

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, April 8, 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
Sharon Harley	Assistant Secretary
Graham Staley	Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

Tricia Adams	District Manager
Jan Carpenter	District Counsel
Kristen Trucco	District Counsel
Victor Vargas	Reunion Security
Zory Ramos	Reunion Security
Alan Scheerer	Field Manager
Mike Smith	Yellowstone
Nicole Ailes	Yellowstone
Rob Stultz	Yellowstone

**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.

Ms. Adams: In advance to the public comment period, which is the next item on the agenda, we do have a statement from the Chairman of the Board.

Mr. Greenstein: There are two items on the agenda for the West meeting that are also applicable to the East meeting. One has to do with golfcarts and the other has to do with parking and towing enforcement. What we are going to do, since the issues are common to both the East and West side, we are going to defer discussion on those two items within this West meeting until the end of the meeting which will get us closer to the beginning time of the East meeting. If it turns out that we have a little bit of a break and we have to have a recess, we will then continue

the West meeting at 1:00 p.m. Last week we didn't have a problem going beyond 1:00, but we just want to let you know what we are going to do. This way when we get to the public comment period, which Trish is going to announce after I finish speaking, if you have comments concerning those two items, I would suggest that we defer that public comment until after we discuss those items to make you more informed as to what the current status of those items are. Then you can formulate a better comment.

Ms. Adams: Thank you Mr. Chairman.

## **SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS**

### **Public Comment Period**

Ms. Adams: We are up to the public comment period for the agenda. This is an opportunity for any member of the public to make a statement to the Board of Supervisors regarding anything that is on the agenda. As the Chairman just requested, if it is regarding parking enforcement and towing or if it is regarding golfcarts on district roads, please hold off on those comments until the appropriate public comment period when both boards will be convened. At this time, are there any members of the public? If you could please state your name and your address for the record. Also, please limit your comments to three minutes.

Mr. Witcher: My name is Bill Witcher and I live at 1268 Grand Traverse Parkway. Gina and I are dog walkers, and we are walking up and down Grand Traverse quite a bit in the preserve community. It would be nice, and I don't know if this is the group that I ask, is to get a speed limit sign put up in that particular area with the digital speed board attached to it. There is one on Grand Traverse prior to getting into the Heritage Preserve, but once you get past that sign and into the Heritage Preserve area there is that long stretch by lot 1. That is a great speed street for folks because there are not a lot of houses in that area and folks come through there at some excessive speeds. It would be great if we could get a speed sign in there.

Ms. Adams: Thank you Mr. Witcher. Are there any other members of the public that would like to make a comment to the Board of Supervisors? Hearing none, we will move on to the next item.

## **THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS**

### **Approval of the Minutes of the March 11, 2021 Meeting**

Ms. Adams: Included in your agenda packet, behind the minutes tab is a draft of the March minutes. Are there any comments or corrections?

Mr. Staley: It would not be normal if I didn't have at least one. On page 13, we were talking about the auctions for parcels along Grand Traverse. I made the comment about using those lands for parking would only be useful for 10 to 15 houses, but it is recorded as hours, which is obviously very confusing. If you just replace hours with houses.

Ms. Adams: We will make that change.

Mr. Staley: And I also think when I was talking about parcel 1, I said that the survey showed support for the fitness area. I am fairly confident I said, "if you exclude the Wyndham votes, then there is clear support for the..."

Ms. Adams: Can you help me focus on that section, what page are you on?

Mr. Staley: Yes, it's on page 11. "Parcel 1 results show that residents want a picnic area or barbeque facilities." Somewhere in there I talked about if you exclude Wyndham then there is clear support for the fitness because Wyndham has 247 votes, I think. Which we all agreed, a barbeque made no sense.

Ms. Adams: We will review the recording for that section and make sure that's picked up. One comment before anyone makes motion to approve, on page one of the minutes, for some reason the meeting time was printed as 11 and it was actually 11:30 and the meeting was actually called to order at 11:30, so those two changes will be made to the minutes. Any other comments or discussion?

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein, seconded by Mr. Burman, with all in favor, the Minutes of the March 11, 2021 Meeting, were approved as amended.

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

#### **Public Hearing**

##### **A. Public Comment**

Ms. Adams: Mr. Charmin, we are at the rule hearing for the parking and towing rules. Do we have a motion to open the rule hearing?

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein, seconded by Mr. Burman, with all in favor, the Public Hearing was opened.

Ms. Adams: We have the rule hearing open for the consideration of parking and towing rules. This is an item that was brought to the Board's attention a couple of months ago. As Board Members recall, we recently had some sections of development that were transmitted to the District that was the Encore at Reunion West Community Development District section. They

had not gone through the District procedures for the parking rule hearing and that is why we are here today. It was a request from the HOA Board for Reunion West Community Development District. Board Members, would you like to take public comments on this item, and then go into discussion?

Ms. Carpenter: Did you raise the issue of potentially not one side versus the other?

Ms. Adams: I am going to do that.

Ms. Carpenter: Do you want to do that before comments?

Ms. Adams: I can do that.

Ms. Carpenter: I think that makes sense to raise that. At least as an issue.

Ms. Adams: Let me present a couple of things to the Board and then we'll go back and take public comments. Included in your agenda packet is a copy of the proposed rules that is consistent with the other areas of Reunion East and Reunion West Community Development District. The approach that the Boards have taken is to restrict parking to one side of the street and to make the available parking consistent with the flow of traffic unless there were extenuating circumstances such as fire hydrants or other conditions that merited pushing that to the other side of the road. What you have presented in your agenda packet is consistent with the District's parking rules at other locations. However, upon conferring with the Homeowner's Association Board of Directors, I met with the president and the other officers on the Board, ultimately their request is to restrict all street parking at Encore Reunion West. Rather than having parking available on one side of the street, they would like to have no parking on the streets in the Encore neighborhood. Their reasons for that: one reason is that the community was designed with additional parking lots. At least three parking lots come to mind which were designed to capture overflow and guest parking. Another reason that they cited was that although it was an error to have parking discussed in their conditions, covenants, and restrictions HOA governing documents, it was part of the governing documents and when owners bought into that neighborhood, they believed that they were buying into a neighborhood that completely restricted on street parking. The third reason the Board cited is that they had surveyed the residents in the neighborhood and the results of the survey showed that a majority of the residents were in favor of restricting all street parking. Ultimately, it is the request of the Reunion West HOA in that Encore neighborhood for this Board to consider eliminating all street parking. We are still conferring with legal counsel regarding the signage. Right now, the signage plan for the other sections of Reunion is that at the community entrances there is a sign established that identifies



the community as a “tow away zone.” As you enter the property, areas where parking is restricted are marked with a “no parking” sign. With this proposal, it would shift the signage requirements to posting both the “tow away” notification and “no street parking” notification at all community entrances. You would not necessarily have the look and the expense of having signage installed at 50 foot or less intervals along the community. Those are a couple of considerations. In addition to the Encore neighborhood, we are also looking at amending the parking map for Whitemarsh Way and for Loxahatchee Court. The recommendation from security and with staff input is to reduce the parking restrictions on Loxahatchee court and you do have a map included in your agenda packet. The end of the road there does not function like a cul-de-sac. There is a private HOA road that cuts all the way through and there has been some lack of available parking for residents in that vicinity, and so relieving the side of the cul-de-sac and allowing for parking is what staff is recommending. The street just north of that, Whitemarsh Way, staff is recommending that nearby the intersection that there is an additional no parking zone established to push parking further back from that intersection and allow a better line of sight for people who are entering the busier road. We can either go into Board discussion and then take public comments or we can pause and take public comments on this issue now that the more salient points have been laid out. Does legal counsel have any comments?

Ms. Carpenter: No, let’s take public comment and then we can discuss procedure and what we do if we want to go forward with the no parking versus one side of the street parking.

Ms. Adams: At this time, we are going to take any public comments. If there is anyone here who would like to speak to the parking zones at the Encore section of Reunion West, Loxahatchee court, or Whitemarsh way, this is an opportunity to make a comment. Seeing none we will turn this over for Board discussion. I will mention that under section 4, tab B is where you see the resolution and the parking maps. I know that sometimes when there are reproduced, they are a little bit difficult to see. If you have any questions or I can be helpful to point out any recommended changes I would be happy to do so.

Mr. Greenstein: Well, I am familiar with the Loxahatchee Court situation, which is a little different because it is almost like a spur road off Golden Bear Drive. It is a different situation.

Mr. Staley: Could you explain why it is different? I don’t quite understand.

Ms. Adams: With the parking rules for the majority of Reunion East and Reunion West in all cases where there is a cul-de-sac parking it is restricted. The reason is that a cul-de-sac is designed for emergency vehicle turn around or for large utility vehicle turn around such as

garbage trucks or other utility trucks. However, when you look at the google map you'll see that this does not function like a cul-de-sac because there is a private HOA road for alley parking. All of the emergency and utility vehicles actually utilize that road to exit Loxahatchee court.

Mr. Staley: The fire truck can get down that road? It's quiet narrow.

Ms. Adams: The residents on the north side of this cul-de-sac, if this map is facing north, have really bumped up into conditions that make it untenable to find parking in that vicinity.

Mr. Greenstein: Graham, you hit on the key issue which is security. Alan Scheerer, our property manager, who is celebrating 36 years of marriage today. He is a great guy, and we are very lucky to have him. As far as the situation on Loxahatchee, you're familiar with it?

Mr. Scheerer: Yes.

Mr. Greenstein: You support the change?

Mr. Scheerer: Yes.

Mr. Greenstein: Okay, that's good. On Whitemarsh, it's that intersection which has been a problem from day one. Where you have a lot of traffic coming into Legends Corner off of Tradition boulevard and you have people leaving Whitemarsh and you have townhouses and houses on the left. There is a vacant lot or some golf property on the right, but that is an area where you always have one car having to yield to the other and the chances of an accident are pretty high. I would agree that we have additional no parking designation in that particular area. How many spots would we be taking out?

Ms. Adams: It's a little bit difficult to see on this, but what staff is proposing is that it goes down two lots which could presumably be up to four parking places, I would say. Depending on the size of the vehicle. It is very close to that Tradition intersection and it is an area that security has noted that there has been some concern about the line of site. We've received several calls from residents over the course of the past few months since parking rules have been implemented citing concerns about that vicinity.

Mr. Staley: I did send you both a note a week ago. I thought the CDD owned land next to the monument across from those homes.

Mr. Scheerer: Coming in Whitemarsh on the left-hand side there is some vacant property there that is CDD, but it is a gas line. There is gas that runs through that middle easement and you can see the markings that are there. We can look at it, but I don't know if the gas company would give us any right-of-way to create some sort of additional parallel parking on that side. Because that gas line easement runs all the way down.

Mr. Staley: Because presumably, those residents will have to park on the access road at the back of the home. Those five or six cars that you're talking about.

Mr. Scheerer: That's where their garages are.

Mr. Staley: I know. They've been parking there for 15 years.

Mr. Scheerer: There's also some vacant lots currently down there too. It's only a couple of spots. I think Mr. Goldstein raised that before too and I think this may be a little frustrating for the first two houses, but it would definitely eliminate that challenge of, "I'm turning on Whitemarsh and somebody's coming off of Whitemarsh and there's no place to go until the traffic comes through."

Mr. Staley: I agree, this is a major problem. I was trying to find a possible solution with that spare land but if it's a gas line.

Mr. Scheerer: It's a gas line easement all the way through there, yes sir.

Mr. Carpenter: And I'll add, the gas companies are not at all happy to give any construction over them. We've tried a couple of places and it's somewhat of a nightmare. It's a long process if they will even agree to access to do anything on it. They can probably park on the grass but building anything would be just about impossible or very expensive.

Mr. Greenstein: Does anybody else on the Board have any issue on what we have discussed so far concerning Loxahatchee and Whitemarsh? I'm going to let Supervisor Goldstein make a comment.

Mr. Goldstein: How many spots are we talking about moving it down from the corner?

Ms. Adams: Four.

Mr. Scheerer: Basically two lots. Between the second and the third home we'll put the "no parking" with the arrow towards Tradition.

Mr. Greenstein: It is definitely safety driven. It's not a question on convenience of parking or anything else. There has to be room for, especially at night it gets hazardous, a car making that left turn or even a right turn. A left turn is more dangerous because the person leaving wants to go left as well when they are crossing each other. There has to be room for the two to coexist and right now there isn't, so that's a good change.

Mr. Staley: Could I ask as a courtesy we send a letter to those four homeowners.

Ms. Adams: I plan to knock on doors or make contact.

Mr. Greenstein: That would be great. We basically have agreement on the treatment for Reunion West within the gate.

Ms. Carpenter: I would suggest that you want to have a motion to approve that under the hearing and then go on to the other parcels.

Mr. Greenstein: That was going to be my next question.

Ms. Carpenter: Okay, perfect.

Mr. Greenstein: I'll make a motion to approve parking changes for Whitemarsh Way and Loxahatchee Court.

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein, seconded by Ms. Harley, with all in favor, the Whitemarsh Way and Loxahatchee Court Amended Parking Maps, were approved.

**B. Consideration of Resolution 2021-06 Adopting Amendments to Chapter V of the Rules of Procedure – Parking and Towing Rules**

Mr. Greenstein: It's interesting, today at least, that Encore Reunion West, I guess with the uniformity of the house builds and the limited capacity of each house they were able to stick. I have to assume it is a county requirement for off street parking. It's not just an HOA covenant. As far as having to have four off street spaces for let's say up to a five bedroom home. That same formula that was first adopted by the HOA was subsequently codified in Osceola county. I guess my question is, does each home meet the county code as far as having adequate off street parking so that it is practical to implement no street parking? Is there anyone here from Reunion West Encore?

Ms. Adams: I will mention that my conference with the HOA directors was held via Zoom because some were out of the country and all of them were out of the vicinity at the time that we held the meeting.

Ms. Carpenter: Since they had it in the CC&Rs it's probably correct, but we should probably have our District engineer confirm with them.

Ms. Harley: In the original documents, I think what you will find it states is that there should be no street parking longer than 24 hours. In the survey that they took where they said the majority of owners, I think what you'll find if you actually ask them for the details is that there are 700 plus homes there and there were 40 contributing to the survey.

Ms. Adams: The response was a very small sample. You're correct, Sharron. I think you have good firsthand knowledge of the parking situation in that vicinity, and I think everyone would want to hear your input regarding general thoughts on one side only street parking versus no street parking. What you could see as potential issues.

Ms. Harley: Honestly, there are three sections of overflow parking. It's not a huge amount of parking. I think to actually make no road parking, which is wanted by the Board, with great due respect there are Board members who have nothing to do with the rentals and the homes. They just live in their homes full time. Whoever has to enforce it, it's just going to be a nightmare for them. I think you should at least give an option of one side; it's going to make it far more workable.

Ms. Adams: The Board members for the HOA were very deferential to the CDD Supervisors. They understood that ultimately, it's a District policy and that this Board would be making the policy decision. They also acknowledged that adopting parking restrictions for one side of the street only would get them much further than where they are now in terms of having organized parking and the type of community, they felt they could safely navigate the roads.

Mr. Staley: I would be very cautious about going to no parking itself. It sounds like a huge step.

Ms. Greenstein: Definitely, and the reason why I brought up the county ordinance is because it does go beyond us. Kind of like higher regulation authority. I'm pretty sure I am right on this, the fact that for the East side the covenants for the Master had no off street parking. Because at one point we had some early issues. I then saw that it was in county code, so we would point out it's not just the Master that is enforcing this it could be ultimately the county. When you do a permit, they should be looking to see how much parking is going to be available for that particular size house. Because we had that issue come up from time to time. This definitely is a major turn, and I find it really interesting that if you look at the original documents and the guidelines that we used when Reunion was first established, all the houses were going to be the same. They were all going to be 4 or 5 bedrooms with four parking spaces and there for there would not be any on street parking. That's why the roads are narrow. Of course, the world happened, natural things happen, bigger houses were built and the off street parking rule really does play an important role for us and for the rental community. It definitely is challenging to limit marking to one lot on each side of Old Lake Wilson Road.

Mr. Burman: In the case of Reunion proper, we were able to pose some control over that because of new construction. Reunion West is done; every house is finished. What the county did or didn't do is moot because the house is there. Parking is there.

Ms. Harley: The largest overflow parking there, if I am correct, actually belongs to Encore and not to the CDD.

Mr. Burman: No on street parking means you have to have those ghost patrol trucks circulating the community 24/7. They would be yanking cars morning noon and night. I don't think it's workable.

Mr. Greenstein: It's clear we cannot go with a policy of no on street parking. That's untenable, I believe. From the head nodding and comments I think we are all in agreement on that. It's just a question, do we take action today relative to the one side of the street parking or do we defer this? Or is it going to end up with the same result anyway?

Ms. Adams: The Board does have the option, if the Board wanted further time to consider this matter or for staff to gather any other information, you do have the option to continue the rule hearing until your next meeting. However, if the Board is ready to approve the map as presented which contemplates one side of street parking, there are still several steps that the Board would need to approve before this would be fully implemented. For example, we would need to bring back the proposal for the installation of the "no parking" signs for Board approval. We would also need to bring back agreements for parking and towing enforcement with the HOA and utilizing their security services. And then finally we would need to amend the current towing agreement with Reunion West between Reunion West and Bolton's Towing to include the map that had been revised. There are several items that the Board would see in order for this to be fully implemented. It is not a quick process.

Mr. Greenstein: As far as the designation to the one side of the street where parking would be prohibited, we had feedback from the HOA. We have a map that we believe if we go with one side of the street it represents the side of the street that they want.

Ms. Adams: Yes, I can generally describe the meeting as the HOA directors not having a lot of attention to the detail on the particular side of the street but spending more time robustly supporting the concept of no street parking. However, again, they were very deferential to this Board and understood that if the Board chooses to adopt parking restriction on one side that that gets them closer to where they would like to be.

Mr. Greenstein: Okay.

Mr. Staley: I drove around here yesterday for half an hour and it's very difficult to see the logic in what they have done compared to here. Where no parking is normally on the left-hand side. Here I think they are trying to follow some sort of system because of the circular nature of the layout it's hard to do that.



Ms. Adams: Supervisor Staley, I need to let you know that it was actually Alan and I that developed the map and then provided that to the HOA directors, and the reason that there was not always the ability to restrict parking consistent with the flow of traffic was because of the number of fire hydrants that were on one side of the street. Those fire hydrants eliminated 6 or 8 parking spaces in a stretch, it made sense to restrict parking on the fire hydrant side of the road. That's where you'll see more anomalies. It's just a different interval of fire hydrants and the structure of the roads, like you said.

Mr. Staley: A lot of it seemed okay. I think we have to find some way of communicating that this is going to happen to those over 660 people who didn't respond to the survey. Otherwise, they will wake up one morning to find "no parking" signs.

Ms. Adams: That's a good point. What the Board had directed for other parking restriction implementation was to communicate via the Master Association email blast and the Encore section does have an email blast addressed. Initially the communication was to notify residents that parking restrictions had been adopted by the Board and that very soon they would see "no parking" signs installed where parking would be restricted. Once those signs went in, residents were notified that there would be active enforcement and warnings would be issued. And then ultimately there was a notification that cars found in those zones were subject to towing.

Mr. Staley: So, they have had communication. That's good.

Ms. Adams: We have not yet issued that communication until there is Board action, but we can tee that up at the correct time if the Board decides to take action on this item.

Mr. Greenstein: As occurred on the Eastside, there were some exceptions. There were modifications. First of all, prior to actually finalizing the location of the street signs for purposes of having the contracts replace the signs and getting the locates and all that stuff done, there were some adjustments done base upon some information that came to our attention on individual situations. And then we had a situation on Watson Court where a homeowner stuck to it and showed us that there was no material difference, and it was slightly more beneficial to have the rule change so that the parking was on the other side of the street not on the one as you drive in. He seemed to have the consensus or enough people on the street that were going to go along with it, or who didn't care one way or the other, and we went ahead and made an exception for that person or for that street. The same thing can occur here. I think we can go ahead with the motion to adopt one side of the street parking restriction and towing for Encore at Reunion West.



On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein, seconded by Ms. Harley, with all in favor, Resolution 2021-06 Adopting Amendments to Chapter V of the Rules of Procedure – Parking and Towing Rules, was approved.

Ms. Adams: As staff mentioned, there will be several steps in this in addition to communication with residents in that area and the HOA directors in that area will also be working with our signage vendor to get the cost for “no parking” signs that would be compatible with the map that is presented in the agenda packet. Do we have a motion to close the rule hearing for parking and towing rules?

On MOTION by Mr. Staley, seconded by Mr. Greenstein, with all in favor, the Public Hearing was closed.

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

#### **Consideration of Proposals from Duke Energy to Upgrade Street Lights**

Ms. Adams: Under section five in your agenda packet we have lighting proposals. I did intend to bring this to the Board’s attention during last month’s meeting. However, I think by the time we got to District manager’s report we were tight on schedule. The Districts have been contacted by Duke Energy for the purpose of transitioning either the metal halide or the HPS, I think it’s high-pressure sodium, streetlights to LED. The reason for that is they are no longer to fully support the older style light fixtures. They are proposing to change out the light fixtures, keep the pole the same look, the look of the fixture the same, it would only be the components that would be transitioned to LED. What you’ll find with LED is there is not much of a cost difference. The LED fixtures cost a little more to rent month to month. Your energy consumption are a little bit less month to month. There is not a substantive cost savings to convert to LED. The primary benefit is the ongoing support for the streetlights from Duke as well as the reduction in maintenance that can often be realized when you switch to an LED style energy. We have three proposals in here. I think it’s pretty clear, each proposal walks you through the scope of the request. The first lighting proposal is for Whitemarsh Way and it proposes removing the HPS light fixtures and replacing with LED light fixtures. There are 94. You see the removal is the current cost per month for those 94 lights and the existing cost is \$1,989.04. If you look at the proposed cost it’s \$2,254.12. Right around \$275 more per month for the 94 lights. Because LED approached with this request, they agreed to waive their CIAC which is a capital upfront expense that they sometimes collect. They also agreed that there would be no penalties for canceling the

current streetlights, even if the terms of the streetlight agreement have not been fulfilled. These are put forward for Board consideration and Board discussion. You'll see that the next streetlight proposal is for Tradition Boulevard. And then finally for Reunion Boulevard, Grant First Park Parkway. Do we have OUC lights in Reunion West?

Mr. Burman: Yes, Traditions Boulevard is all OUC.

Ms. Adams: We have another utility provider that staff will be reaching out to determine the ability to implement LED lighting rather than the existing lighting. This only deals with those streetlights that are provided by Duke energy.

Mr. Staley: So, you are confirming that the brightness and the expression will be the same, even though it's a different wattage?

Mr. Scheerer: It's a whiter light, it's pretty common, and I think this addressed as everything within Reunion West. But the Reunion West inside the gate, even though one of them says Tradition Boulevard, it's not actually Tradition Boulevard, it's not actually Tradition Boulevard, that's just address location. Tradition Boulevard is OUC all the interior neighborhoods are Duke Energy.

Mr. Greenstein: If the lumen output is roughly the same, if not better, I've found a lot of the times it is actually better, and then wattage is half then we should see a 50% reduction in the electric bill.

Mr. Scheerer: And the maintenance will be less frequent which I know this guy's team will be grateful for.

Ms. Adams: Fewer streetlight outages is a big benefit. If you look at each proposal, it breaks down the cost of the rental, the cost of the maintenance, and the cost of the F&E. That's your actual consumption charges, your fuel and energy charge.

Mr. Staley: I saw here, on the Eastside there is a proposal for a lot more lights. There is nothing inconsistent between the two proposals? If we make this decision and the East make their decision, it will be consistent?

Ms. Adams: Yes.

Mr. Greenstein: Thank you for pointing out. The information is right here. It's basically a wash, give or take. If we're saving energy, you should be all for it.

Ms. Adams: I appreciated the way that Duke prepared these lighting proposals because all of the information is on one page. It shows your current costs, and it shows your proposed costs

all on one page. It clarifies there is no upfront costs or no capital expense to enter into this program.

Mr. Greenstein: As a community project, it's for the common good to use less energy. It's differential. It's minimal as far as the additional cost. There is a slight additional cost per month. Again, on an individual basis it's pennies.

Ms. Adams: Yes, it's almost a wash.

Mr. Greenstein: I think it's fine.

Ms. Adams: The cost of renting the fixtures is a little bit more than the old style, but your maintenance and your consumption charges are less.

Mr. Greenstein: I will motion to approve conversion to LED by Duke energy.

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein, seconded by Mr. Staley, with all in favor, the Proposal from Duke Energy to Upgrade Streetlights, was approved.

## **SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

### **Consideration of Playground and Outdoor Fitness Stations on District Parcels**

Ms. Adams: The next item in your agenda packet is noted that it would be provided under separate cover. It's consideration of playground and outdoor fitness station on District parcels. As a handout today, there is a double-sided handout that has green fill on the top of it. On one side it says GTP Parcel, of course for Grand Traverse Parkway with the outdoor fitness stations. On the other side it has Valhalla Parcel for the playground. The Board has been considering for several months two parcels owned by the District and the best use of those parcels. The Board directed staff to administer a survey and gather feedback from residents. As a result of that feedback and as a result in Board discussion, last month staff was directed to flesh this out a little but in terms of the thought being that Valhalla parcel that a playground would be the best use of that parcel and for the Grand Traverse Parkway the outdoor fitness stations and compatible amenities would be the best use for that parcel. I am just going to walk the Board through the Valhalla parcel and the playground. If we get the Board's blessing and action on this, we will start to confer with the engineer who, of course, there would be a cost to doing so and we would need to have Board action before that step occurs. For the Valhalla parcel playground, there would be engineering layout design. There would be a permit that would have an associated cost with Osceola county. Additional parking construction: I think that was clearly the goal based on discussion last month, that if possible add either additional parallel parking or any kind of parking

to further benefit the playground in that Valhalla area. The cost for site preparation, the cost for the playground equipment itself in the installation. We would bring back a schematic for Board consideration and the associated cost with that. Also a shade structure, fencing for the playground, surface material for the playground, landscape design and installation for the playground, benches. These are all options, the Board can come up with a concept that's more elaborate than this. This would be consistent with other amenities at Reunion that include benches, a bike rack, litter receptacles, and then signage in terms of policies that are adopted about the playground and any type of signage that our insurance carrier would urge us to post at the playground. If the Board wanted to consider electric utility and lighting, alternatively the park hours can be dawn to dusk and would not necessitate additional lighting. Water utility and fountain, if that's a consideration the Board would want to make for this amenity. And then just to note that there will be an ongoing cost for insurance and maintenance that the Board would want to consider. This is just a general scope of different thoughts based on other Reunion amenities and this is ready for Board input and discussion.

Mr. Staley: Can I give you some thoughts?

Ms. Adams: Yes, sir.

Mr. Staley: I would go dawn to dusk, personally. I would keep away from a water utility and fountain; that's just a maintenance issue and we'll be spending most of our time repairing it. When you think parking, I think you could consider using two of the mail kiosks spaces for the playground as well as any other parking around there as well. Limited to one hour for the playground. Just so we can get this conversation going, I think two mail kiosks go in there, and two mailbox kiosk parking spaces are enough. Based on what I have seen. We could use two of them for this plus any other parking that we think is appropriate. That would be my comment.

Ms. Adams: We have all five Board Members present, so this is a great time to have that discussion. Is there consensus with the concept of having the playground dawn to dusk and thus eliminating the need for additional lighting. Okay, I am seeing consensus on that issue. The other thought was to eliminate the water fountain and the need for water utility. I am seeing consensus on that as well. What about eliminating consideration of any additional parking.

Mr. Staley: No, I am not saying eliminate, I was saying consider additional parking, but also take two of the mail kiosk parking spaces to supplement any additional parking because I think four is too many.

Ms. Adams: Understood.

Mr. Greenstein: Right now we have four, and most of our locations elsewhere within either East or West side have maybe three spaces. We can look at that when it gets down to the detail, because the spaces are already there.

Mr. Staley: I have never seen more than one car parked there at a time.

Mr. Greenstein: I agree. We can look and see if we can utilize any of those spaces towards the parking requirement to support the playground. We're not locking in any number of spaces of finalizing. That gets down to the specifications level.

Ms. Adams: Right.

Mr. Greenstein: You did a great job of identifying the categories of cost. There are considerations that we have to make. I think right for today's meeting, we just want to reach an agreement that yes, we're going to put a playground.

Ms. Adams: You're blessing this scope and this concept, and it will move forward and engage the District engineer and start to flush out the costs.

Mr. Greenstein: Exactly. And we can have a motion on that.

Ms. Adams: Did you want to do them both together? Or do you prefer separate motions?

Mr. Greenstein: No, I think we can do them both together. I think we're going to find that we are in agreement on a playground at Valhalla and the outdoor fitness station concept for the other parcel.

Ms. Adams: For the outdoor fitness stations, just flipping to the reverse side, you'll see that there is a lot of redundancy. I am trying to see if there is any salient difference and I am not really seeing any. I don't want to walk the Board through each item because we have already addressed that. But again, it contemplates the engineering, the permitting, the additional parking, site preparation, fitness equipment and installation, shade structure, surface materials, landscape design and installation, benches, bike racks, liter receptacles, and signage. Would the Board like to consider eliminating anything? So, it would be open dawn to dusk and eliminate any requirement for electrical supply and lighting. What about the water fountain for this? Eliminate?

Ms. Harley: They can take water bottles.

Mr. Greenstein: Exactly. The cost of bringing in a water utility is significant beyond the maintenance of a water fountain. I think most people are accustomed to bringing a bottle of water. Especially if you are riding a bicycle, you have the holder and you stick a bottle of water in it. We can save some money by not doing that.

Mr. Staley: We may have to consider because of the development that is taking place behind this location. Is it Elevation Development?

Ms. Adams: I have it in the action items list, but I think it might be Elevation.

Mr. Staley: We may need to put some better screening there. We might have to add that later as we know what that development is.

Ms. Adams: Supervisor Staley, you bring up a good point. One thing I did not contemplate in this scope for the outdoor fitness stations is any fencing and instead contemplated that any buffering or visual barriers would be part of the landscape design. I'll make a note in terms of back barrier to see if we might need to consider fencing.

Ms. Harley: You might be able to do that with screening and landscaping because it's going to add time to the scope.

Ms. Adams: One interesting thing about parks and playgrounds is you want to be cautious about creating any place that somebody can potentially hide. Typically, with any kind of fencing it needs to be open so you can clearly see children or see anyone who might have foul intent at an outdoor area. We want to approach that carefully in terms of safety considerations. Any other discussion? Otherwise, if the Board is satisfied with this high level prospective, we can, again, start to engage the engineer for layout design and parking construction and start to flush out the costs based on the scope. We would just need a motion to approve the general scope for the playground and outdoor fitness stations on District parcels.

Mr. Greenstein: Motion so made.

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein, seconded by Ms. Harley, with all in favor, the Playground and Outdoor Fitness Stations on District Parcels, was approved.

## **SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

### **Discussion Items**

#### **A. Golf Carts on District Roads**

Ms. Adams: The next item that was scheduled is golf carts on District roads and this item is going to be deferred until a later time and I believe that at this point it is likely that we will have both meetings running in tandem. We'll be prepared for that. The other item that is deferred is the no parking enforcement and towing. This is also scheduled for discussion at the Reunion East meeting. The Board Members have been provided security reports under separate cover, and there is a printed copy to review should you wish to do so. There is also a handout for today that is an overview of the parking violations and some of the other workload that has been handled by the



security team at Reunion this past month. That will be discussed at that time. So, we are down to staff reports.

**B. No Parking Enforcement and Towing**

*Deferred as mentioned above.*

**EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Staff Reports**

**A. Attorney**

Ms. Carpenter: We don't have a whole lot this month. The golfcarts took some time. The only other thing that we are working on was a request on Reunion East to work on an amendment to the interlocal to talk about modifying the District's obligation for road maintenance on both sides of 532. We have the amendment put together and Alan is working on a map. It might be good to get input on. Alan, if you could maybe go over the roads that we are currently maintaining to see if there are any other changes. So, when we go to the county we make sure that we are in agreement for both East and West that we are asking for a reduction on the right parcels. The current thought now is on 532, that the District does not want to be maintaining the south side of the road but would continue the north side and the median. There are also some other requirements in roads.

Mr. Scheerer: Sinclair Road is also part of an interlocal, so there may be some consideration on Sinclair with respect to the development that is going on there. The big difference on Sinclair is all the property that we are currently maintain is Bahia grass. So, there are really no changes or anything like the East.

Ms. Adams: Jan brought up a very good point, that it makes sense to approach the county in tandem if there is consideration of being relieved from maintenance responsibilities on Sinclair. Alan, do you want to just go over the sections now that the District is maintaining. For Sinclair Road, the areas that the District is maintaining, that there's now other property owners.

Mr. Scheerer: I think anybody that is coming in and out of Sinclair Road will see the apartment complexes that are going in there and the treetop trek. The bridge area for 429, we don't really maintain. We do have Reunion Encore West just past the apartments to the East of 429 and we may want to keep maintaining between the sidewalk and the curb but the medians we're maintain that and there may not be a need to do that. All the apartment complexes are going in there. There is also the church that has signage there. I don't know when or if that church will be built, but that's right at the 429 on ramp.



Ms. Carpenter: The map also gives the ability; I think it's Old Lake Wilson Road that's tagged. I don't think we're maintaining anything on that.

Mr. Scheerer: We are maintaining some stuff on Old Lake Wilson Road. I believe both sides of the road from 532 down towards the back side of the Grands where the bridge is. We are maintaining that.

Ms. Adams: Would that be East or West?

Mr. Greenstein: It's East.

Ms. Carpenter: We will send the current map, which is really a terrible map. But we'll send the map out to both Boards so you can see the current map. Perhaps if you have any thoughts just hand write them and send it back or send an email. And then Alan can look at it. Since we are going to be amending it, let's get what we really want to be maintaining and make sure we are not on the hook for anything that we don't want to maintain.

Mr. Scheerer: And I believe some of the areas we are maintaining on Old Lake Wilson Road are going to be gone because they are going to be widening it. There will be some changes to that, I am sure.

Ms. Carpenter: We'll send the maps to the Board Members on both boards so you can take a look at what we are permitted to maintain so we can clarify and make sure we are only maintaining and obligated to maintain what we want to maintain.

Mr. Greenstein: Just for a bit of clarity, for those of you who haven't heard this issue in the past or us discussing things that are common to both East and West, we have an interlocal agreement with the CDD that basically allows everyone who is on the Westside to use and have access to all the amenities on the Eastside and vice versa. Of course, all the amenities right now are on the Eastside. But none the less things such as maintaining the median in the front of the Resort or these areas on Old Lake Wilson Road, the cost of that is shared between East and West based upon the population split. I forgot what the latest split number is.

Ms. Adams: It will change with the next budget.

Mr. Greenstein: It's almost 50/50. It's getting close. We have a common interest, East and West even though the things we're talking about are on the East, the West is paying for it just like the East is paying for it. What we are trying to do and what we have talked about for months is the southern side of the road, which used to be undeveloped, we believe there was a benefit to beautify that. The southside of the street started getting developed and we said they should be paying their fair share. We went forward and tried to get them to pay and the folks on the other

side, which was basically the shopping center, basically said thanks but no thanks. Now that the other side of the street is being developed we're going to let them take care of it. So, we want to go to the county and tell them we're not going to take care of the south side of the street anymore and if there are any other areas that we need to adjust as Jan pointed out then we will when have this discussion with the county. But our cost should be lowered as a result of taking this action.

Ms. Carpenter: Just for background, because it's a state road and these are state of county roads, the county would maintain them with just Bahia grass and nothing else. No irrigation, no trees. What they do is give the opportunity to folks that own land adjacent to them to be able to upgrade and make it look nice. We have to option to stop maintaining at any time, but this allows us to make it look nice as the entries to the Resort. That's about all we have worked on for substance or legal work this month.

Ms. Adams: And Jan may also have some comments as we go through the action items list in just a moment.

**B. Engineer**

Ms. Adams: The engineer is not in attendance today, but he will be here next month. One of the action items lists we have received some communication on and I will provide and update on that.

**C. District Manager's Report**

**i. Action Items List**

Ms. Adams: Under staff reports for District manager's report in section 8 tab c of your agenda packet there is a status update for the action items. Reunion West, I believe, starts on the 4<sup>th</sup> page. The Reserve study update, I did receive some comments from Board members as well as from staff. We are in communication with reserve advisors to incorporate those comments. The most impactful comments were regarding the priorities for the first 5 year spending and splitting up sidewalks and splitting up fitness equipment in a manner that is consistent with the history for Reunion East and West. They are going to make a change there but not to the overall recommended reserve contributions. You should be receiving your revised reserve study at next month's meeting which will also be the time that the first draft of the budget is considered for the upcoming fiscal year. We've had discussion regarding the use of the parcels on Grand Traverse Parkway and Valhalla. The lighting monument has been completed. The last time I checked with Alan we were just waiting for Duke to install a meter. Is that still pending?

Mr. Scheerer: Yes, I got a notice today that they are only going to be installing Whitemarsh at this time that there are some issues with Golden Bear. That's suppose to happen tomorrow.

Mr. Staley: That's strange because the meter is actually in on Golden Bear.

Mr. Scheerer: Really? Oh, they did get it in.

Mr. Staley: This is like a long ongoing saga.

Mr. Scheerer: Yes, it's totally out of our hands. This is all on Duke.

Mr. Greenstein: But the signs are lighted, correct?

Mr. Scheerer: When I get the meter in, they will be lit. We put in all the new electrical and all the meter boxes and the breaker box for two little 15-watt lights. I'm not sure what Duke's doing, but they are not in a good place right now. We're still waiting on meters and once they are in, we will activate the lights.

Ms. Adams: The next big item was the transition items for Encore at Reunion West and one thing that happened in March was the transfer of the data utility lines. All of that has now been completed and we have all of the information necessary to prepare the next year's budget. The only item that is a transition issue is Alan and I are working with the HOA to determine CDD irrigation costs. We will be working on that and then this item will be completed.

Mr. Staley: Back in January we discussed when we approve the temporary contract extension for landscaping in Encore Resort. We said we would consider a revised contract putting together that service by Yellowstone in that area, are we still going to do that?

Ms. Adams: Are you directing staff to bid out this project?

Mr. Staley: I think we should have a single supplier. I don't why we've got two suppliers for such a small area. Unless you guys can think of some reason why we need two suppliers. I'm sure both of them would like to do all of it, so we should be able to get a good process going for the CDD West.

Ms. Adams: It's a simple question, but I don't know that there is a simple answer. The way that the last landscaping project was bid out it was a tandem joint proposal between Reunion East and Reunion West. We provided a scope of services and solicited proposals. Because of the amount of the contract, it did require a sealed bit proposal process. Bids were opened and presented to the Board and the Board made a decision to engage Yellowstone to service Reunion East and West. That agreement can be amended to include additional service area. That agreement can be amended to reduce service areas, for example County road 532 that we are discussing. Are you asking to rebid Reunion East and West?

Mr. Staley: I just remember that in January when we extended the contract to Encore, we said we'd discuss the fact that we should really consider having a single supplier. I didn't realize there was a lot of history.

Ms. Carpenter: We do have a single provider, don't we?

Ms. Adams: No, because Creative North is doing the landscape service for Encore.

Mr. Greenstein: Your recollection is correct and I indicated at the time that sometime in the spring when the dust settles, and I think we're getting to that point now, with Encore Reunion West that we would be able to recompet the contract so that we have one supplier for all areas covered by Reunion East/Reunion West CDD. I think that's what he is talking about.

Mr. Burman: I think part of it is the Board of Reunion West also wanted one supplier. They also wanted Creative North doing all of it, and I don't think it's a big issue, but it is one of the things that they have brought up.

Ms. Adams: They are engaged by the HOL as well as the District in that neighborhood.

Ms. Carpenter: Do we want to rebid just that area, or rebid the whole scope for both?

Mr. Burman: I think we just did the whole scope.

Ms. Carpenter: Well, we have very good pricing at this point, it doesn't make sense to rebid the whole thing, just bid that one scope for Yellowstone as an addition and everyone else to bid that scope. That way you have a way to see if Yellowstone's increase.

Mr. Staley: Because at the time if you remember, we didn't have a lot of time because the contract expired. Encore had given up maintenance, so we had to take it on immediately. If we could bid just the Encore piece.

Ms. Adams: So, what I hear Board direction on is for staff to develop a scope of services and bid packet for the Encore neighborhood at Reunion West and to bring that back for approval at an upcoming meeting and once approved then that would be noticed to the landscape service providers in central Florida to provide a bid? Okay.

Mr. Staley: I would make such a motion.

Ms. Adams: I think we can take that as staff direction now and we'll bring back an actionable item at a future meeting, if that sounds good to everyone?

Mr. Greenstein: I think we do good. And I think we have to kind of look at it more globally, possibly. Not just the one practical situation that we have but look at so that we can further consolidate service delivery between the two CDDs. Because if the outcome of just doing that piece...the outcomes could be that the current provider stays as the current provider. But then

we end up with two different providers. That's why I was thinking we would have to look at it more globally.

Ms. Adams: Do we want to have further discussion before we give staff directions. I'm hearing two different concepts.

Mr. Greenstein: Personally, I hadn't spent the time to really scope it out and look at the issue.

Ms. Adams: Alternatively, staff can add considerations for landscape service provider to the Encore transition action item list and we can revisit this at next month's meeting.

Mr. Greenstein: Yes, by next month's meeting we will definitely decide how we're going to proceed as far as contractual obligations. Thank you.

Ms. Adams: The next item on the action item list is consideration of refunding the 2004 bond assessment. The District understands based on the presentation at last month's meeting that there would be cost savings and that could be passed on to residents and there is also an opportunity to extract cash for capital projects. All of that can be discussed and considered closer to the fall. The earliest that the bonds can be priced would be November. They can close as early as February 1, 2022 which is 90 days before the no-call provision which is the soonest that that can happen based on the terms of your bond issuance.

Mr. Staley: I think there will be savings and any savings could be passed on to taxpayers and or used to build up reserves for future projects.

Ms. Adams: Yes, or a combination. Parking rules, we have spent some time on that, and I'll update the action item list. This will remain as there several steps to fully implement the no parking zones at Encore neighborhood, monitor the Elevation development. I'm going to send an interim report to the Board. I need to check with county staff and see if there have been any applications turned in. I doubt it because we would have received written notice, but I will provide an interim report in between Board meetings and a status update for that development near by Reunion.

Ms. Carpenter: Do you know the name of the development or what they are going by?

Ms. Adams: I'll have to add it to the action item list, because I do not recall it.

Ms. Carpenter: We can see what we can find out too because we know the developer.

Mr. Greenstein: Is this the development that is potentially going behind our planned amenity.

Ms. Adams: No, this is the one behind Grand Traverse Parkway.

Mr. Greenstein: It's not the one that's going to squeeze between 429 and Nicolas golf course.

Ms. Adams: Right. One thing that legal counsel and the district engineer are working on is the certificate of completion for the bond series 2015/16/17. There are several steps to do that. And that just closes out the construction funds for those bond series that is required that the Board takes action on that so that will be coming before the Board at a future meeting. The Sinclair gate, this is an item that has been robustly discussed at numerous Board meetings for both East and West. There has been a lot of frustration when there is accidents nearby Reunion on toll roads or on I4 or even on Old Lake Wilson Road, traffic backs up at the Sinclair gate. Last month, the Board directed staff to investigate opportunities for an emergency maintenance of traffic plan with Osceola county. The District engineer has some initial thoughts about that. He provided some preliminary comments and is reaching out to the county engineer and he plans to have something for the Board to review at next month's meeting. That's where we are with that. We do have to TECO easement agreement in process. This is something that Board has already taken action to delegate authority to the Chair to approve. This is for that installation of the 4-inch gas line. Any questions or any other items that the Board has?

Mr. Greenstein: I just want to clarify on the Sinclair gate. The basic issue is that our control of the roadway, up to traffic approaching the gate, begins where you have seen on the ground, we divided the lanes up between resident only and everybody else. In reality, there are times when we need to have control over the traffic before they make the turn. And the Resort has had situations where I know Anthony Carl went out there one time and basically had security officers directing traffic and interviewing the drivers and getting them to turn around and keep the right lane unimpeded for resident access. We were told by Osceola Count Sheriff that we can't do that because it's Osceola county roadway and not Reunion CDD roadway. That's what this whole item is about. Having the engineer talk to the county and reach an agreement that as necessary we can control traffic before it becomes a problem on our property.

Mr. Burman: I had one quick question about the privatization discussion. I know it's been going on for a while. Reunion West POA meeting yesterday, they said that they were told that the roads would be private but not the green space, not the streetlights, not the storm water. I hadn't heard that. Is that true or not true? Maybe Jan would know better.

Ms. Carpenter: It was just roadways. The District would still own green space and storm water, just purely the roadway.



Ms. Adams: Just so Supervisors are aware, if you go back to the action item list, you bring up a good point, this should probably be both on Reunion East and West. But right now, it is just noted on Reunion East regarding the feasibility of selling the roads to a private entity. There was a meeting between Kingwood management staff and executive staff with district management staff and they expressed an earnest interest in purchasing the roads. They did enquire about the feasibility of purchasing other district assets, but the focus is on the roads and there has been no Board discussion regarding any assets that are available or for sale other than the district roads.

Mr. Greenstein: Interesting that that question came up. There is enough to chew on dealing with the roadway then getting into other CDD areas.

Ms. Adams: And Kingwood management staff has indicated that they have hired legal counsel to further investigate the issue. It appears that we may have a willing purchaser but they're not at 100% yet.

Mr. Staley: I think neither are the CDD Boards. Because there are a lot of other considerations. It's a complex issue.

Ms. Adams: Yes. Anything else on the Reunion East or West action item list?

Mr. Staley: What are we going to do about Mr. Witcher's request for the speed sign on Grand Traverse?

Ms. Adams: If Supervisors would like, I can confer with operations staff regarding the ability to relocate some of the existing radar display signs or if there would be a purchase required and gather some information and bring it back.

Mr. Staley: Alan's input is important.

Mr. Scheerer: Tell me what you want me to do, and we'll do it.

Mr. Staley: Review the feasibility and the necessity.

Mr. Scheerer: Okay.

Mr. Greenstein: First thing is relocation and if we can't relocate then we'll have a motion to purchase another unit.

Mr. Scheerer: We have a couple on Grand Traverse we can relocate.

Ms. Adams: And if the Board would like we can have that discussion now, Alan is here. Or otherwise, we can research feasibility as staff and present information to the Board at a future meeting.

Mr. Greenstein: I think it's 60 seconds.

Mr. Staley: There is a lot going on in this meeting.



Mr. Greenstein: When I say 60 seconds, I mean decision to relocate or so we can speed things up...

Ms. Adams: We just need Alan's input on feasibility or relocating.

Mr. Scheerer: We can relocate any of the signs because we're putting them on streetlights right now. The feasibility of doing it is we just take one of the Grand Traverse Parkway signs, maybe the one closest to the Preserve, and we can relocate that into the Preserve.

Mr. Greenstein: We've been relocating signs as need be. Is everybody okay with relocation?

Ms. Adams: Mr. Witcher's request was for a speed limit sign with the radar display on it. This wouldn't fully satisfy that request, but it would provide a radar display in that vicinity of Heritage.

Mr. Staley: Personally, I would like Alan to go and come back next time. I would personally like to talk to him about this time at further length.

Mr. Greenstein: Okay, your call.

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

Ms. Adams: We do have an item that Board action is required. Included in your agenda packet under section 8, section C-2 is your check run summary. This is a check run summary from March 1-March 31. It includes the General Fund replacement and maintenance fund as well as payroll expenses. The total amount is \$586,331.62. I will note that there were some sizable transfers to the Debt Service Fund. That is when the debt service fees are received from the tax collector and then transferred over for the Trustee to manage payments to the Debt Service Fund for different bond issuances.

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

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

Ms. Adams: Included in your agenda packet for Board review under tab 3 is the unaudited financial reporting for February 28<sup>th</sup>. This is a combined balance sheet as well as statements for your General Fund, your repairs and Maintenance Fund, as well as some of the bond accounts. No Board action is required but I am able to take any questions the Board might have. Otherwise, we are down to any other business or Supervisor's Request.

**NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Other Business**

Ms. Adams: Right now, it is 12:52, so if this Board would like to take an eight-minute recess and then we can return, and this meeting will continue at 1:00 and we will call to order the Reunion East CDD meeting at 1:00 also. Mr. Chairman, is that the way we would like to handle that? And then there could be public comments regarding the issues that are on both agenda. Or do you want to finish this meeting before the other one.

Mr. Greenstein: I think it's just a technicality, isn't it?

Ms. Carpenter: I think we can hold both together.

Ms. Adams: So, we will take a seven-minute recess and reconvene at 1:00 and we'll call both the Reunion East and West meetings to order.

*\*The meeting convened at 12:53 p.m.*

  
Secretary/Assistant Secretary

  
Chairman/~~Vice Chairman~~