought up at the Homeowners Association meeting. Mark, you want to handle that?

Mr. Greenstein: As you pointed out, I think the problem is on two previous occasions, maybe one on the West, but at least two on the East. We have discussed the issue of the resort within both CDDs. Throughout the resort where there are vacant lots, we don't have continuous sidewalks. People, residents, guests, have indicated that it's a safety issue when they're walking with a toddler, with a stroller, or a bicycle, etc. and they have to basically go into the street to continue their journey on, and then get back on the sidewalk. So just for your information, there are a little under 200 vacant lots on the East side, and 250 vacant lots on the West side. I don't think there's any argument, I think everyone agrees that it has the safety aspect to it. I think it goes beyond convenience or inconvenience. But at the same time, it's a challenge for us because the sidewalk is usually constructed, it is constructed when the property is being improved or when the home is being built. These areas are not level in all cases. The vacant lots are not prepped or

leveled to the point where a home would be built on it. It's rough. So, there's work involved in that.

Mr. Chiste: Unfortunately, during construction if you put in sidewalks, it's going to have to be destroyed. That's the only problem.

Mr. Greenstein: The costs of the installation is born by the developer of the property. So, when the home is built they level it, they put in the sidewalk. Right now, I think a ballpark figure to do it would probably be around a million dollars, or starting at a million. I want us to seriously consider it. I did not want to dismiss it at the HOA meeting. Maybe we consider doing half, one side of the street, cutting the potential costs in half by people having one side. I had to bring it up, I wanted us to discuss it. They will be bringing it up at the East meeting as well. There's no formal proposal at this point. But I need to get it on the record and John you are bringing out the critical factor which is the fact that it's probably going to be destroyed when home construction occurs.

Ms. Musser: Yes, it will be.

Mr. Chiste: Mark, you kind of made an interesting point. There are certain areas now people only build sidewalks on one side of the units. A lot of new communities will only have sidewalks on one side. So, there is a sidewalk in the entire community, but it's not on both sides of the street.

Mr. Greenstein: That was the only practical way that I came up with.

Mr. Chiste: I think it's a great idea. I'd love to know what that number is.

Mr. Greenstein: And if we did an actual survey of the properties we may find where there may be a stretch whether 3 or 4 lots. On Gathering Court I know of one area where there are four lots that are continuous. Putting that in and doing that would be a lot simpler, a little more cost effective, than doing one here, and one there, and one there. If you think that doing one side of the street is something that we should at least scope that out. I think it's a benefit to the master, it's a benefit to the resort, it's a benefit to the property owner. And there are various angles that we can consider as far as financing it. Because we ultimately are responsible for maintaining it.

Mr. d'Adesky: And I'm going to bring up just a factor that you may or may not have thought about. Once again, when we construct an improvement, we have a duty to maintain and operate that improvement. So, once we go and construct a sidewalk, we have a duty to maintain set sidewalk. Now, that being said if we knew that construction was commencing on a particular sidewalk maybe we could block that off and physically coordinate that, but we would have to actively manage from the beginning of construction from every lot and be notified that every

single lot can stop that. Otherwise we would have extreme liability from trip hazards, slip and fall as though sidewalks are destroyed by trucks and as a deflection increases on those sidewalks and there's cracks and other things that are obvious trip hazards. The CDD engages in a duty, where right now, we have no duty to improve. It's unimproved land, so we have no duty to maintain.

Mr. Boyd: Not to mention the houses that are under construction at any given time. Because we get the sidewalks completed, then the next day, if more houses start construction with the sidewalk. Now you not only have unaided ground but you have pallets and nails and all kinds of other stuff.

Mr. d'Adesky: Exactly, we would have an active duty to go out there to maintain and observe that. We are engaging in something when we know there's going to be construction. So, I just want to make sure everyone's aware of that. Not to mention if somebody was walking along that and a construction truck or something else pull up and there was some sort of incident, where someone was hit by a truck. That would also be on the CDD, because we chose to proactively put that sidewalk in, which gives people the appearance that's is safe to walk there.

Mr. Flint: Also you have to stabilize the ground on either side of the sidewalk. They would have to sod it, and there will probably not going to be any irrigation. We have another district where we were actually sued because someone stepped off the edge of the sidewalk and there was a hole there. That lawsuit went on for a couple years, and we actually, GMS got named in that lawsuit as well.

Mr. Boyd: When concrete costs 10 or 12 layer or square foot to pour, when they are on one site. When they have to be mobilized to 450 different places and make forms, it's going to be way more expensive than just 10 dollars a foot. It's going to be a lot more work involved in mobilizing crews to 500 different areas.

Mr. Greenstein: I think I'm moving against the tide here, when I raise this question. Is there anything that can reasonably be done to improve the area or stabilize the area, make it habitable for someone to continue their journey on that side of the street, where it happens to be a vacant lot there, short of concrete?

Mr. Scheerer: You mean like an unimproved path?

Mr. Greenstein: Yeah. I'm saying maybe pebbles, like gravel? Again, because we went ahead and did that improvement, then we become liable for anybody who falls on that improvement.

Mr. d'Adesky: And I haven't thought about that from an access standpoint. We are installing that does that mean ADA issues? I haven't thought about it too much, but, I can imagine a creative lawyer would throw ADA in there. Is an unimproved mulch path ADA accessible? \

Mr. Greenstein: I think we did a good job of discussing the issue. Again, there are no easy answers. We will have another discussion on this when we have the East meeting, and we'll see where that brings us. But I did want to raise it because of the fact the community is concerned about it. Now we can explain the bigger picture and overtime the problems are getting smaller and smaller, and we haven't had any lawsuits. So, we are okay. Thank you.

Mr. Flint: Alright. Next item.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Discussion of Potential Recreation/Dog Park in Heritage Preserve

Mr. Sheerer: Yeah, in the agenda you will see the park, and I also took pictures. And I know this is something that Mr. Greenstein had brought up for consideration and discussion about the possible use for that parcel.

Mr. Flint: So, it would be R1 on this map?

Mr. Sheerer: R1 on the map.

Mr. Greenstein: One of the things I was going to ask you today Alan on this subject is, in a previous on a road trip around the west side and looking at some of the water retention ponds, I discovered for the first time that we have a retention pond area behind the houses on Windstone Way, right?

Mr. Scheerer: There is a retention pond the District maintains off of Windstone.

Mr. Greenstein: Would it be possible in that area back there, to have a trail of any kind, or is it set up the way it is that it's more management, and we couldn't have any kind of walking trail or anything around it or behind it or connecting into this property.

Mr. Sheerer: I think one of the things we would have to check if there's any property behind the homes that are designated CDD that could be created from that R1 recreation tract back to the pond off of Grand Traverse and Windstone .

Mr. Flint: There's that one separate track.

Mr. Sheerer: I just don't know if it goes all the way around the back.

Mr. Greenstein: I spoke with a number of residents that indicated that was something they would like to see from a recreational standpoint, a walking trail tied to this area.

Mr. Sheerer: Yeah, that's what I didn't know behind Windstone and heading towards this park if there was an easement.

Mr. Greenstein: We can look it up. It's nothing requiring immediate action.

Mr. d'Adesky: So those are probably still some undeveloped lots. If they were developed you would want to try to reference those homeowners and see how they feel about it. Often times a survey will say generally a trail, but you start to put in somebody's back yard and they start complaining about it.

Mr. Greenstein: Well what is the designation on the map it says 0-1.

Ms. Musser: Yeah, 0-1 right there.

Mr. Greenstein: What is the significance of that 0-1? Because that would be the areas.

Mr. Flint: It's just a plat designation, it doesn't actually mean we have a use for that given use.

Mr. Greenstein: Because that would be the path that we would have to take to get back there. So at this point, I'm just looking for some consensus that we would like to have some amenity that would be managed by the CDD on R1, and whether it's purely a recreational park type of thing, whether it has a dog park component similar to what was done on the east side. Because the latest concept is to have a walking trail.

Mr. Flint: Mark, if you want to gage whether the Board is interested, then we can do more research and bring it back.

Mr. Greenstein: Exactly

Mr. Flint: If the Board is opposed, then we won't do anything, but if there's a desire to look into in then we can do that. We can bring back.

Mr. Burman: I would support that. It's an ugly parcel. I would just be cautious about routing any trail behind people's homes. They are not going to like that.

Mr. Sheerer: We can definitely look at it. I will get with Mark and take a look at it.

Mr. Greenstein: You've been opening my eyes to all kinds of property that we have in the back there. It's funny, a resident suggested it. I don't know if they've actually gone back there or just physically made their way around. But they seem to like the idea of a walking trail.

Mr. Sheerer: I think the first step is to explore what you do with the tract, and then you work on the trail.

Mr. Greenstein: I agree. So, would we like to. Look into R-1? Are you good with that John?

Mr. Chiste: Yes.

Mr. Greenstein: So, we will do further study on this. No one is anti-recreation or anti-dog park.

Mr. Chiste: No, we like dog parks.

Mr. Flint: Alright. Next item.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Consideration of Proposal from SunScape Consulting to Provide Landscape Management Services

Mr. Flint: Subsequent to bidding out landscaping services, the joint process that we did with the resort and the Master Association. We also came to an agreement with SunScape Consulting to provide the landscape consulting services, and that agreement has actually expired. They have provided a proposed agreement to extend those services, it's the same monthly charges they had previously. I did a handout and a slightly revised version of it, because back when the Board entered into this in 2016, I had asked that he adjust the threshold values when the additional percentage payments would kicked in. So, he has increased those to \$10,000. I think the prior version had \$8,000.

Mr. Greenstein: I think \$5,000.

Mr. Scheerer: Yes, \$5,000.

Ms. Musser: And number two says two years in the old version, and the new version says three years.

Mr. Flint: Yes, to do the re-bid.

Mr. Greenstein: Alan, I don't want to put you on the spot because we haven't had a discussion about this in advance, but how would you describe the significance of the contribution being made there for the cost?

Mr. Scheerer: Based on the elements that he manages on the West side, I'd say that I think at this point they are minimal. The only improved area is that we have is the guard house. Pretty much everything else out there is unirrigated, or partially irrigated bahia.

Mr. Flint: Keep in mind this is a shared expense just like the landscape contract.

Mr. Greenstein: Yes, I was going to point that out.

Mr. Flint: This costs would be allocated to both Districts based on the platted lots.

Mr. Scheerer: There is way more work on the East than performed on the West.

Mr. d'Adesky: You could always make it subject to approval based on what East does or you could table it.

Mr. Burman: Or figure out a fair cost share between East and West.

Mr. d'Adesky: Yeah, that's another option.

Mr. Burman: There's 2 acres on the West and like 150 acres on the East.

Mr. Flint: All of the amenities are in the East also, but those costs are being shared because of the Reciprocal Use Agreements. So, I would hate to start having different allocations for different things because we are kind of treating it as a system of improvements rather than trying to allocate specific ones to each District.

Mr. Greenstein: I'm sitting on both Boards, but I'm looking at this as one thing. That's why I was asking you Alan, as to how significant is this? It's not a budget crisis by any means, but at the same time from a good government standpoint, should we be spending \$40,000 a year or more for Mr. Yahn's services.

Mr. Flint: Another approach you could take is to extend it on a month to month. The agreement is going to have a 30 day termination no matter what.

Mr. Greenstein: Exactly. So, we are going to have it there anyway.

Mr. Flint: I think we are going to be talking about landscaping issues, and maybe you would want to extend it on a month to month just to see how that's all going to shake out. Because you also provide services to the Master Association and with the association and resort changing landscaping contractors, I don't know where his services are going to fall with those entities. I know he's still under contract with them, but there are some moving parts here. We operated for many years without the services, it's not like we don't know how to manage it. There was some benefit when we were all bidding together having the services. He does provide value. So, you just have to weigh the costs benefit of that.

Mr. Greenstein: Again, based on the status of things right now, even though we do have the 30 day kick out, I don't want to give the impression that we are going into an agreement for a 3 year period. What do you think David? You are probably in the best position.

Mr. Burman: I'm in the worst position. In general I do like the idea of professional oversight over contractors who have every incentive in the world to cut corners when they need to. It doesn't matter who the vendor is, it's just the way it is. But at the same time, I'm not sure we face that in the CDD arena. We are just facing some improvements here and there. We are not talking about every single person's home. So, it's a little bit different.

Mr. Greenstein: There are a number of different things in this arena. The subject of landscaping will be taking place over the next few months.

Mr. Chiste: Mark, can I give a suggestion?

Mr. Greenstein: Please.

Mr. Chiste: I would rather pass on this right now. Let's see what happens and let's see the results of us overseeing the landscaping ourselves over the next 6 to 12 months. If we see that this is something that we need to have the arbor experts involved in, because things are not working the way they should, then we can rehire. It's not like this is the only guy in town.

Mr. Greenstein: So what are you saying, John? I think you were going in the direction I was going.

Mr. Chiste: I'm saying do not extend the contract. Let our management company oversee and monitor the overall landscaping of our CDD area. If we believe that things are changing dramatically, or if it doesn't look right based on what's going on, then we can always reengage with these guys because They don't really do the work.

Mr. Greenstein: Exactly.

Mr. Chiste: They just oversee it.

Mr. Greenstein: That's why it is Sunscape Consulting.

Mr. Chiste: We just had the same issue with Margaritaville. We were paying this company around \$200,000 to oversee the management of the maintenance. I thought, do we really have to have these guys? So, we are taking the approach of let's not utilize them, see if we see a major deficiency and if for some reason we do then we can always reengage.

Mr. Greenstein: No, I don't have a problem with that. It's just the fact that again it is a shared cost item. Can we provide for a motion that?

Mr. Chiste: Maybe we can provide a motion that our suggestion.

Mr. Greenstein: Obviously, the East has to look at it.

Mr. d'Adesky: Yes, exactly. Even if you don't take action today, you can take action next month, and reengage.

Mr. Flint: If the desire is not to continue the services, then no action is necessary because there is actually no contract in effect right now.

Mr. Greenstein: That's fine. It has already terminated?

Mr. Flint: Yes, they have been providing the services, and we have been compensating them since this.

Mr. Greenstein: Thank you, John.

Mr. Chiste: You're welcome.

Mr. Flint: In the event the East wants to continue the services, is the West agreeable to funding the prorated portion? That's the potential issue if the East decides that they want to do this, the question of proration is valid.

Mr. Greenstein: I don't think that's going to happen, but we will be open to the possibility. We are in the right direction on this.

Mr. Flint: Sounds good.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Staff Reports

A. Attorney

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

Mr. d'Adesky: No, nothing other than the ordinary.

B. Engineer

Mr. Flint: Xabier is here and he has a monthly report. You have some updates on the widening of the lanes and the kiosk?

Mr. Guerricogoitia: Yes, we do. The entry improvements which include the additional pavement at Sinclair Road gate and also the parking spaces have been submitted for permitting. We anticipate having that permit issued by the end of the year.

Mr. Flint: Are there any questions for our Engineer?

Mr. Greenstein: What do we do if we don't get the permit by the end of the year?

Mr. Guerricogoitia: We'll get it next year.

Mr. Greenstein: That's the thing, it becomes hurry up and wait. We do all the leg work and we get it in there, and it would be nice if we could somehow push it to the head of the line. Best case scenario we get the permit by the end of the year, when do you think we can actually see some progress.

Mr. Guerricogoitia: We can proceed with getting bids on the work, there's nothing that would change the plans we have currently. We are at a point where it would be prudent to go get some bids on it and have the Board evaluate the costs of those improvements.

Mr. Flint: The next step would be preparation of construction drawings to bid the project. He believes that what they've used for permitting, there's been no significant comments from the county, so they should be okay to use for bidding purposes. If that's the case my suggestion would

be that we direct the Engineer to move forward with bidding the improvements so that when we get the permit we can start construction.

Mr. Greenstein: Sounds good.

C. District Manager's Report

i. Action Items List

Mr. Flint: The neighborhood monuments are complete, those will drop off the list. Two items were just brought up as well as the four way stop for Tradition. Has that been done?

Mr. Scheerer: No, that work will begin December 16th, Monday. I had a meeting scheduled this morning, a pre-meeting with Fausnight. They cancelled the meeting until tomorrow morning. The purpose of the meeting, John Cruz with security is going to be there. I want to ensure the placement of the advance warning signs, that there is a new four way stop ahead, are in place well before they go ahead and install the pole and create actual four way stop. I want to make sure security is involved. I have the drawings which I'll send an email out tomorrow to the HOA and the Resort and let those guys distribute them. Also the crosswalk up by Heritage Crossing will happen.

Ms. Musser: The stop sign warning sign will be before they go over the bridge, right?

Mr. Sheerer: Yes, it will. And I do need to get with Bear's Den. They have a sign directing you to Bear's Den just before you get to the corner. That sign needs to be removed. We can temporally pull it out and relocate it somewhere else. It's just pointing you towards the guardhouse. But, that sign will need to come out.

Mr. Greenstein: We can take a look at that and determine the next best optimum place for that sign. Advance warning, as far as implementation of this four way stop, what were you thinking will be the advance warning? Meaning tell people 10 days, 2 weeks, a week?

Mr. Sheerer: The advance warning is just the sign stating the four way stop is ahead.

Mr. Burman: But for how long will they put it out there before the actual stop signs are there?

Mr. Greenstein: That's what I want to avoid.

Mr. Sheerer: The plan is to do it all at the same time.

Mr. Flint: One thing you can do also is you can put red flags on top of the stop signs.

Mr. Sheerer: Yes, we do have flags going in.

Mr. Greenstein: What about the flashing light?

Mr. Sheerer: The Board did not approve any flashing light, no digital message boards. The plan that was approved was in advance to get a set of signs to be installed 150 to 200 feet before you get to the actual four way stop.

Mr. Greenstein: I just think between the Resort communication and putting things on our own website, you want to give people at least a week's notice that this is what's happening. You don't want people blowing through that intersection, it can cause more problems than it's worth. I think the cross flags idea that's fine, but I think we need to communicate to folks what we are doing before we actually implement it.

Mr. Flint: It sounds like we don't want to hold up the installation, but maybe we can cover the stop signs.

Mr. Greenstein: In most cases like this that I've seen, they put the cover over the sign itself. But people can see from driving, they can see this is what's going to be happening soon.

Mr. Sheerer: The signs will be there; the flags will be there. We will just cover the stop sign a week to ten days.

Mr. Greenstein: You think a week is enough time? I just don't want people to all of a sudden approach it, not realizing that it's there. Even if it's just a few days' notice.

Mr. Sheerer: We can install it on Monday, and then expose it the following Monday and give everybody 5 days to digest it. There will be a map that goes out via email.

Mr. Flint: I think that's more than adequate.

Mr. Scheerer: So, five days and remove the covers the following Monday?

Mr. Greenstein: Sounds good.

ii. Approval of Check Register

Mr. Flint: Any questions on the General Fund check register?

Mr. Greenstein: It looks like it's all routine stuff.

Mr. Flint: Hearing no questions, I would ask for a motion to approve.

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

iii. Balance Sheet and Income Statement

Mr. Flint: The Balance Sheet and Income Statement is through October 31st. There is no action required. Does the Board have any questions? We can discuss those if so. Hearing none,

iv. Status of Direct Bill Assessments

Mr. Flint: I don't think I have those in here, but I don't believe there are any changes. We don't have any issues yet, and we will continue to monitor that.

v. Presentation of Arbitrage Rebate Calculation Reports

Mr. Flint: We just need a motion to accept the reports.

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein, seconded by Ms. Musser, with all in favor, the Arbitrage Rebate Calculation Reports, were approved.

vi. Presentation of Revised Number of Registered Voters – 240

Mr. Flint: The Supervisor of Election Center revised to change the number. They were going back to review to see if they picked up any expansions. So, as you can see we are at 240, we would have had to hit 250 for the next two seats to transition. The fact that we haven't hit 250, it's now going to be 2022 before the first two seats will transition. So, we are going to have to continue to have Landowner Elections until 2020 for all three seats.

NINETH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Other Business

Mr. Flint: Was there anything else the Board would like to discuss?

Mr. Greenstein: Just a couple of quick things, hopefully. Alan, do we have a radar speed sign that could be put in place on Grand Traverse, or do we have to buy one?

Mr. Sheerer: We have two already located on Grand Traverse, we can do what we've done before.

Mr. Greenstein: Okay, so it must be a relocate job. It's reported that people are speeding from the bridge on that stretch from Castle Pines to Tradition. That stretch is the one that people were speeding on.

Mr. Sheerer: We have two on Grand Traverse. We can relocate any of them if we want to.

Mr. Greenstein: Okay, we will look at that.

Mr. Sheerer: We can find a spot for it.

Mr. Greenstein: It's a straight run, there are no curves, people have a tendency to pick up speed on the straight. There's no houses there. So, we can probably re-locate a sign. We'll take a look at it and see. The other thing I wanted to mention is the parking and towing project that is moving forward on the East side. I'm sure everyone knows this; we've brought this up before. We proposed rulemaking for a parking and towing policy on the East side. We've designated a

number of streets that will be used to initially implement, to determine what the impacts of implementing parking on one side of the street only to allow for emergency vehicles to safely get in and out of those streets will be. There's all kinds of issues revolving around this. But we made a conscious decision to send the trial balloon up on the East side and not the West side for administrative control purposes. Just for the scope of the project, there is a lot of territory to cover. There are some residents on the West side that are concerned that the East side is going down the road and the West side is being left behind. That is not the case. I think I had a discussion with George about the formalities of what we are doing. We are having a hearing on the 19th, that had to be advertised in advance. Any proposed rulemaking that is done of an equal nature for the West side would have to also go through a hearing process. The whole idea was that, unless there was some significant modifications needed for the West side, I think the West side and the East side share a common issue, and the West side could adopt what the East side does. We will then, even on the East side, have to have another hearing even though we probably wouldn't do it at night, we would do it during the day as part of a regular scheduled Board meeting, to formally adopt and permanently adopt the rules.

Mr. d'Adesky: We are adopting it in a limited area, and it is permanent for that area. However, if you want to expand it you have to do a whole new hearing to expand it beyond the areas we have marked and designated.

Mr. Greenstein: And just so you know there has been discussion among the folks on the East side, saying "Why are you only selecting 5 or 6 streets. Why don't you just come up with a rule there's only one side of the street, how are you going to determine that and do it for the entire Reunion East." Well, that could come up at the hearing on the 19th, but we couldn't do it because we only announced we were doing it on those 5 or 6 streets. It will require subsequent action. What I think we should do as a West Board is try to catch up with the East, meaning get ourselves in a position where when the final action is taken it can apply to both East and West at the same time. Does that make any sense George?

Mr. Flint: I understand what you're saying, but it would be up to the Board if you want to do that. I thought the East was going to do it as a trial and the West was going to monitor the implementation of that. What you're saying is rather than do that, let's try to do it parallel.

Mr. Greenstein: No. I want to make sure I'm clear. Legally, I want the West to be able, as long as the Board agrees to it, to implement that rule for the West at the same time that it becomes formal for the East. The trial will only be on the East.

Mr. d'Adesky: So, we will officially adopt it, the rule will go into effect assuming the Board votes to adopt it next week after hearing comment from the public. It will go into place for that small area within Reunion East. What I believe you are saying is, there is probably a time if they adopt it, that Reunion East would want adopt that for the whole community. And what you would want, is that if Reunion East would expand this to the entire community, Reunion West would do the same thing at the same time.

Mr. Greenstein: Right. And again, I am told that on normal administratively controllable stuff, through the interlocal agreement, the East or the West could easily adopt the other's policy without any problem. But because this is a rule-making, you would need to have the hearing. So what I'm saying is, we need to then schedule the hearing. Even though it's a formality thing as far as I'm concerned, there will be folks who will want to voice their opinions. So, we need to set a hearing meeting for the West for parking and towing policy.

Mr. Flint: Based on Andrew's interpretation, I wouldn't think you would do that until the East was ready to expand that to the entire District. And then at that point, West would advertise a public hearing.

Mr. Greenstein: Okay, so we do a joint announcement and we could do an East and West for the formal rule.

Mr. Flint: You would have to do two separate hearings if you do them on the same day.

Mr. d'Adesky: If we adopt it in December and start enforcing in fairly rapidly, we get a couple months of data. Let's say by March we say this is working, this is looking good. In March, we say let's set a public hearing, we set that two months from then so we would set it for May. We could set it both for East and West in May at the exact same time. One meeting would have it first, and then the other would have their meeting and their public hearing. You would have that time where you'd have data from the East to see how it's going.

Mr. Greenstein: Sounds good to me. The fact that we just discussed it shows the West we are not leaving them in the lurch.

Mr. Flint: Alright, any other comments from the Board?

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Supervisor's Requests

There being none, the next item followed.

ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Next Meeting Date

Mr. Flint: The next meeting date is January 9, 2020.

TWELVETH 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