

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 11, 2021 at 11:30 a.m. at Heritage Crossing Community Center, 7715 Heritage Crossing Way, Reunion, FL.

Present and constituting a quorum were:

Mark Greenstein	Chairman
David Burman	Vice Chairman
Michael Mancke	Assistant Secretary by phone
Sharon Harley	Assistant Secretary
Graham Staley	Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

Tricia Adams	District Manager
Jan Carpenter	District Counsel
Alan Scheerer	Field Manager
Victor Vargas	Reunion Security

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

Roll Call

Ms. Adams called the meeting to order at 11:30 a.m. and called the roll. All five board members were present constituting a quorum.

**The recording for this meeting was not started at the start of the meeting and picks up during the public comment period*

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS

Public Comment Period

Ms. Carpenter: The District owns the roads and the sidewalks so the Sheriff should ticket because they are public. We can talk to the sheriff's office and just confirm if they are out there they will ticket if they see somebody.

Ms. Harley: Is that piece of property that comes between the sidewalks, because it's basically the access onto the driveway, is that still considered the sidewalk?

Ms. Carpenter: It's generally CDD property from the greenspace. The owners are responsible to maintain it, but it is generally owned by the CDD, but I will have to look into it.

Mr. Scheerer: The driveway apron itself I believe is granted as part of construction of the home and the maintenance of that driveway from the road to the sidewalk and from the sidewalk to the house is the residents. The CDD has an easement from back to sidewalk to back to sidewalk, you're absolutely right. The landscaping between the sidewalk and the curb is owned by the residents. The CDD, what we do from a safety standpoint if there are any broken panels or issues like that, we correct them. You have probably seen it in the invoicing, and you've seen it around the community. We do that for a maintenance standpoint for safety, but the residents have to actually clean and maintain that sidewalk.

Mr. Staley: Who actually owns that pavement? That piece of land between the sidewalks?

Mr. Burman: It's part of the CDD right-of-way.

Mr. Staley: CDD owns it, so the CDD has the right to police it.

Ms. Adams: The District adopted parking rules that do prohibit parking blocking a sidewalk. However, the issue becomes, is the vehicle parked on private property or is it parked on District property. The District has the same issue that Osceola County Sheriff's Office has when they come, and they see a vehicle that is in their own driveway. Sometimes, a majority of the vehicle is in their own driveway with a small part blocking other property. They are perceiving that it is on private property and it is not a traffic enforcement issue. We have those same grey areas regarding parking enforcement, and we have been working through those issues with security trying to communicate with residents as a first step before any enforcement activities would occur. We do need to get clarification on how much of the vehicle is on private property versus district property or public property in order to enforce the parking rules as well. And again, Osceola's County Sheriff's Office is having that same challenge.

Ms. Carpenter: I suggest that we work with GMS, have them get the facts and we will see what we can do best to address it. Who is the best person, make sure county is aware in terms of what we think they should do, and see what's the best enforcement method or system of enforcement methods.

Ms. Harley: Does security not address this issue as they do any other parking violation?

Ms. Adams: We have not towed any vehicles that are parked on driveways.

Mr. Vargas: We started enforcing this last week and there were two incidents where the people were very disrespectful to my team and they refused to move the vehicle, so we proceeded to contact the Sheriff. They came, they checked the vehicle, and a supervisor from the deputy

came called the office and said that's on private property and they cannot get fined for that, and they we need to make contact with the HOA.

Mr. Staley: Just to clarify, where were they physically parked.

Mr. Greenstein: On this apron.

Mr. Staley: Were they parallel to the road on the apron?

Mr. Vargas: There were two vehicles parked. One was close to the home and this vehicle; the sidewalk was in the middle of the vehicle.

Mr. Greenstein: We have all kinds of situations. The reason you're bringing this up is because we have people who are stretching the envelope trying to avoid compliance with the rules. Now we are trying to determine how can we enforce the rules legally. I've seen cars parked on driveways where they are blocking sidewalks. That's a clear violation of state law. There is a state statute on the books about blocking sidewalks and if a sidewalk is blocked then I think it would be Osceola County Sheriff who would have to issue a citation for that situation. Blocking of a sidewalk is absolutely illegal and we have, to me, a remedy for that. The situation that I am seeing is when the car is parked totally, it's a smaller vehicle, it's not a big SUV that would definitely block the sidewalk. It could be a Volkswagen bug, a compact car, and they have it parallel to the road, parallel to the sidewalk, on the apron. We would have to see what we could do about designating that apron as an extension of the sidewalk, possibly. I mean, it's blocking the sidewalk, you can't walk up onto the sidewalk from the street because a car is there.

Ms. Carpenter: We'll take a look at the plats and see what authority we have.

Ms. Harley: In a majority of cases, do people move when you ask them to?

Mr. Vargas: A majority of the time, yes. But there are sometimes where people are abusing it. It's not the guests, it's more renters and people like that.

Mr. Greenstein: They don't want to be inconvenienced to park across the street. I see people who just do not want to park on the proper of the street. Their side of the street happens to be the side the side that was designated for no parking. They don't want to be inconvenienced. We have to do something about it and we're going to determine what legal steps we can take and we're going to execute it. Because it is in that grey area and I see it just continues to happen. Thanks for bringing it up. It happens eastside, westside, all around the town.

Ms. Adams: Is there anyone else who would like to make a public comment? Hearing no other comments, we will move on to the next item.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS

Approval of the Minutes of the February 11, 2021 Meeting

Ms. Adams: A draft of the February 11, 2021 minutes was provided in the agenda packet. Are there any comments or corrections?

Mr. Greenstein: I thought they were fine in substance, overall.

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein, seconded by Ms. Harley, with all in favor, the Minutes of the February 11, 2021 Meeting, were approved.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Presentation by Jon Kessler FMS Bonds Regarding Proposed Refinancing of Series 2004-1 Bonds and Board Discussion

Ms. Adams: The Chairman of the Board would like to rearrange the agenda a little bit. Under District Manager's Report, one of the items that was on the action items list was a follow-up from last month's meeting where there was an inquiry regarding bond refunding. Provided under separate cover is a handout today that is a presentation from FMS Bonds. The PowerPoint presentation is in front of all Board Members, and we have Jon Kessler from FMS who is on the phone and he's going to walk the Board through this presentation.

Mr. Kessler: My name is Jon Kessler. I am with a company by the name of FMS Bonds, we are a municipal bonds broker/dealer. We're based in South Florida and have been in business for 40 plus years and we specialize in arranging financings for Community Development Districts in Florida and the similar types of Districts in Texas. We are involved with the District dating back to 2012 when the District restructured its bonds. We were asked to look at the Districts ability to refinance its bonds. We put together this summary presentation. In a nutshell, when the bonds were restructured in 2012 the bonds holders required a lockout period of 10 years. That is very standard in the industry, these bonds are not actually callable until May 1, 2022. According to the information that we got from the District which is straight from the tax role, about 40% of the collateral is still backed by a vacancy of lots and while those lots have a lot of value, the rating agency won't rate bonds that are not all built out with homes. If the bonds were not call protected, we could refinance them today around 3.1%, which would be great savings. But because they are not callable and because they are not built out, we have to do taxable non-rated bonds and there is just a very thin market for that. You could probably get some savings, but it wouldn't be meaningful. The bottom line is that we think it's best that the District wait. 90 days before the call date of May 1, 2022 you can actually refinance. Assuming at the end of the year that rates are

favorable, we get the paperwork ready and pull the trigger so that it would close in February. You probably could even go out and market bonds in November and do a very long date to closing on February 1st. That's what I think would be best for the District. We put together a summary table that shows if the rates were the same today when you go to refinance in the future. I don't know if anyone had an opportunity to look at this or if anyone had any questions. I would be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Greenstein: Number one, on very short notice I greatly appreciate you pulling this together. It was really informative. I was pretty sure personally that the 10 year no call provision was going to be the controlling factor in this. To be quite honest, I personally didn't know there was any alternative. Based upon the numbers, it makes the most sense to wait and try to do it under the normal 10 year waiting period and hopefully the numbers will work for us.

Mr. Staley: As I understand it and thank you very much for the presentation since I asked about these, it's great to get so much detail. If we wait 12 months approximately and refinance in May next year, we'll get 14 years of savings. At today's rate it would be very significant savings. That's something we ought to be pursuing.

Mr. Greenstein: Absolutely, I don't know if you can hear Supervisor Staley, but he is basically looking out at the life of the bond issue and the fact that it would be in place for roughly another 14 or 15 years and it would be substantial savings over that period. Unless something radically changes in the market, it's definitely something that we should be doing.

Mr. Kessler: The only other thing I would say is that which we didn't really show what this would look like because we really hadn't had a discussion on what the Board's goals are. Obviously what this just shows you is if you refinance for savings, you could also refinance, lower the rate, keep the assessments the same, and then generate funds for projects. I don't know what the Boards goals are at all, but that is also an option as we get closer.

Mr. Greenstein: What our needs are going to be a year or two from now while we think we would know them, we didn't know about Covid so we're not going to know about other things that may pop up on us.

Mr. Kessler: You can always go hybrid. Because you are just going through the process, you can always set aside \$200,000 can go to a project, and the rest to reduce debt services.

Mr. Greenstein: I appreciate Supervisor Staley bringing the issue up. We are trying to maintain the lowest assessments possible and something like debt service, which is a very controllable thing, we can do that. We've done it before, and we can do it again.

Mr. Staley: It's very timely, and we needed to look at it in great detail. I presume the 10-year call applies to all the other bonds we have as well, so the other opportunity will be coming in 2025. We don't have any other series of bonds to consider. Again, for the East to consider, I don't know if there are any bonds out there, but this would apply to the East as well.

Mr. Greenstein: I can't recall what the interest rate was on the initial issuances, but I am sure it was in the sixes and sevens. There were others that were probably a little higher on the East side back that were issued in 04 and 05. We were just watching the rates go down, but we just could not do anything about it because of the 10-year call provision. We jumped on that one as soon as we could. And we'll do the same with these. Thanks again Jon for your time. Greatly appreciated.

Mr. Kessler: Okay guys, and if anyone has any follow up questions feel free to reach out. Thank you.

Mr. Greenstein: Thanks again.

Mr. Staley: Tricia, do we have any history working with these people?

Ms. Adams: Yes, FMS actually is the ones who have been facilitating the bond issuance for Reunion from many years ago and continue to work with Encore even with our new bond issuance that's pending for Reunion East.

Ms. Carpenter: I think they started about 2014 or so and before that it was another firm that did the original financing.

Ms. Adams: Didn't FMS acquire that firm though?

Ms. Carpenter: No.

Ms. Adams: Okay, I'm sorry.

Ms. Carpenter: Sealy's firm did the original financing then when West started redeveloping FMS came in and they are doing one for Reunion East as well.

Mr. Staley: Perhaps we can make a note once we've completed this year's budget, or should I say 22's budget, then when September comes, we can bring this back.

Ms. Adams: Supervisor Staley, I did add this as an action item with the update for today regarding the no-call provision for 10 years, so if the Board would like I can again update the action item list and have this as an action item for Fall 2021 with a goal to close sometime after February 1, 2022. We will continue to track that.

Mr. Staley: Thank you.

Ms. Adams: Any other discussion on proposed refinancing of the bonds? Hearing none,

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

**Consideration of Resolution 2021-05
Providing for Removal and Appointment
of Treasurer and Appointment of
Assistant Treasurer and Assistant
Secretary**

Ms. Adams: Included in your agenda packet is Resolution 2021-05. We have had a personnel change in our accounting department. This resolution would remove Ariel Lovera and appoint a new treasurer, Jill Burns, who is a GMS employee. If there are any questions I would be happy to answer, otherwise we're looking for a motion to approve Resolution 2021-05.

On MOTION by Mr. Burman, seconded by Mr. Greenstein, with all in favor, Resolution 2021-05 for Removal and Appointment of Treasurer and Appointment of Assistant Treasurer and Assistant Secretary, was approved.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

**Ratification of E-Verify Memorandum of
Understanding**

Ms. Adams: The next item on the agenda is ratification of the E-Verify memorandum of understanding. At previous Board meetings we have had discussion regarding the new Florida State law that the District is required to enroll in the E-Verify system. Included in your agenda packet is the certificate of enrollment and we are just looking for a motion to ratify.

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein, seconded by Ms. Harley, with all in favor, the E-Verify Memorandum of Understanding, was ratified.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Review of Reserve Study

Ms. Adams: The next item in your agenda packet is the reserve study. There was Board action several meetings ago to update the reserve study. Reserve advisors had been previously engaged by Reunion East and Reunion West Districts. They were on site and did an evaluation of the District's assets and provided a capital outlay plan. It was included in your agenda packet and I'd also be happy to provide this under separate cover so you have the spread sheets in excel format. This reserve study is not yet in final format, it is subject to Board member input as well as staff input. So, if there's any questions or comments this would be a good opportunity to do that. Otherwise, the way that this reserve study will be used is in capital budget planning as well as in regular budgeting in terms of the amount of reserve that's recommended and what the current reserve fund balance is and what components need to be scrutinized for potential capital replacement.

Mr. Staley: Alan, just a general question, is this a useful study?

Mr. Scheerer: Yes, it's good knowledge to have. I don't find any reason not to use it. Some of the items, I think Tricia and I talked about, are coming in and replacing all your pool equipment. I don't know if you need to do that. At a maintenance perspective we already budget for three heaters a year because we know those are going to go at some point. Then anything mechanical with the pools we will address on an as needed basis. Then the sidewalks are ongoing, I don't know how far you want me to get into it.

Ms. Adams: Yes, we discussed this and with staff input we would like to rearrange some of what they classified as five year priorities to make it line up more with the historical capital planning as well as the current condition of the equipment that was reviewed.

Mr. Staley: The other question to go from, is there anything obvious that is missing here? Big ticket items?

Mr. Scheerer: I think they got pretty detailed on that. I know the bridges; they mentioned the bridges right off the bat. This Board may know that's done by Osceola County. Those inspections and then any recommendations for repair comes back to the Board for consideration. I think they did the guard houses, the pools, the cabanas, the arbors the sidewalks, the roads. I think at some point we're definitely going to have to evaluate the roads and maybe get an engineer involved with that. Overall, we are in pretty good shape what we do have.

Mr. Staley: You didn't miss any of the other neighborhoods that are within the CDD, once again, I'm still learning about everything we own.

Mr. Scheerer: I think everything that the CDD owns is in it. We don't really own a lot of the West. We've got the Davenport Creek bridge and we have a guard house.

Ms. Adams: There's some barrier walls.

Mr. Scheerer: Yes, walls and fencings in certain locations.

Mr. Staley: Nothing in Reunion West.

Mr. Greenstein: There are no amenities, per say. Not yet. The level of detail to me is remarkable. I would hope a home inspector would go to the length of detail that they went to in some of these things. You wouldn't think about necessarily doing a thorough inspection of a trellis or some other item, but I give them credit. They've got their act together.

Mr. Staley: I should clarify, when I said Reunion West, I didn't really mean West. I meant outside the boundaries.

Mr. Greenstein: That's a good point.

Ms. Carpenter: Tricia, when do you need comments to finalize?

Ms. Adams: If Board members can provide any updates or comments within the next three weeks we can bring back a revised reserve study for next month's meeting for adoption by the Board. And by adopting it you're accepting the study and it doesn't tie the Boards hands to the recommendations.

Ms. Carpenter: It's also good tool for insurance. You can make sure your insurance policy knows everything we have.

Mr. Burman: Is this required for CDDs?

Ms. Adams: No.

Mr. Greenstein: We can basically look at it and raise questions and make a comment, but I would think from an engineering standpoint and from a property management standpoint those two are going to have the most to say about this document and its accuracy.

Ms. Adams: The document is in very good condition. It's very comprehensive and it provides an accurate inventory of District assets. The only changes that staff has discussed and recommended were some minor changes to capital planning for the first couple of years regarding some of the specific components. And again, that's just to tie in with the history of how Reunion has handled the capital budget in the past. I appreciate your comments in the next three weeks and we'll get those incorporated and present a final reserve study at the April meeting.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Discussion Items

A. Feasibility to Sell District Roads to Private Entity

Ms. Adams: We have a discussion item on the agenda regarding the feasibility to sell District roads to private entity. As Board members are aware, this has been discussed at several meetings. There has been information provided by legal counsel and District management staff regarding some of the steps that would need to be taken to identify the purchase cost of the roads and the feasibility of selling the roads to a private entity. At last month's meeting the Board had gotten to a point where they really wanted to determine if they have a willing purchaser. David Burman thankfully volunteered because of access to the Master Association to get feedback from the Master Association regarding their earnestness in purchasing the District Roads. The Master Association did take action on this item and I'll let David go ahead and discuss that.

Mr. Burman: I don't have the final details, the Master Association on their own I don't think is interested in doing it on their own, but Kingwood seems to be interested. They want to understand how all this works. I don't think I really have an answer for you today. We were

supposed to have a meeting yesterday and it got canceled and I don't really have any good feedback for you today.

Ms. Adams: I will report that there are some employees from Kingwood, Anthony Carll and another, who have scheduled some meeting time with District management staff to get a better understanding on how the cost will be determined and what is entailed in that. Do we have any remarks from District counsel regarding the current status?

Ms. Carpenter: GMS is going to meet with Kingwood first just to go through some of the big picture items because we really need to make sure they understand the big picture before we get into the weeds of the tax analysis and how to do it because, as you all know with bond issues and pay downs it is going to be a lot of work. I believe George is trying to set up a meeting or GMS will set the meeting.

Ms. Adams. Yes, it has been set and George will be in attendance. It will be a phone meeting and it's scheduled for next week.

Mr. Greenstein: With that in mind, at our last meeting because of either a conflict of schedule between this meeting and when the Master was going to get together or in this case it's lack of finality to make a decision, is it proper to indicate that we should possibly continue this month's meeting?

Ms. Adams: Yes, if this Board would like to receive information and have discussion regarding any input that Kingwood representatives provide we can continue today's meeting. To be frank, I am not expecting anything actionable. However, if this Board wants to quickly tee up the process of a pro and con sheet or a white paper regarding the project or a community wide workshop that could be held virtually. If you want those things to happen quickly, we certainly can continue this meeting. This is an agenda item; we can continue the meeting rather than adjourning today. Alternatively, your next meeting is scheduled the second Thursday in April which I believe is April 8th.

Mr. Greenstein: We don't need a continuance. We'll never be able to get anything done during that time anyways, so we're fine.

Mr. Staley: That's good news. At least this conversation is continuing.

Mr. Burman: Jan, how would the refinance of these bonds effect that process? They are somehow related, right? What would they do?

Ms. Carpenter: It would depend on the timing. That could be perhaps something to put them together but because of all the bond issues, every area that's been assessed for certain bonds

is going to have to be looked at and treated differently because you'll have to pay off by house because each lot has a separate assessment. Then you'll somehow come up with an equalizing amount for HOA and then deal with the prepayments or people who paid. It would add a wrinkle but I think the bigger picture is Kingwood or the Master willing to go through that time and energy and can we come up with something that would be on our side yes we can see them but how to pay for and how the Master would come up with an equal payment based on assessments to be paid is really going to be tricky.

Mr. Burman: Thanks.

B. Presentation of Parcel Development Feedback Report

Ms. Adams: Another discussion item on the agenda is the presentation of the Parcel Development Feedback Report. At last month's meeting I did provide a verbal report that highlighted some of the results from the feedback survey that was administered earlier in the year regarding two parcels at Reunion West CDD that had been identified as having potential to be constructed into amenities. The feedback report was included in the agenda packet. I'd be happy to answer any questions or alternatively if the Board would like me to walk through the report I'm happy to do that.

Mr. Greenstein: I appreciate the way you pulled it together. There were direct responses to the survey but then there was also subsequent feedback.

Ms. Adams: Yes, we did receive feedback under separate cover representing large numbers of homeowners and that was included in the results so that Board members could consider them from different perspectives.

Mr. Greenstein: I'll ask the Board now, do you have enough information now to have a discussion of what we think we would want? Or do you need to digest it and think on it some more and we can take action on it at the April meeting? As Chairman I feel it's my responsibility to take the lead or give significant credence to the input from the members of the Board who live on the West side. There isn't one solution, there are a few preferred solutions. I'd like to hear from Supervisor Staley and Supervisor Harley as to what they prefer to see done with the parcels.

Ms. Adams: The form of this survey was included in your agenda packet as an attachment to the report. There was thought that it may be more helpful to qualify the least interested and not interested responses into one category.

Mr. Staley: Parcel 1 results if you exclude Wyndham, show that residents want a picnic area or barbeque facilities. I don't think that's a good option, I think it would be unsightly, I think

it would be difficult to maintain and I can't see people walking all the way from the east side to the west to use that. The results suggest that we should be building some sort of fitness area and perhaps a small covered area with a bench and table to allow people to sit and watch people working out or to rest. We do have a lot of people that run those roads and I think it would be an excellent use of that space. It will be a destination for people. On Parcel 2, I think the most favored thing is a playground area. We would have to figure out parking for that.

Mr. Greenstein: Have you given thought to on Parcel 2 at the mail kiosk area, we talked about a playground in that area and there would be additional parking around the perimeter.

Mr. Staley: I thought about that, but I think how are we going to police that? People would be parking there 24/7.

Mr. Greenstein: Tricia, should we do one parcel at a time?

Ms. Adams: The way Supervisor Staley teed up the discussion, he had a suggestion for Parcel 1 and 2. We can further discuss an outdoor fitness station at Parcel 1 combined with benches, potential shading, additional parking for access to the amenities. For Parcel 2 you have the playground designation and how parking will be allocated in those areas.

Mr. Greenstein: Where do you come out on this Sharon?

Ms. Harley: Not the same. I agree that parking is a separate issue but it is a huge issue within the Resort and it's just being compounded by the new parking regulations that we've put into effect, particularly where Parcel 2 is located. That's still a very underdeveloped area and there are still a lot of lots that are going to be built up there. I don't think it's an ideal situation for a playground. I actually think what we should do is as we have done the mailbox parking, go around the rest of it and put additional guest parking. The parking there is ridiculous and it's only going to get worse as we build out more lots. I agree we need to have amenities. So, if we did parking around the sides we could still have an attractive green space in the middle. I don't think it's a great location for a children's play area because you're going to have a lot of traffic around there eventually when we get finished building those lots. I think Parcel 1 is big enough to incorporate amenities and parking. We could have a workout area and a small children's area. I'm not for the barbeque area because I think it will bring trash and I don't think people will clean up after themselves. I think that would bring on so many problems.

Mr. Greenstein: I think the barbeque idea is off the table, it makes no sense. It's not what we are looking for.

Ms. Adams: So, there is a consensus to remove that option.

Ms. Harley: I do think Parcel 1 is big enough to incorporate both things which would be great for the west side.

Mr. Greenstein: Can we agree on a recreational or exercise related amenity to combine with a children's playground amenity and also parking so that you can use that amenity? That parking lot would be related to the amenity, it would not be a general parking lot type thing. It's not overflow parking, it's parking for the amenity.

Mr. Staley: Sharon points out the parking options but the reason I totally disagree with that is because that will be a parking facility for 10 houses, maybe 15. It's not good use of the land that benefits the whole of the west side. I disagree with using that space to satisfy the needs of a few homes. I think we're here to look for the best use of land for the majority of the interested parties in the CDD.

Mr. Greenstein: The two areas are close enough together that I don't recommend putting in playgrounds at both locations. I think we are moving towards the idea of an exercise related outdoor activity facility for Parcel 1 and there could be a covered area. The issue of parking is a secondary issue. There has to be sufficient parking for people who want to use the amenity. I want to let Supervisor Goldstein from the East CDD make a comment.

Mr. Goldstein (East CDD): In your survey, did anybody ask for a dog park? How high was that on the results?

Ms. Adams: It was quite low.

Mr. Goldstein (East CDD): The reason I bring it up is at our dog park a lot of the West people come over and complain that they don't have a dog park on the west side. They love the playground on the east side too. I was just curious where dog park was in the results. From what I've seen on our side, the playground gets more use than the dog park. The playground is getting tons of use now. It's a great amenity for the money.

Mr. Greenstein: So, can we agree that the additional parking which goes beyond the actual use of the land is a secondary issue that we will continue to discuss? As far as what we put on that really attractive Parcel 2, that circular grassy area, that a playground is a feasible item. Is that the location for the playground? Or is Parcel 1 where the playground should be?

Mr. Staley: I'm very sensitive to Sharon's concern about parking. If I thought that developing both of these lots as additional parking would do anything other than scratch the surface of the parking problem on the west side, I would go along. But it will not even scratch the surface.

Mr. Greenstein: I think parking is a secondary issue, we are talking about what we are putting on the land for Parcel 1 and 2. I think a playground appropriately fenced would be very attractive on Parcel 2. Then an exercise related amenity would be on Parcel 1, there could also be picnic table or a covered area.

Ms. Adams: If the Board wants to take any action we would need to take public comment. Alternatively, the Board can direct staff to bring back feasibility for certain amenities for Parcel 1 and Parcel 2 for consideration and action at next month's meeting.

Mr. Greenstein: That's exactly where we are. We've gotten specific enough that they have direction to scope things out.

Mr. Staley: So we can come up with a design for those two lots?

Ms. Adams: We may not be able to have a design quickly. Because this was not teed up as an actionable item but rather a discussion item, if there is consensus to direct staff to bring back feasibility of developing Parcel 1 into outdoor fitness stations and for Parcel 2 a playground area then we can come back with some rough considerations. We will obtain a list of criteria for the Board to consider and some rough estimates and feasibility for an action item at your April meeting.

Mr. Greenstein: Consider GMS so directed.

Ms. Adams: Understood, thank you.

Mr. Greenstein: Thank you all for the good discussion.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Staff Reports

A. Attorney

Ms. Carpenter: We have nothing major going on. The Interlocal Agreement has been in discussions.

B. Engineer

Ms. Adams: No Engineer's report today.

C. District Manager's Report

i. Action Items List

Ms. Adams: I have included the action item list in your agenda packet that was transmitted to Board members electronically. This is the action item list for Reunion East and Reunion West CDDs. I would be happy to discuss this if there are any questions. For Reunion West the first item was the reserve study update. We will update those to reflect Supervisor's input from today

and we will bring back a final reserve study for acceptance at next month's meeting. We have the Board direction regarding the best use of Parcel 1 and 2 for amenity development. Lighting monuments, are we still on track to complete that by the end of March?

Mr. Scheerer: The inspection by the county was completed yesterday, I am just waiting for Duke to set the meters.

Mr. Greenstein: That's great.

Ms. Adams: The Encore transition at Reunion West, we still have a few items that we are resolving. The data line transfer was complex and required some additional steps that are still underway. Alan has been working with vendors on sidewalk maintenance. We also have some irrigation meter issues that we are working through. Parking rules for Encore at Reunion West, at last month's meeting there was discussion regarding this item. The Board set at rule hearing for the April meeting. Today we did hope to have a map that would have been vetted by the property owners association. At last month's meeting they requested input, but we still do not have that map. I have been in contact with the POA manager as well as the president and we expect to have that before next month's meeting. They are being very differential to their stakeholders within the community regarding the development of the no parking zones. I would like to get some initial feedback from supervisors in order to facilitate next month's rule hearing in terms of if they have requests that substantially deviate from the current no parking rules. Is the Board comfortable with giving initial feedback since we are not able to review a map today?

Mr. Greenstein: I was hoping they would follow our lead. I don't think any group wants to see a situation where the exceptions exceed the rule.

Ms. Adams: I see a lot of heads nodding in consensus, so to the best extent possible unless there is a unique situation we would like to try to keep it compatible with the other streets in Reunion.

Mr. Greenstein: We had a handful of exceptions and that's fine. We want a uniform implementation of the parking rules.

Ms. Adams: With the rule hearing, we have an opportunity to amend the Reunion West parking maps. There are two areas we have been notified about that might need consideration for additional no parking zones. I was contacted by a couple of residents over the past few weeks or months who lived by White Marsh Way, and apparently there may need to be additional no parking rules near the intersection for Tradition. Security has been actively monitoring that and seeing what times of day there are issues. There is also an area on Loxahatchee Court that may

need relief from parking restrictions on one side of the cul de sac. Last month there discussion regarding the residential traffic backup at Sinclair gate. We had additional security officers staffed at Sinclair gate on at least Wednesday, Thursdays, and Friday from 3:45 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. The security officers were asked to track the traffic that was being processed at the gate. Victor prepared the spreadsheet you have before you that identifies how many of the visitors that were there were cutting through the community and how many were actually guests who had a destination within the community. This does not take into consideration any residents who used the gate during that time. As you get down to the bottom of the page you will see that there were two days, the 4th and 5th of March, where there were accidents nearby on either I4 or 429. When there are accidents the GPS devices reroute to alternative ways around the accident. We have not received any qualitative feedback from residents who access the gates during this time to see if it was a better experience for residents. We do not have any quantitative data to see how many were processed during these times compared to other time periods. This is provided for informational purposes and to determine if the Board wants to take any additional steps at Sinclair now like increased funding for security.

Mr. Greenstein: We are trying to achieve unimpeded access for residents and guests who have a pass and an official reason to be at Reunion, not the folks who are being rerouted because of traffic. Honestly, I'm looking for a plan from security.

Ms. Harley: What do you think is the best solution, Victor?

Mr. Vargas: I think we need to have somebody present at all times.

Mr. Greenstein: So we need additional staffing to control traffic. On a temporary emergency basis, can we try to split the traffic up in an area right before the turn?

Ms. Adams: Is this District property or county roads?

Mr. Greenstein: County property. And I know we have done it, there was an instance where Anthony Carll said enough is enough and we have to get this under control. He went out there and there came the sheriff.

Ms. Carpenter: Why don't we have Steve Boyd the engineer look into the transportation and see if we can get an MOT or something.

Mr. Greenstein: Exactly. Good idea.

Ms. Adams: I do want to be clear for the record, we are not turning away public access. We are not denying public access, these are public roads and if we have a staffed gate public

access is available. I will add Sinclair gate on the action item list so it is continuously tracked and we will be facilitating a potential maintenance and traffic plan with Steve Boyd.

ii. Approval of Check Register

Ms. Adams: For Board action, this is the approval of the check register. Included in your agenda packet is a check register. The detail for your check register is included in your agenda packet. I am ready for any questions or discussion, otherwise we'd be looking for a motion to approve.

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

iii. Balance Sheet and Income Statement

Ms. Adams: The next item is in your agenda packet for information purposes. It is the balance sheet and income statement.. It includes your combined balance sheet as well as your statement of spending and revenues. If there are any questions, I'd be happy to take those.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Other Business

Ms. Adams: Is there any business? Hearing none,

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Supervisor's Requests

There being no Supervisor's requests, the next item followed.

ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Next Meeting Date

Ms. Adams: Your next meeting is scheduled for April 8th at 11:30 a.m.

TWELTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Adjournment

There being no further business, Ms. Adams called for a motion to adjourn.

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



Secretary/Assistant Secretary



Chairman/Vice Chairman