

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 11, 2020 at 12:30 p.m. via Zoom Teleconference.

Present and constituting a quorum were:

John Chiste	Chairman
Mark Greenstein	Vice Chairman
Debbie Musser	Assistant Secretary
Michael Mancke	Assistant Secretary
David Burman	Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

George Flint	District Manager
Jan Carpenter	District Counsel
Kristen Trucco	District Counsel
Steve Boyd	District Engineer
Alan Scheerer	Field Engineer
Tricia Adams	GMS
Rob Stulz	Yellowstone Landscape
John Cruz	

**FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Roll Call**

Mr. Flint called the meeting to order at 12:30 p.m. and called the roll. Five Board members were present constituting a quorum. This meeting was held via Zoom and was advertised.

**SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Public Comment Period**

Mr. Flint explained the comment period and reviewed the ways to participate via Zoom and phone. There being no public comment, the next item followed.

**THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Approval of the Minutes of the May 14, 2020 Meeting**

Mr. Flint: Did the Board have any additions, comments or corrections on the May 14, 2020 minutes? Hearing none,

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein, seconded by Mr. Chiste, with all in favor, the Minutes of the May 14, 2020 Meeting, were approved.

#### **FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

#### **Review of Landscape Review Committee Recommendation and Selection of Landscape Firm**

Mr. Flint: Previously Reunion West issued an RFP jointly with Reunion East. You appointed Mr. Greenstein as Reunion West's part of the Evaluation Committee. Mr. Greenstein met with Mr. Goldstein from Reunion East as their representative, as well as Tricia Adams and Alan Scheerer. We advertised an Evaluation Committee for yesterday morning at 10:00 a.m. They met and went through all the proposals and came up with a consensus Evaluation Committee ranking. You all were provided that information this morning. The Evaluation Criteria that was used to review the responses was included in the RFP. All the firms that were submitting were aware of how their responses would be evaluated. The Evaluation Committee is just making a recommendation to you all. You can either choose to accept their rankings, or if the Board wants to go through with review that's your prerogative as well. Tricia, do you have the rankings you can put on and share screen?

Ms. Adams: Yes, I will put those on shared screen. Also, they were transmitted to the Board of Supervisors under separate cover.

Mr. Flint: You can see each of the criteria. The committee went through each one of the responses on each criteria and ranked them. The official results placed Yellowstone first, Florida Commercial second, and BrightView third. Yellowstone came in at 9.48 and Florida Commercial came in at 7 points. Tricia, do you have a summary with prices?

Ms. Adams: I do.

Mr. Chiste: I saw that there is a wide divergence in the pricing.

Mr. Flint: Yes, I think several of the companies were lumped together. There are three lumped together.

Mr. Chiste: There are 4 together on the low end, and 3 on the high end.

Mr. Flint: Price, per your criteria, is 15% of the total. So you can see Yellowstone at \$756,000 and the number two Florida Commercial at \$989,000.

Mr. Chiste: And even big differences between the allocation between East and West, too. Mark, I will look to you. You spent a lot more time on this than most of us I'm sure. Do you have any ancillary comments to bring up.?

Mr. Greenstein: Well again, we went through the process and beyond personal knowledge of the candidates, or reference information, the evaluation kind of lays it out. The question for the Board becomes, is there a difference in quality, and there really isn't that much of a difference in quality among the number 1 and the number 2, or even the number 3. Is it worth the \$240,000 difference? I just personally don't see that. The only time I've ever gone with a higher priced bidder is if there was a substantial difference in quality and the low bidder was just out to lunch when it came to the level of service it was required of them. So, in this case at this point, I would recommend that we maintain Yellowstone as the CDD landscaper and take advantage of this new contract. Budgetarily, there's no question that we cannot absorb another \$240,000 at our expense for something like that.

Mr. Chiste: George, what was the cost last year? What was the last contract on this?

Mr. Flint: I think their bid is, \$10,000 less.

Ms. Adams: Yes, our current contract is \$776,290. Yes, and there's a split of course between East and West.

Mr. Flint: So, they are pretty close on their bid to what their current contract is.

Mr. Chiste: Understood.

Mr. Chiste : And George what is the out on these contracts?

Mr. Flint: It's 30 days without cause termination provisions. That's typical on all our contracts.

Mr. Chiste: There's no ability to re-negotiate with somebody else, correct? So, we couldn't go to number two and say hey, you are really close is there anything you can do to help us, or something like that?

Mr. Flint: Right. Because of the public bidding process, we are obligated to consider the numbers that they provide in their sealed bid. We can't negotiate the price.

Mr. Chiste: Mark, as our liaison, are you making a motion to accept the ranking?

Mr. Greenstein: Yes. Even though this is a new contract, we are basically continuing them and we can re-visit the issue of having multiple contractors on premises later down the road. I could have specified time period we go look at the quality of performance in other factors and they enter into our re-visiting this, but as George pointed out it's a 30 day kick out.

Mr. Flint: Is there a second?

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein, seconded by Mr. Chiste, with all in favor, approving the recommendation of the Landscape Review Committee to select Yellowstone as the CDD landscape firm, was approved.

Mr. Flint: We will get together and see how Reunion East deals with this as well. I assume we will bring back a contract at the next meeting.

#### **FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

#### **Review and Acceptance of Fiscal Year 2019 Audit Report**

Mr. Flint: Next is review and acceptance of fiscal year 2019 Audit Report. That was prepared by Grau & Associates. It's included in your agenda and it is a clean audit. On pages 28 and 29, you will see the report to management. If there are any findings or solutions they would be indicated there. You can see there are no findings or recommendations and they found that we complied with the provisions of the Auditor General they are required to review. Are there any questions on the audit? If not, is there a motion to accept it?

On MOTION by Mr. Chiste, seconded by Mr. Greenstein, with all in favor, Acceptance of the Fiscal Year 2019 Audit Report, was approved.

#### **SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

#### **Consideration of Resolution 2020-03 Setting a Public Hearing for the Establishment of Rules for Parking and Towing**

Mr. Flint: We brought this up last month. This is a resolution that would set a public hearing for Reunion West to consider the establishment of a Rule for Parking and Towing Policy. This is not adopting a Parking and Towing Policy; it's just setting the public hearing for the Board to consider adopting a Parking and Towing policy. The preliminary parking and towing rule is attached to the resolution as well as maps that identified the no parking zones included as a part of the rule. Tricia, do you want to go over it?

Ms. Adams: Yeas, as a matter of fact, Supervisors may have noted that the first map attached to the rule is actually affiliated with the Reunion East, so that will be removed and I apologize for that. I am going to go ahead and share a copy on the screen now with the Reunion West maps for consideration. You should be seeing on the first map on the screen and on the side of the street that is marked in red, Alan Scheerer has gone through and identified areas that would be considered no parking zones. In effect there would be parking allowed on one side of the street

only. The next diagram shows part of Grand Traverse as well as Castle Pines and I think the next map is the rest of Grand Traverse and going into Twin Eagles.

Mr. Chiste: There's no alternate parking, once it's set it's one side of the road or the other, right?

Ms. Adams: Yes, and if you need me to go back and look in more detail, I'm not sure what documents you have in front of you or if this shared screen is visible or helpful for you, but you should be able to see on which side of the street parking would be permitted.

Mr. Chiste: Mark, you guys have done this on the East side. The people have the parking on their side of the street, I assume are less happy than the people on the other side?

Mr. Greenstein: No, it's interesting the way that worked out. I think in most cases, if you are entering the court, where there's only one way in and out and you're coming in, we allowed parking on the right-hand side this way it avoids any U-turns. Where there was a situation where it was optional, where people could come in from either end of the street, we chose the route that was most frequently used. In Patriots Landing, we almost had to customize and use logic as to which side of the street we allowed. We allowed the side that allowed for more parking, which was the side that in one area there was a retention pond, the lake. That one you can get 40 cars down the street as compared to maybe 10 where you have to do driveway. But the thing is this, am I correct in saying Tricia and George, that we are talking about here now is setting the public hearing and that even though we are applying the maps, we put the map out that explains the areas we are looking at that we are not locked in at this point to the exact placement of the signs. Is that a correct statement?

Ms. Adams: That is correct.

Mr. Greenstein: Because we have tweaked some before on the East side where it came back to us we realized and took another look and we adjusted. I think in this case, learning from what we did on the East, we'll make sure that before we do anything, before we get to the hearing stage, that we've vetted the whole thing, so that we can anticipate any push back. There was a lot of push back, literally, when we initially had the hearing on the East side because the rental community didn't like it. I think they recognized the importance of it from a safety standpoint. I think it's going to be a smooth transition.

Mr. Flint: Mark, surprisingly there were probably more Reunion West residents at the public hearing than there were Reunion East residents. They were concerned because Reunion

West Board was not doing a new parking policy. So, they were more upset because they wanted a policy to put into place and they showed at the East meeting some support as well as opposition.

Mr. Greenstein: That is true, but we had the rental community who were slightly upset. They think when they are bringing in all these large volumes of renters that they are not going to have a place to park. Public safety is the number one thing though. Eventually I keep saying there is going to have to be some long-term parking facility or some centralized parking facility, that the resort is going to need to support. If any residents has a large number of guests, even on a temporary basis, they can't park on the street unless they are going to walk three for four blocks away. So, hopefully, they will come up with a shuttle service and centralized parking. So far, it's been a smooth transition and we haven't had to tow anyone. People have come around. So, hopefully, I can make a motion to approve Resolution 2020-03.

Mr. Flint: As for the date for the public hearing, we would be looking at the August meeting. There is a 30 day notice required so the July meeting is too soon. Do we want to do the August 13<sup>th</sup> meeting?

Mr. Greenstein: That's also the budget meeting, right?

Mr. Flint: Correct.

Mr. Greenstein : Yes, so it can coincide with the August budget meeting date.

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein, seconded by Mr. Chiste, with all in favor, Resolution 2020-03 Setting a Public Hearing for the Establishment of Rules for Parking and Towing on Thursday, August 13, 2020 at 12:30 PM at this location, was approved.

## **SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

### **Review and Consideration of Revised Proposed Fiscal Year 2021 Budget**

Mr. Flint: Last month you had approved a proposed budget and set the August 13<sup>th</sup> meeting for the adoption. Subsequent to the meeting, we realized that the allocation percentages that were included in the proposed budget were incorrect. The expense line items themselves have not changed in this version, the only thing that's really changed is how we allocate the expenses between East and West. You can see this current version is based on a 52/48. 52% is West as continued to without that number has gone from a 70/30 down to almost 52/48, it's almost a 50/50 right now. As Reunion Village starts to develop, obviously this is going to change again. So, the percentages may switch back in the other direction a little bit. We wanted to just present this, so

we got it in the record, the error in the allocations that were in the last version. Any questions on the?

Mr. Greenstein: That was the only area that jumped out at me in the initial proposal.

Mr. Flint: Jan, do you think the Board should approve this revised version, or we just wait until the public hearing and include it in the public hearing?

Ms. Carpenter: We can adopt it with changes, if you want to propose it so people can see anything changed prior to that.

Mr. Flint: Yes, that would probably be best. If the Board is amenable, then a motion to approve the Revised Proposed Budget for Fiscal Year 2021 would be in order.

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein, seconded by Mr. Burman, with all in favor, the Revised Proposed Fiscal Year 2021 Budget, was approved.

## **EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

### **Staff Reports**

#### **A. Attorney**

Mr. Flint: Jan and Kristen anything else?

Ms. Trucco: No, we do not have anything else to report. Thank you.

#### **B. Engineer**

Mr. Flint: Steve, do you have anything for West?

Mr. Boyd: I will give the Board an update. I had hoped to review two things with you today. One an approved plan for the mail kiosk, and two a bid. I hate to report that as far as the permit goes, I received additional comments from the County the first of June, which were surprising in that one of them was that the roadway to be platted to include the parking lots. I'm pushing back on that and I don't think that's going to be required, but they still are asking me to prepare a maintenance of traffic plan which for this scope of work I don't believe are warranted, but we've got to pull together and going to re-submit. They also wanted a costs for the maintenance of traffic included in the estimate for the inspection fee. So, unfortunately we are jumping through some additional hurdles on getting that plan approved. Our low bidder, I had sent the information to him and have been actively communicating with him to get him to update his bid to include all the landscaping. He's become unresponsive. So, I don't have the bid for you either today unfortunately. So, I've got some work to do and I will get back with you next month.

Mr. Greenstein: Sounds like the County needs a little drone photo of the area.



Mr. Boyd : We've got an aerial photo in the plans, they've got some new staff and with everybody working remotely and what was making a difficult situation with the County staff, it's a little bit worse than had been before. So, I'm going to get through those in comments. I've already talked with them about the plat, and so I don't think that's going to be an issue, but I still need to pursue the bid. I may have to go in a different direction with my bidder.

Mr. Greenstein: It's not a raging forest fire, it's just a hairy beast from age, that's all.

### **C. District Manager's Report**

#### **i. Action Items List**

Mr. Flint: That was the only item on the Action Item List was the Parking Kiosk for West. The restriping of the approach to the Guardhouse has been complete.

Mr. Greenstein: The only thing that came up was the comments from the peanut gallery I got relative to the signage. Alan talked about additional signage so it's just not on the ground. You indicated you said you had some ideas.

Mr. Scheerer: Well, I did get a hold of the company that did the original signs. I got a them through Carlton Grant's old emails because he did the signs coming off of 429 and Sinclair Road. They haven't give me a price or the concept yet, but hopefully I will have that as soon as possible as well as the costs because we are also looking at replacing the sign that was damaged by the car accident at Sinclair and Tradition Boulevard. He's working on that, I think it's going to be an easy fix. It may be a little expensive cause those signs aren't cheap, but it will look good and it will be about the same size as the original signs.

Mr. Greenstein : So, just for clarification, the signage, the signpost that was mowed down by that vehicle that came across, we paid to put that in?

Mr. Scheerer: I think the Resort did. I think Carlton actually absorbed some of that when he was doing the one as you come off of 429 and Sinclair. There's two there, then there's another one down by the one that got hit by the car. I was just looking at, I was just getting a price. I'm not doing it, I'm just going to get a price to replace it. At the same time, they're in design right now for a couple different designs for what the sign should look like for the visitor and resident lane coming in.

Mr. Greenstein: I'm trying to remember what was on that sign. I think it was basically what I referred to as a Resort sign.

Mr. Scheerer: Yes, it just gave direction to the resort.



Mr. Greenstein: The master was responsible technically for that sign. We can help coordinate getting the repaired or removed or whatever, but from a cost standpoint I think it was a more substantial sign.

Mr. Scheerer: Yes, they were several thousand dollars for those signs. I'll have more information for everybody at the next meeting, it's just taking a little time for them to get the concept together.

Mr. Greenstein : Let me ask you a question. Can we talk to Anthony or David? Can we just pull out the frame? It's an eye sore. The guard rail that's damaged is laying low on the ground, it's really not that noticeable, but the twisted and mangled metal that is sticking up 6 feet in the air are. Hopefully they took pictures for insurance purposes or whatever they are going to do.

Mr. Scheerer: We can pull those out, we can get those pulled out.

Mr. Greenstein: That would be great.

Mr. Scheerer: I did clean up some of the debris when I came in one morning, I've got the actual sign itself here at the office, so if they need to do something with it, I do have it here. But we did clean up some of that mess and get rid of it except for the post. But I will get rid of those as well.

Mr. Greenstein: Thank you.

## **ii. Approval of Check Register**

Mr. Flint: We have the approval of the check register from May 1<sup>st</sup> through May 31<sup>st</sup>, for \$77,183. Are there any questions on the Check Register?

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

## **iii. Balance Sheet and Income Statement**

Mr. Flint: You have the unaudited financials through April 30<sup>th</sup>. If there are any questions, we can discuss those. No action is required.

## **iv. Status of Direct Bill Assessments**

Mr. Flint: We have the status of the direct bills. I think you've got a June payment that is due, but it's not overdue yet.

## **NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

## **Other Business**

There being none, the next item followed.

**TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Supervisor's Requests**

There being none, the next item followed.

**ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Next Meeting Date**

There being none, the next item followed.

**TWELTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Adjournment**

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein seconded by Mr. Burman, with all in favor, the meeting was adjourned.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary/Assistant Secretary  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman/Vice Chairman