

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, March 12, 2020 at 12:30 p.m. at the Heritage Crossing Community Center, 7715 Heritage Crossing Way, Reunion, Florida.

Present and constituting a quorum were:

Mark Greenstein	Vice Chairman by phone
Debbie Musser	Assistant Secretary
Michael Mancke	Assistant Secretary
David Burman	Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

George Flint	District Manager
Andrew d'Adesky	District Counsel
Steve Boyd	District Engineer
Alan Scheerer	Field Engineer
Tricia Adams	GMS
Rob Stulz	Yellowstone
Don Harding	RECDD Board Member

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 one attended via phone, constituting a quorum.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS

Public Comment Period

There being none, the next item followed.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS

Approval of the Minutes of the January 9, 2020 Meeting

Mr. Flint: Did the Board have any comments or corrections on the January 9, 2020 minutes?

Mr. Greenstein: The Duke Representative mentioned was Rick Feather.

Mr. Flint: We will fix that.

On MOTION by Mr. Burman seconded by Ms. Musser, with all in favor, the Minutes of the January 9, 2020 Meeting Minutes were approved, as amended.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Review of Landscape Maintenance Proposals

Mr. Flint: Both the Reunion East and Reunion West Boards approved a request for proposals to issue a joint RFP for landscape maintenance services. Reunion West meets today and Reunion East is meeting next week. They moved the meeting date due to a conflict with some Board members schedules. In the past what the Districts have done is appointed an evaluation committee comprised of representatives of both Districts to go through and review and rank the proposals. That would be our recommendation in this case as well, so that hopefully the evaluation committee can provide consensus recommendation to each Board that they can consider at a future meeting. I would expect, if the Board is amendable, that the evaluation committee would make a recommendation at the regular April meetings. We may want to hold a joint meeting in April for both Boards if we are going to take presentations that way they don't need to present separately to each Board. We are still in the process, it was a sealed bid process. We received the proposals last week. We provided you with an initial comparison of the numbers, but we still need to go through and review the sufficiency of the proposals. Then if you appoint an evaluation committee, that evaluation committee would go through the responses and apply the criteria and weighting that you all approved in the RFP. Any discussion from the Board on that?

Mr. Greenstein: It sounds like the right approach to me.

Mr. Flint: I was thinking one Board member from each CDD and then staff including Tricia, Alan and myself would comprise the committee unless the Board has any others or you can put more than one Board member if you wanted to. They're going to have to be an advertised meeting.

Mr. d'Adesky: We advise you don't do that. Just because if there is more than one, it would evoke an advertised meeting and then folks attending it.

Mr. Flint: Well, we have to advertise it anyway because it's an advisory committee. So, I don't want to play Sunshine Law with you, but I don't think it would come into play because it's already going to be advertised. But it's really up to each Board how you want to do that.

Mr. Greenstein: Well, I should be available, so I can do it if that's amenable to the Board.

Mr. Flint: Is the Board okay with Mark?

Mr. Burman: Yes.

Mr. Flint: So, then Mark can serve as the Board representative for Reunion West and then Reunion East would need to consider appointing someone other than Mark since he serves on both Boards. I would assume if they agree, they will appoint someone else. Then we would have two Board members.

Mr. Greenstein: Works for me.

Mr. Flint: Is there a motion then to create an evaluation committee and appoint Mr. Greenstein as Reunion West's representative?

On MOTION by Mr. Mancke, seconded by Mr. Burman, with all in favor, Creating an Evaluation Committee and Appointing Mr. Greenstein as Reunion West's Representative, was approved.

Mr. Flint: I know there's a couple companies that are here today. How we see it working is that each Board is going to appoint representatives to a joint evaluation committee. That evaluation committee would meet, review the responses, and rank them in accordance with the criteria that was provided. They may choose to recommend that the Boards consider presentations, or they may not. We will let the companies know at least a week in advance if presentations are going to be required. I expect we would be looking at the regular meetings in April which is the second Thursday. Reunion West meets at 12:30 p.m. and Reunion East meets at 1:00 p.m.. Again, we will confirm that information prior to those April meetings.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Ratification of Series 2019 Requisition #6

Mr. Flint: This is in your agenda. It's for engineering services related to reviewing and processing Requisition #4. It's for \$1,200 to Boyd Civil Engineering. It's been transmitted to the trustee and we are just asking the Board to ratify the requisition.

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein, seconded by Mr. Burman, with all in favor, Series 2019 Requisition #6, was ratified.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Ratification of Data Sharing and Usage Agreement with the Osceola County Property Appraiser

Mr. Flint: There were some legislative changes that puts some penalties in place in the event governments disclose information that should otherwise be confidential. There are certain situations where, for example, police officers, firemen, under state law they can be exempt from public records as far as their address and contact information. Because the counties provide us

with the tax roll and we certify back to them the assessment roll to collect the assessments, there is a data sharing situation. Some of the counties have chosen to require these agreements which basically say we won't disclose the confidential information. In this case Osceola County doesn't provide the names, so it would be difficult for us to disclose it anyway, even if it was accidental.

Mr. d'Adesky: We would have to make an active effort to do that.

Mr. Flint: So, these are standard. They are requiring it of all special districts, CDDs, etc. We've already executed this because of the deadline they provided. We are asking the Board to ratify that execution.

On MOTION by Mr. Burman, seconded by Ms. Musser, with all in favor, the Data Sharing and Usage Agreement with the Osceola County Property Appraiser, was ratified.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Discussion of Initiating Parking and Towing Policy

Mr. Flint: Next was a request. Mr. Greenstein, you may have asked this to be placed on the agenda. This Board may recall that we've had discussions in the past and Reunion East actually went through a public hearing process to adopt a rule implementing a towing and parking policy on certain roads within Reunion East. We held a public evening hearing to impose those. That hearing took place and the Board adopted the rule. We have since began implementation of the towing and parking policy. It's initially just providing warnings. We've entered into an agreement with the Master Association through their security contract to actually assist in enforcing the towing and parking policy. So, for the last two weeks the security has been issuing warnings. Staff has been receiving weekly reports on what's been issued. It seems to be going well. So far, the feeling is it has been successful. Initially what we thought we would see was a pilot implementation. When we worked through the issues with that, the thought process on East was that they would expand that to more than just the initial five roads or whatever was included. The extension to that would be that Reunion West would also look at implementing a towing and parking policy, so that we would have a uniform policy across the entire community.

Mr. d'Adesky: Correct me if I'm wrong, George and Mark, but I think that was one of the major comments that we got from the public during that meeting was the uniformity.

Mr. Flint: When East held their public meeting, I would guess there were more than half of the people in the audience were Reunion West residents. Their concern was that Reunion East was doing this but Reunion West was not doing it. The discussion at the time was that we were

looking at doing this on a smaller scale to make sure it works, make sure to work out all the bugs, and then the hope would be that both Boards would consider a wider implementation. So, it's really up to this Board how you want to handle that in Reunion West. So, we are putting it on here for discussion in the event the Board wants to consider moving forward with that you would have to go through the same public hearing process that East went through. What we would do, is develop a towing and parking policy. It would be similar to or identical to what East used with the exception that the map attached would be identifying different streets. Whether West chose to do it throughout the entire West CDD or you chose to do an implementation of a small area as well, that would really be up to the Board. Mark, do you want to say anything?

Mr. Greenstein: I think you covered it very well. I think the East implementation has basically accomplished what we thought it would. I think compliance is really high even though we are just doing warnings basically for the month of March. As you said, based upon the number of residents that were there from the West, I'd recommend that we play catch up so that when we do finally implement it resort wide on a formal permanent basis, the West would be at the same point as the East. Rather than designate a few streets in the West and see how it works, I think it's going to be the exact same result as what we did on the East. So, without doing any kind of trial run, I would recommend that we take the necessary steps to implement an identical policy to what we have on the East on the West.

Mr. Flint: The process would be, first you need a policy and a map to consider. So, if it's the desire to investigate moving forward, the first step would be at the next meeting bringing back the policy and the maps. Then you would have discussion and then the action at that time would be if you are interested in moving forward, you would vote to set the public hearing. You wouldn't be able to set the public hearing today because you don't have the policy in front of you. So, the next step would be having the policy rule in front of you and then setting a public hearing which would have to be at least 30 days from the date that you agreed to set it because we have to notice it. There may be some differences in West, I don't know how the Encore communities fall in with Reunion Proper and whether these parking policies would also apply to some of those Encore developments or whether it would just be the historical Reunion area.

Mr. Greenstein: That's a good point. If Encore wants to segregate or not include Bear's Den because they don't feel it's needed in Bear's Den, then we can consider that. I quite honestly have not gone through to see if we have the same issue about the emergency vehicles not having

enough access to get through if the cars are parked on both sides of the street. I would leave that up to you guys to make the recommendation as to what you want in Bear's Den.

Mr. Flint: Mark, it may not apply in Bear's Den depending on what they've decided to do with those roads, whether they are private or not. At one point they were going to be conveyed to the District and then they changed their mind. There's also the other Encore developments outside of the Sinclair Road Gate that would also probably need to have some discussion as to whether they fall under this too.

Mr. Greenstein: That's a good point. If they have the issue over there and if they have something that could be corrected or improved through this effort, then I say include them. But they really weren't part of the focus.

Mr. Flint: Right. John is not here or on the phone, so we don't have an Encore person necessarily represented, but we will have an opportunity to have this discussion. If the Board wants to move forward, we can have this discussion at the next meeting when we actually have the policy and an initial map. We can talk about what should be in and what should be out at that point.

Mr. Greenstein: That sounds fine.

Mr. Flint: Is the Board okay then with that approach that we would bring a policy and a map back at the April meeting and then you can decide at that point if you want to set the public hearing?

Mr. Burman: Yes.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Discussion of Sinclair Road Gate Operations

Mr. Flint: This is on the agenda because there's been some discussion about the public access nature of CDD gates. I think we all know because the roads are owned by the Community Development District, a community development district is a public entity, so there are public access requirements that we have to follow with our gate systems. We've also entered into an interlocal agreement with Osceola County that is not necessarily required, but was something that they wanted in place to reconfirm the fact that the CDD understands that there is to be public access to the roads as a government entity. I think the test, Andrew you can confirm, but it doesn't mean that every gate has to be staffed, but it does mean you have to have at least one gate where someone from the public can gain access to the community.

Mr. d'Adesky: Correct.

Mr. Flint: The other gates could be resident only, they could be remotely operated, etc.

Mr. d'Adesky: As long as one gate allows you to access whatever area it is. You can't have for example an enclave parcel that is only accessible by a remote gate. It has to be the one main entrance you can get there somehow once you are inside passed that gate.

Mr. Flint: There has been a lot of concern about pass-through traffic. As a result, there has been some question as to whether the Sinclair Road gate could be converted to a resident only gate, which would resolve some of the issues with the pass-through traffic. We would still have public access through the main gate and the Old Lake Willson Road gate or the Spine Road gate. There's obviously pluses and minuses to making that a resident only gate. This issue came up because the resort had concerns and I think Mr. Harding who's on the Reunion East Board is here as well as some other Board members and residents have some concerns about the pass-through traffic and it is causing issues at the Sinclair Rd Gate. We were on course, if the Board recalls, to initially construct an additional lane that would allow residents to get through to the resident access of that gate and guests and others would have to go through and actually interface with the guard. Then as a result of some changes we were actually able to hopefully avoid constructing that additional lane and threw up a restriping of the area. We can actually create two lanes to approach the guard house. So, we've submitted the restriping plan to the county and we are waiting for their approval. In the event they approve it, we'll be able to through our restriping plan, actually create two lanes approaching the guard house which should avoid some of the backup of residents and delays of residents gaining access to the community. I don't know if Mark and others agree, but some of the discussions I've had is that they'd like to see this striping plan implemented first and see how that works. Then if it doesn't work, we would potentially look at some change to how that gate is operated. Again, Mark, I don't mean to take all of your thunder. Is that consistent with what you would like to see?

Mr. Greenstein: Oh absolutely. I want to ensure that the striping includes the roadway all the way up to White Marsh? Near Traditions club house entrance? Is Alan there?

Mr. Scheerer: Yes.

Mr. Flint: Yes, he's handing out a map. Right now, the striping goes to the driveway to the lift station.

Mr. Greenstein: Right, in other words the striping is needed from the security shack to the lift station, but also looking at the striping of Tradition Blvd inside the gate around the Tradition's

club house. Those areas there are improperly marked. So, hopefully we will get that done at the same time.

Mr. Flint: Is that related to this?

Mr. Scheerer: Mark, if I may, the striping plan that you and I looked at only considered widening the availability for access into the Reunion West gate coming in off of Sinclair. I know you and I talked about a possible restriping plan in the future to deal with what's in front of Bear's Den to White Marsh and all the way down. For the purpose of whether or not the West gate needs to be converted to a resident only gate, the striping plan that we're looking at and considering now is just from Sinclair to the gate.

Mr. Flint: From the lift station.

Mr. Scheerer: Yes.

Mr. Greenstein: Ok, that's fine, but as far as cost and the need to get the road markings right, should we consider doing that now or do we do it as a separate piece and it won't make a different price wise?

Mr. Scheerer: I think it will make a difference price wise. What it's going to do is delay the process.

Mr. Flint: What he's asking is, is it going to be more expensive doing it in two versus one. I don't think so.

Mr. Scheerer: I don't think so.

Mr. Flint: They typically charge per foot and I don't know that it's going to be much different if we do it all at once. I think the main priority is trying to get the approach to the guard house done and we wouldn't want to delay that.

Mr. Greenstein: Right, and we talked about it while the assets belong to the CDD, the roadway and the guard house, staffing is controlled by the Master Association of that guard house. While it does impact us, I think the ultimate decision on how to handle that gate as far as making it resident only, it belongs to the Master. Does that make sense, Andrew?

Mr. d'Adesky: Say that one more time, Mark.

Mr. Greenstein: What I'm saying is the staffing of that gate, the actual officers who are at that gate are assigned to that gate and managed by the Master. We had a meeting on another subject last week with Anthony. I first learned of this effort from him and after we had discussed it, we agreed that we should do the resurface striping anyways, regardless. So, I don't want to see that delayed any longer because that's been in the works for a long time. I do believe it can help

and that area from the actual turn on Sinclair to the lift station, which I know the county does not want us to change in any way, I think once we do our striping and if there is a backup where we need two lanes around that turn, then we will go to the county and try to get that. So, we can have a separate lane for resident access really starting on Sinclair.

Mr. d'Adesky: We would have to go to the county for that.

Mr. Greenstein: So, we do one thing at a time.

Mr. Flint: Mark, what you are basically suggesting is that the CDD Board doesn't have a say in whether it's resident only or staffed.

Mr. d'Adesky: That's incorrect really because we are directing them. We have to direct them. We have an agreement with them. Essentially, they are enforcing on behalf of the CDD. They're our agent, so we do have a say in it. Also, we own the infrastructure.

Mr. Greenstein: Oh, okay.

Mr. d'Adesky: So, the striping and the pavement, the actual physical building, those are our buildings. They belong to the CDD and those are CDD assets that we have a duty to maintain.

Mr. Flint: But what I would say, Mark, is the Board could take a position that they delegate the decision, I think.

Mr. d'Adesky: Yes, you could ask the HOA if they have an opinion if they want to deal with it in a certain way. Maybe they have data and experience that can make this a better decision than the CDD can make unilaterally. That's fine. You are always allowed to ask people for what their opinion are, but at the end of the day, it's the CDD that's authorizing the changes and probably ultimately paying for them.

Mr. Mancke: What if the HOA decides not to man the gate?

Mr. d'Adesky: Then the CDD would have to directly hire and contract a security company to perform that service.

Mr. Flint: Or we could decide if we want to keep it resident only.

Mr. Greenstein: I thought this was coming from the resort, from Anthony, as a result of residents being significantly inconvenienced a few times. We know when it happens, we know it's not 24 hours a day, but it's rush hour especially on Friday nights or if there's an accident. I thought after our discussion he recognized that any unpredicted or occasional traffic or visitor or friend or relative of someone who lives on the West side would be forced to go around. In bad conditions that could take another 20 minutes to a half hour to get back around. I really think we need to do this step by step and do this striping and try to get traffic control going so that with

proper signage the residents have access to that resident gate. We will do everything in our power to make that happen. We will also consider anything else that we have to consider including resident only if that fails. We've already authorized it; we should do it.

Mr. Flint: Is the Board comfortable with that approach?

Mr. Burman: Yes.

Mr. Flint: It seems like you have consensus from the Board.

Mr. d'Adesky: That's already been approved, so there's no Board action needed.

Mr. Greenstein: I appreciate the discussion about who basically controls the operation of that security facility. Even though the Master has been delegated authority to operate it, we were the ones that gave them that authority. I'm glad you brought that up, Andrew.

Mr. d'Adesky: It's important to remember because that goes back to our maintaining them in a public nature, but it's our duty to check up on that. We need to make sure they are continually maintaining them and open them to the public if needed.

Mr. Greenstein: Thank you.

Mr. Flint: Does the Board want to open the floor up to Mr. Harding? Yes, sir?

Mr. Hardin: I had met with Anthony earlier today maybe before Mark got there and he was very much in favor of making it a resident only gate and he would pull the security people out of that gate in order to make that happen and hopefully the CDD would be in favor of putting the appropriate signs up and making it resident only. His concern was also the concern of the number of residents who are very much upset with the backup and the people coming through Reunion, just passing through causing all kind of traffic at certain hours of the day and actually maybe putting some things in jeopardy as far as traffic within the resort. He was very much in favor of doing it and I think Mark went and met with him afterwards and I think the striping of things will work, but then again, I don't know what that does as far as reducing the amount of through traffic. Because there's still going to be, even though the residents will be able to get in, the through traffic and the heavy traffic is still going to be there at certain hours. That's a number of residents' real concern.

Mr. Flint: It's a tough situation because on one end you are concerned about the pass through and if the solution is to make it resident only, then there's going to be a whole series of other residents that are going to be inconvenienced because they have guests or vendors have to go all the way around the 532 gate.

Ms. Musser: Then what happens out here?

Mr. Flint: Yeah, there's not a big staging area for cars at the main gate either.

Ms. Musser: It's going to get worse with all the construction.

Mr. Flint: Yes. Is there any other discussion?

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Staff Reports

A. Attorney

i. Update on Auditing Requirements

Mr. d'Adesky: This is something that we are doing for all our CDDs. It's just an update the statute which essentially, it passed a lot of provisions regarding fraud and waste. GMS is doing all this work already. I think George said it at a previous meeting, he hasn't had an issue with an audit in 15 years. But we are already doing a lot of things that the bill requires. It requires the audit to be posted on the website for 2 years; we're already doing that. It requires that members of the Board be on the audit committee; we're already doing that. The only thing I want to make you aware of is if an auditor ever asks you for information, try to answer them expeditiously. There are penalties. You can't obstruct an audit. Frankly, the question they will probably ask you is do you know of any undisclosed claims against the District. The answer is usually no. If they're sending a legal notice, it's usually for myself or George. If there were ever a question about an audit, just as George or myself and we'll answer you. Just a matter of keeping you updated on the latest legislation.

B. Engineer

Mr. Flint: Steve, any report?

Mr. Boyd: No, just following up with the conversation we just had. I want to make sure what I've given the County is what you intend to proceed initially. If there's some changes to that, Alan get that to me because I'm expecting a green light from the county on that restriping any day.

Mr. Flint: I don't think there's any change in the plan for the approach to the guard house. There may be another scope of work related with a different area in Reunion West, but not impacting what you've submitted. Right?

Mr. Scheerer: Right, yes sir.

Mr. Flint: So, we want to get that approved as soon as we can.

Mr. Boyd: Okay, we should have that in any day now.

Mr. Flint: The mail facility, what's the latest on that?

Mr. Boyd: That was tied to the same permit as this restriping or changes for Tradition Blvd. We want to make sure that what the county approves is good and we don't have to go back and rely on that permit in any way. So, once I get this green light when the county responds on the street striping, I'll officially remove the Tradition Blvd from that permit application. I've already received a landscape plan that the county requires upon review of that permit. That'll go back in with the landscape plan for a final permit. As soon as we know that we don't have to include anything associated with Tradition Blvd on.

Mr. Flint: Okay. Any questions?

Mr. Boyd: We can update the bids we got for Tradition Blvd and have the landscape.

Mr. Flint: Okay. Has the permit been issued? They were waiting on the landscape plan.

Mr. Boyd: No, we are waiting on the landscape plan, but also it's tied to Tradition. I didn't want to pull Tradition out before we were 100% sure that what we are planning to do is done.

Mr. Flint: Okay.

Mr. Greenstein: I was under the impression that the striping didn't require a permit or that is what I was led to believe last month.

Mr. Boyd: What we were told that striping probably doesn't require a permit, but I don't want to resubmit that permit package without it and then have him change his mind and come back and say no, actually it does require a permit. So, that's all.

Mr. Flint: So, Mark, Steve wants to get signed off on the striping plan before he moves it from the permit application. So, it's kind of a chicken and the egg thing. For some reason, if they don't approve the striping plan and they say we have to expand that lane, then we are back to where we were and Steve doesn't want to pull that lane out.

Mr. Boyd: Right.

Mr. Flint: And then find out that we actually have to construct the lane.

Mr. Greenstein: Got it.

C. District Manager's Report

i. Action Items List

Mr. Flint: We've talked about the items on the action items list.

ii. Approval of Check Register

Mr. Flint: We have the approval of the check register from February for the General Fund and the Replacement and Maintenance Fund. That total is \$510,552. Were there any questions on the check register?

On MOTION by Mr. Burman, seconded by Ms. Musser, with all in favor, the Check Register for \$510,552, was approved.

iii. Balance Sheet and Income Statement

Mr. Flint: You also have the unaudited financials through the end of January. If there are any questions, we can discuss those. No action is required.

iv. Status of Direct Bill Assessments

Mr. Flint: We have the Direct bill status. The Direct bill is up to date through March. So, the next payment is in June.

Mr. Greenstein: Good.

Mr. Flint: And we are working on Reunion East. We've got some very small bills that have not been paid that we are in communication with on East, but that doesn't affect West. Any questions on the financials?

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Other Business

Nothing to discuss. Moved to the next item.

ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Supervisor's Requests

Nothing to discuss. Moved to the next item.

TWELTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Next Meeting Date

Mr. Flint: The next meeting date is the second Thursday in April at 12:30 p.m.

THIRTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Adjournment

There being no further business, Mr. Flint called for a motion to adjourn.

On MOTION by Mr. Mancke seconded by Mr. Greenstein, with all in favor, the meeting was adjourned at 1:10 p.m.



Secretary/Assistant Secretary

Chairman/Vice Chairman