

MINUTES OF MEETING
REUNION WEST
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

The regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Reunion West Community Development District was held on Thursday, June 10, 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 Manke	Assistant Secretary
Sharon Harley	Assistant Secretary
Graham Staley	Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

Tricia Adams	District Manager
Kristen Trucco	District Counsel
Alex Fox	Latham Luna
Steve Boyd	District Engineer
Alan Scheerer	Field Operations Manager
Victor Vargas	Reunion Security
Nicole Ailes	Yellowstone
Mike Smith	Yellowstone

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

Roll Call

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

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS

Public Comment Period

Ms. Adams: The first item on today's agenda is a public comment period. This is an opportunity for any members of the public to make a statement to the Board of Supervisors. Is there anyone here at Heritage Crossings who would like to make a statement to the Board of Supervisors? Alright, do we have any callers who would like to make a statement to the Board of Supervisors? We received under separate cover via email, a message directed to the Board of Supervisors. This was from two homeowners in Reunion West CDD, Mr. Jim Dowling and Mr. Chris Dowling, and it contains remarks regarding the use of parcel one and parcel two, which are under consideration for amenity development. There are some notes for the Board to consider

regarding insurance and maintenance and it expresses opposition, in particular to the outdoor fitness station that is proposed for development on Grand Traverse Parkway. We will enter that letter into the meeting record.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS**Approval of the Minutes of the May 13, 2021 Meeting**

Ms. Adams: Included in your agenda packet, under tab 3 is an unapproved copy of the minutes. This is from your May 13, 2021, meeting. I have reviewed the meeting and noted a few minor corrections, nothing substantive. Under separate cover via email, staff has received meeting minute corrections from Supervisor Staley. Are there any other corrections that need to be noted on the record? If not, we would be seeking a motion to approve.

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein, seconded by Mr. Manke, with all in favor, the Minutes of the May 13, 2021 Meeting, were approved as amended.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**Consideration of Resolution 2021-07
Approving the Proposed Fiscal Year 2022
Budget and Setting a Public Hearing**

Ms. Adams: The next item in your agenda packet is Resolution 2021-07. As Board members are aware, approval of this resolution would approve your proposed budget for Fiscal Year 2022 which starts in October. It would also set your public hearing for your August meeting date. That is when you would be scheduled to do your budget adoption. Your proposed budget can be changed at any duly noticed Board meeting up through your budget adoption, but the operations and maintenance fees that you set in your proposed budget would be a cap. The Board would have the ability to reduce the assessment but not to increase it once the noticing requirements are met. Because this proposed budget does contemplate an increase, we have additional noticing requirements. In addition to reporting information to the county, it also triggers a mailed notice to all landowners in Reunion West CDD. The Board reviewed the budget at last month's meeting and subsequently we had a workshop which Board members attended. That was held via Zoom. We also had some members of the public who attended the workshop, and we went through the budget in detail. As a result of that meeting, there are a few changes to the proposed budget in terms of how the information is laid out, with the most salient changes being how the repair and maintenance fund is displayed or how the capital spending plan is displayed. Let me get to that section of the budget. If you go to page 14 of your proposed budget, it has an overview of the proposed budget for Fiscal Year 2022 in your last column. Moving to

the next page there is detailed history of what has been planned or spent during the current fiscal year. You'll see on page 15 at the very top of this table it says, "Fiscal Year 2021 Updated Expenses." Those are updated as of the end of May beginning of June, calendar year 2021. And then the next page identifies some of the items that will be deferred for next year's budget consideration or have been discussed as potential projects, including the parcel development you will see at the bottom of the table. Hopefully this information is helpful to understand how the capital repair and maintenance fund spending is laid out. We did spend quite a bit of time during the workshop, so I am speculating that there are not a lot of follow up questions, but I am happy to answer any questions. Otherwise, we would be seeking a motion to approve Resolution 2021-07.

Mr. Staley: Just a couple of points for me. On page 16, the list of projects for 2022, obviously there is a contingency over and above this of about \$240,000 because the total that has been proposed for next year is \$906,000 which you can see on page 14 at the bottom. This list of projects only adds up to \$650,000 or something. So, there is obviously another contingency.

Ms. Adams: Yes, these are some of the specific items and then when you look at the bottom of page 14 where there is the table that has the total proposed 2022 budget and the categories of building improvements, fountain improvements, gatehouse improvements, monument improvements. This table is based on historical spending and understanding that we may not explicitly say that we will need to replace an HVAC system at the guardhouse or we may need to replace a controller at the guardhouse, but we understand that historically we need to plan and budget for that.

Mr. Staley: None of us have a crystal ball. But to think that we're going to spend \$906,000 next year and were already planning to spend \$474,000 this year, there's probably some room there. We don't know, but there's possibly some room.

Ms. Adams: Good point.

Mr. Staley: The other comment, which I mentioned to Tricia earlier, it's an observation it's not a criticism, it's just an observation. Obviously CDD gathers revenue based on the number of units. And if you look at the unit as a whole, the west side has 37% of the units. When we share expenses based on the number of platted lots, we're going 47% of the cost. I said to Tricia, not for now, but I need to understand why we've got that imbalance. Because units and plots ought not to be that different. And maybe it's because of the multifamily units on the eastside. But to be only gathering 37% of the revenue and to incur 47% of the costs, it bothers me a little bit.

Ms. Adams: Just to draw Board Member's attention to some of the information that might be helpful to amplify this. On page three of your proposed budget, you can look at any of the fiscal years, but we'll use Fiscal Year 2022 which is at the top as an example. The first product type is commercial, and you'll see that Reunion West does not have any commercial properties that are contributing to the revenue. The next category is hotel/condo, and you'll see that Reunion West does not have any hotel/condo units that are contributing to the revenue. The next three categories are where there are multifamily homes, single family homes, and golf course property that are contributing. These are all paying debt service fees as well as the operations and maintenance fees. If you look at the Reunion West proposed budget, they are benefiting from the revenue that they realized from commercial and hotel/condo properties. So, that's the difference that Supervisor Staley is bringing up.

Mr. Greenstein: The east side.

Ms. Adams: Yes, the east side. Did I misspeak and say West? East side does benefit from commercial properties and hotel/condo. However, the interlocal agreement which has been established for many years, which shares expenses, those shared expenses are based on platted lots. We're getting to the point where we will almost fully realize all of the platted lots. Reunion West has been 100% platted. Reunion East has been mostly platted, but we still have two phases of Reunion Village, that as of my knowledge from today's date have not yet been platted. They are planning to plat those very soon, so very soon we'll have a full picture of what will be platted for Reunion East and really rounding out the District boundaries and we understand what's platted for Reunion West. So, very soon we'll have the ability to compare how that platted difference and cost share compares to the revenue that's generated by the assessed properties.

Mr. Staley: And that leads me to the concern I had in the workshop and also in the last Board meeting. That even with this increase and with this capital projects proposal, we will finish next year with only \$680,000 for reserves in the replacement and maintenance fund. That compares to something like \$3 million in the east. We have to go for this increase to start to build the reserves because we know from the reserve study that in years three, four, five, six, etcetera, we've got substantial expenditure coming along that we have to prepare for. Rather than have big increases from year to year. While it's a sizeable increase in percentage terms, I don't see a choice but to notice that increase and then we've still got another eight weeks to think about it. But I think we have to notice it. And as you said, if we want to drop it we can drop it. But at the moment we have to notice it at a 36% increase. I don't know what other people think.

Mr. Greenstein: That captures it all.

Ms. Adams: Do we have a motion to approve Resolution 2021-07?

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein, seconded by Mr. Manke, with all in favor, Resolution 2021-07 Approving the Proposed Fiscal Year 2022 Budget and Setting the Public Hearing for August 12, 2021, was approved.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Discussion Items

A. Sinclair Road Entrance Operations

Ms. Adams: Moving through the agenda, we do have a couple of discussion items. I believe this was placed by supervisor request and it's also a follow up on a topic that the Board has grappled with over the course of many meetings. Ultimately, the Board has been looking at the Sinclair gate operations. Ways that traffic can be expedited through the gate during times where there are accidents on other nearby roads that are causing people to be rerouted on Sinclair. The District engineer has been working with Osceola County regarding an emergency "MOT" or "Maintenance of Traffic" plan so that the times that Sinclair gate is experiencing a backup there can be an earlier division between residents who have automatic access through their cards in order to expedite that traffic and to successfully deal with the high volume of traffic going through the visitor's side. Steve Boyd, the District engineer, is in attendance at today's meeting. Do you have any updates?

Mr. Boyd: I've forwarded judicial information about a proposed plan to Todd Hudson in Public Works and also Jose Gomez in Development Review. They have not specifically responded yet, but I do have a meeting scheduled with them for a week from today, Thursday morning, and I hope to be able to advance something following that meeting. I think what we're probably looking at is a placement of some cones with somebody that would signal or temporary signage that would direct residents to the right and nonresidents to the left at the place where they make the turn. And that's probably about the best we're going to be able to get.

Mr. Greenstein: Is there a way to on a temporary basis with cones or some sort of striping. It wouldn't be permanent, because I know the county would balk at that probably, but where we can have two lanes making a turn. We have an artificial curve there.

Mr. Boyd: Sure. That's feasible.

Mr. Greenstein: It was done to slow traffic down so that people don't go crashing into the barricade and go on what will be the continuation of Sinclair Road in the future, but right now of

course you must make the turn onto Tradition Boulevard. If we could realign that area so that you could have two cars going around and we separate the traffic just in front of that, which is clearly on Sinclair Road. But again, we are doing this based on the emergency nature of the need not based upon a permanent thing. I think once we have the Sinclair Road extension, that will naturally occur because they'll have to reengineer that intersection. Everything we've been trying to do all this time has been to allow for unfettered access by residents and others having official business within Reunion West as well as other points within Reunion. On the days when you approach and the line is not past the turn, and you have people who actually obey the signs, it's great. And then of course on the days when you have folks who are trying to beat the system and figure that they'll pressure you and they'll pressure the guard in allowing them to go through the resident only gate, they are blocking our traffic. Every time we've dealt with this, Victor and his staff have gone out onto Sinclair Road and tried to accomplish that. But the roadway markings of course defeat that purpose because it pushes people into one lane. If we can allow for the two lanes to come around and get the separation going on Sinclair, I think that's going to help a lot.

Mr. Boyd: Understood. I'll propose that.

Mr. Staley: Could we implement that next week with some temporary cones? We've been talking about this for a long time. With some temporary cones, just to see if it works. Because if it doesn't work, we don't want to waste six months reengineering and it doesn't work. I don't know what Victor thinks of that idea just to try it. Put the cones down, have your people standing at the end of rush hour, and making sure that they are in the right lane. Is that a good idea or a bad idea?

Mr. Vargas: Right now, we don't have a person assigned to that specific post. As soon as we see traffic we send our patrol, the one that patrols the west side, just to help that officer there.

Mr. Burman: So, what he's suggesting is that you take that patrol and put it way out in front of traffic and put a barrier up, so they don't jump between the lanes and sort that traffic out way early.

Ms. Staley: They'll move the cones as well. I'm not stupid, I think they'll move cones to get through, but I think we should try it.

Mr. Greenstein: No, we've talked about cones, and I think you've attempted and succeeded at times. But when there is a major problem, when there is an accident on I-4 and makes no difference whether it's a Friday or a Tuesday, you're going to have traffic and people trying to defeat the system. It's clear that we have to get approval from Osceola to separate the

traffic to manage the traffic on Sinclair Road before it gets to us. We can put up signage be it temporary or what have you. There's a cut in the road, and I'm not saying we have any legal authority to really do this, but that's why we're talking to the county. When you walk Happy Trails, you've got the big, it's kind of like the "Wild Wild West" sign, that say, "Beware. Do Not Enter." Because it's private property, it's the Homeowners Association of Happy Trails. We need signage on Sinclair Road that tells folks that they have to separate, that they must get in that left lane, and have cones going down so that if they don't want to play the game, they can make the U-turn and go right back where they came from.

Mr. Staley: The other thing we should actively consider is turning that gate into an automated gate. And also, have the heavy vehicles and delivery vehicles, and they are probably best coming through that gate rather than Spine Road, so perhaps you still have to have a manned gate to let the Amazon truck come through. Maybe we still have to allow a security guard to open that gate to let them come through there. But the other gate ought to be pass only. If you end up in that lane, you're stuck there.

Ms. Harley: And we did say before that we can restrict the hours of manned access to serve commercial vehicles.

Ms. Adams: Now, once a gate is staffed you don't have the ability to restrict public access.

Ms. Trucco: Are you proposing two different lanes? One unrestricted and one pass only?

Ms. Adams: He's proposing one resident only and then one that there is a security guard who only allows delivery vehicles.

Mr. Staley: Otherwise, you've got to send all commercial vehicles down Osceola Polk and across that traffic light into the main entrance.

Ms. Adams: The challenge is once you staff it you have to provide access on these public roads.

Mr. Greenstein: Let me just take it back a step. And this is a question that came up as a result of a discussion we had yesterday with parties that were involved in Reunion Village. That gate is the only access gate to Reunion West. On the east side, we have multiple access gates. And we have the flexibility to restrict access at various points because the official gate for the public is the front gate. We don't have the luxury of any other access gates on the west side. I don't know if we could even consider.

Ms. Harley: Why are you saying it can't be done, Mark?

Mr. Greenstein: Because you must have public access. You must allow for public access to Reunion West.

Ms. Harley: Right, but when we discussed this before, it's always been accepted that the other manned gate provides that access.

Mr. Greenstein: What is the other gate?

Ms. Harley: The front gate and Spine.

Mr. Greenstein: Spine is in the Reunion East CDD and so is the front gate. We have all kinds of practical things that we would like to do. Such as, resident only gates and resident only lanes and all this other stuff. But when it comes down to this very issue of public access to the roads because the roads are public, east and west in my opinion, and I'll have to see if legal because I thought that's what they were saying when we had a bit of a discussion on this issue regarding Reunion Village. I'm not going to go into an explanation now on Reunion Village and how we're going to control access over the bridge, resident only, and are we going to have a guardhouse in the front, okay. But there was only one way to get to Reunion West and that is through the Sinclair gate.

Ms. Harley: There isn't because you can access Reunion West at the other gate.

Mr. Greenstein: But Sharron, that's like saying you have two entities, and one is a subsidiary of the other that both have a parent company. You are trying to meet a legal requirement for access using a subsidiary.

Ms. Harley: No, we've had this discussion multiple times and this is the first time that that's been put on the table. If that's a fact, why are we only now being made aware of that? It seems ridiculous when we have discussed this so many times.

Mr. Staley: What Mark is saying is physically there are four ways to get into Reunion, at least four.

Ms. Harley: But only one is counted at Reunion West.

Mr. Greenstein: We're going to have to get an opinion that we can do it. That it's within our jurisdiction or our authority to do it. Sharon, I wish I could answer the question as to why this wasn't thought of or why this issue didn't come up earlier. Again, it came up in a similar discussion involving Reunion Village. But that's on the east side and there are multiple entrances on the east side. We only have the one on the west. For whatever reason we were focusing on the practical ramifications of what we were trying to do with resident only versus general access. We

never got close enough to the issue of making that gate resident only to really force the legal discussion.

Ms. Trucco: Ordinarily, we take the position that as long as there is one entrance that allows the public to enter into, that's sufficient. I understand that you can enter Reunion West through Reunion East which makes this a little different of a circumstance which is why that's a really good point that perhaps we could still be in compliance with the requirement for public entrance through Reunion East. However, let us take a closer look at that and see if there are any other CDDs who have taken that same approach before this Board decides either way. I think I understand the issue now, that there are multiple entrances for Reunion East that provide entrance to Reunion West.

Ms. Harley: If you look at Encore as a community, it's divided East and West and it's divided by Old Lake Wilson Road. Way more than we are divided here inside Reunion. On the west side you have one manned gate going into Encore, and then you have two automated. On the east side of Encore at Reunion, you have no manned gate at all. They are automated gates through the speaker system. And that's the only way to access the east side of Encore. There are two gates. One is automated and one is automated but out of a speaker. If this is the problem that we're going to face on Sinclair Road, let's have a speaker. It works over there.

Ms. Trucco: Okay, let us take a look into it and we can report back. Tricia are you alright with that?

Ms. Adams: Oh yes, and I agree 100%.

Ms. Trucco: With a closer look, there are really valid good points, and we may be able to do some rearranging.

Mr. Staley: In the meantime, can I propose that we trial the cones system? At least try something to show that we're not waiting another month to talk about this again.

Ms. Adams: That is a county road.

Mr. Greenstein: The question I would raise is if the cone system works or if implementing security procedure or what have you, if a protocol works, if it means we have to increase our security budget in order to provide for this kind of control. If this works, do we agree that there is no reason to consider making that entrance a resident only entrance?

Ms. Harley: No.

Mr. Greenstein: So, you agree that there is no reason?

Ms. Harley: No, I think there is a reason. I think ultimately there is a reason to do it and in the short term we're saying, "let's try this" to alleviate the problem that we have. But in the long term, I still think we need to address the problem.

Mr. Vargas: Every time we have an officer there moving traffic, it helps. A lot of times we have visitors trying to come in, which chokes up the traffic in that section. So, we have to find a way to make it quick for the homeowners.

Ms. Harley: Just of the residents who are here today, how many people have tried to access Sinclair Road gate and you have a nonresident block access until you go through that barrier?

Mr. Greenstein: We're not going to resolve this. We need to move forward with the MOT plan. Get the county to agree that we can control traffic on Sinclair Road, especially when the shovel goes in the road on I-4. We're trying to be responsive ahead of that disaster. Because it will be. It's going to really be a problem.

Mr. Burman: Is it fair to say that CDD property ends at our gate? And everything outside of Sinclair is county road? Do I understand that right?

Mr. Boyd: The county right of way starts at the turn.

Mr. Greenstein: At the lift station, right?

Mr. Boyd: Sinclair Road is a straight shot. And then Tradition T's into it.

Mr. Burman: So, we're not suggesting we're going to go on public roadway and try to flow traffic around.

Mr. Greenstein: We are.

Mr. Burman: Okay, well we can't do that without county approval.

Ms. Adams: Correct.

Mr. Staley: We have the county solution which Steve is pursuing, we have a temporary cone solution which I would like us to give Alan and Victor perhaps one member of this Board the ability to work together to get a temporary solution to test into place as soon as possible.

Mr. Burman: Restricted to Traditions Boulevard.

Mr. Staley: To basically keep the traffic separate but have the cones in place to make sure they stay in the appropriate lane. It may not be strictly in accordance with county rules, but it's only cones, we can always collect them up. And the third option is to see the legal question of whether or not we can have an automated gate at the Sinclair entrance. Those are the three things we can work on in parallel.

Ms. Trucco: The automated gate that you're proposing would be limited to residents only, is that what your proposition is?

Mr. Staley: I don't know what the solution would be, but the question of whether we have to have public access is the question.

Ms. Trucco: Understood. I just wanted to make sure.

Mr. Greenstein: One other thing I just want to point out, and it has to do with the lanes. When you make the turn off of Sinclair onto Tradition, because of the fact that the county narrowed it to one lane only, we have a dead zone. We covered up the hashmarks, there is a lane that is not being used is my point. Once you make the turn, you will see there is a hashmark dead zone.

Mr. Scheerer: That was a requirement in the county for us to widen the road past the lift station to the guardhouse.

Mr. Greenstein: Basically, because of that dead zone we're being squeezed in with the other traffic. The other traffic should be going through the dead zone. We should have an unfettered lane right from the turn. I think we need to go back out to that area and see what we can do within our control to stop people from getting blocked. I am waiting, and we will continue to discuss this in the three stage approach, but I want to hear the reasons personally why that gate should be tuned into an automated gate when it's the only entrance for people coming down from 429 or from other areas, and even though we can control it potentially what are the pros and cons of doing that? Because I think of a lot of cons, and I don't see too many pros. Other than make it easier for residents to get in.

Mr. Staley: I think Sharon said she would volunteer to work with Victor.

Mr. Greenstein: That would be great. I definitely want one of you to.

Mr. Staley: I think you're right, all the solutions have to have pros and cons.

Mr. Greenstein: We'll break the protocol, you have 30 seconds, Don.

Resident: we were told a couple of meetings ago that all we had to do is have one entrance available for the public to come into Reunion. That was the legal requirement. Why don't we put the residents first? Residents are complaining like hell trying to get into that back gate and let's make it residents only. Let's put the residents first. I've taken pictures of the backup all the way down to Sinclair Road and up Sinclair Road sometimes. And it has nothing to do with accidents, it has to do with people passing through here because I-4 is all blocked up and they trying to get through.

Mr. Greenstein: But it does have to do with traffic. I agree, you made your point. East and west are combined on this issue, but we need to get past the legal issue and we are going to do it in this three pronged way, then we're going to go forward. You have to evaluate what impact the change is going to have. And unless you have a dedicated que point after 532, you're going to have traffic out the ying-yang on 532 if everybody is being pushed to one gate. Multiple gates were built for a reason. It wasn't built so that we can have resident only, unfettered access. It was built because people come and go. We're going to look at this as a joint Reunion East/Reunion West subject, even though jurisdictionally legally the gate presides within Reunion West, and we need a legal opinion that we have options regarding what we have done up to this point.

Ms. Trucco: Because the roads in Reunion West are public and were made using bond funds, we have to have a public entrance.

Ms. Harley: Right, that I understand. That's why to me, even if it comes back that we have to, the precedent that has been set at Encore East shows that it can be done.

Ms. Adams: I know you made a comment a while back regarding the entrance that has what is called remote monitoring where people call a button. That does allow for public access.

Mr. Burman: But that doesn't really solve the problem for you. Every single member of the public cutting through to avoid I-4 just presses a button and says let me in and they breeze in. That doesn't really solve the problem.

Ms. Harley: People that are not registered as guests do try and go in there.

Mr. Burman: And they can get in.

Ms. Harley: Well, they don't let them.

Mr. Burman: If they get rejected it's against the law.

Ms. Adams: All they have to say is I want to come in and they are instructed that they have to provide access.

Ms. Harley: I understand that. Because that's the same here at Reunion, and we could never get away from that unless the roads are privatized at some point but it gives a deterrent. It's a huge deterrent, and that's the difference. I think with some of these questions, and we see that even by the guards. When I'm in that line to come into Sinclair I see so many people turn around and it's only because the guards are there, and they say "Why are you coming in?" and you see them turn.

Mr. Staley: I think the reason I asked for this to go on the agenda is to generate some intensity of action. That's what I'm trying to achieve. I think we're getting some intensity of

action. We've set up a three person working party to look at the options, the pros and cons. One of the things we'll have to wrestle with is, as Don said, residents only. What is a resident? Is a resident who is renting property for a week? Is he a resident? Or is she a resident? I don't know.

Mr. Greenstein: The definition of resident has to be anyone who has official business. Whether they are renting, it's a broader definition. It's not just the people whose domicile is within Reunion.

Mr. Staley: Then we're back into the access system. So, there are a lot of things to consider. All I want us to do is have this as a standard agenda item for the next, I'm not saying how many months, but until we find the answer.

Ms. Harley: And that would still be fine because official guests on the resort can have an access card.

Mr. Greenstein: Okay, we've spent a lot of time on this issue. One of the things that we have done, and it's still officially an open item, was the privatization of the roadways. This was one of the reasons why we brought up the potential of privatization of the roads and it was to be able to take control and to be in compliance with law. Officially, David, I am told that it's still an open item. Even though you as a member of the Master and in your role of the property management company Artemis, you've indicated that you believe they will not go in that direction. We were told in another meeting by Kingwood to keep it open.

Mr. Burman: What the Master Association decided is that they have no appetite to do it anytime in the foreseeable future. That's the Boards decision. Kingwood is looking at it from the they buy the roads aspect. And they control it just like the CDD does now. That's why they said to keep it open.

Mr. Greenstein: Okay, good clarification.

Mr. Burman: Kingwood is mulling the idea of them buying the roads and them becoming the owner of the roads and all of this discussion goes away, and it all falls to them.

Mr. Greenstein: Thank you for the clarification, it's important. I think the approach we're taking now is the right one. We'll find a way to have this item discussed kind of in a joint fashion as we did with the parking so we can avoid frustrated east members sitting in the seats trying to get their points across at the meeting. Hopefully we can do it in a joint fashion in the future. As a chairman on both east and west, I see these issues, and this is one that's clearly a joint issue. So, we'll deal with it. Thanks everyone.

Ms. Adams: Thank you, that was a robust discussion.

B. Parking Violation Enforcement

Ms. Adams: Parking violation enforcement is the next topic. I will note that further down on your agenda under Tab D we do have a security report that has been provided by the director of Reunion Security, Victor Vargas, that is included in your agenda packet. Board members also had security information for the month mailed out under separate cover for informational purposes only. The Board has a keen interest in the parking enforcement and towing information because the District has adopted rules and the rules allow for the issuance of parking violation notices as well as security directing the towing of vehicles. This was at a request from Supervisor Staley. Would you like to introduce this item?

Mr. Staley: Sure would. Again, this is in general terms, I think that the one sided parking is working. It's a pleasure to drive down the streets now to be honest. You can actually get down the streets and I think it's safer for emergency vehicles. I did notice though in Victor's report that there were 274 parking violations in May, and I think I am right in saying that there were zero towed vehicles.

Mr. Vargas: In May there were two towed vehicles.

Mr. Staley: I don't know what the right percentage is and I'm not looking to tow vehicles for the sake of towing vehicles. I just wondered if there were more opportunities to tow vehicles to send a signal. Or whether or not 2 out of 274 is the correct number. If it is the correct number, it's because people are abiding by the rules once you've warned them. That's good. So, that's the first comment. The second comment is, I'm still confused as to whether we care about people parking on sidewalks or not. I see it all the time. People park on sidewalks, they block the sidewalk. I've heard the argument about there's nowhere to go because the sidewalks aren't completed. Either we allow parking on the sidewalks, or we don't. So that's the second issue. The same, and it's a more difficult one, is the blocking of driveways. We know that happens. We've got several examples of that. Again, either we care or we don't. Obviously, I think we do care. I've seen Victor's people moving them away. I just want to confirm that we're going to stop people from blocking driveways. The difficult one, which I think we're still waiting for legal input on, is can you park on the apron. Parallel to the road on the apron. I don't know if that's allowed or not. And I don't suppose Victor's people know if it's allowed or not. So, we have to give Victor guidance. Either it's allowed or it's not allowed. So that may be some homework for the next meeting. The final point is one Victor and I spent many hours working on in May. One particular resident is unfortunate enough to live opposite a home which advertises 11 bedrooms

and accommodations for 26 to 32 people. It has two car parking spaces because the garage has been converted into a gymnasium. Two car parking spaces, and at any point there can be anywhere between ten or more cars trying to park next to that home. This particular home has a particular dangerous location on the curve. It doesn't matter where it is, it's irrelevant, but Victor and I tried to work on a solution for this type of situation were people, despite being told five times over the course of two days to move their vehicles, they continue to do it and got smart about just moving different vehicles into the illegal spot. So that the normal system of yellow sticker and blue sticker didn't work. So, Victor agreed he would try a system whereby he knocks on the door twice for that house and tells them no third warning, the next time I have to come here the car goes. It doesn't matter if it's been warned or not, that car goes. Again, I'd love some feedback from Victor on whether he thinks that's a good idea because we may have to apply that policy elsewhere. And linked to that is this particular property, two spaces are clearly not enough got 11 bedrooms. In fact, the architecture review Board has their own grid. And I know I circulated this back in April, but I'll send it to the Board again because I would like to remind everybody that we have a grid here that says that that particular house should have eight car parking spaces. Now, two of those are the garage, we'll have to probably forget those because that's a gymnasium, but nevertheless there should have been six spaces outside that house for that particular location. I understand this house is one of very very few that were grandfathered back in 2015 when these rules were set up. I would just like to say and request respectfully to David and Mark who I believe sit on the ACB, this needs to be followed religiously.

Mr. Burman: It is.

Mr. Staley: I don't know how many more are going to be grandfathered, but just imagine. We heard from Mr. Dowling about the parking issues. If we fill out all of these homes with ten or eleven bedrooms, there is no way in the world that you will ever solve the parking problem unless the front of those homes is devoted to more parking. So, it's a plea from me as a CDD Board member to the ACB to really strictly adhere to this. I know you say you do but this is going to become increasingly more important as we fill out the vacant lots around Reunion West in particular.

Mr. Burman: The way grandfather works is when a house has been approved, we can't retract the approval. Once they are grandfathered in, there is no future grandfathers. The ones that predate the rule are grandfathered in so we can't go back and make them add more parking spaces. We don't have the right to do that. It's the first thing the architect looks at. He doesn't even look

at the house until he looks at the site plan. Then the house has to change if the site plan doesn't meet the parking restriction. And most houses we don't even count the inside parking garages, we only count outside spaces. There are some that there is just no option. Some we anticipate there is going to be some other use of the garage because, you probably know Sharon, owners don't give renters a key to the garage. As to the first point, the towing as to what the percentage should be, I don't want to use towing as an arbitrary measure of success. Your very first sentence you said was that it was such a pleasure to drive down the street. That's a success to me. I don't care if they towed no cars or 50 cars, if it's a pleasure now to drive down the streets, let's leave it at that. Until we have to do something else. I don't want to get into the image here of we're the ones trying to increase our towing numbers.

Mr. Staley: No, I'm not trying to increase the towing numbers, I just see a lot of illegally parked vehicles still. At any point and time, you can drive around and cars are parked illegally. It was really a question to Victor. Does he feel he's got all the ammunition he needs to deal with those violations? Or does he need other tools, resources, or whatever.

Mr. Vargas: I think right now we're good. When you divide that per day, it's coming out to maybe nine tickets per day. Even though they move the vehicle, they still have to load that information into the system, and we keep a record of that. I think it's good.

Mr. Staley: Okay. I'm not looking to tow vehicles just for the sake of it. I just want to make sure you've got the tools you need.

Mr. Vargas: Honestly, when it comes to towing a vehicle, we always try to give an opportunity to the person to move the vehicle. If they refuse, then we just tow it right away. I don't like to tow vehicles, but if we have to we will.

Mr. Staley: And to David's point, I understand that these laws have been in place since 2014. So, in theory, we should be past all the grandfathers by now, one would hope.

Mr. Burman: For about seven years.

Mr. Greenstein: I was under the impression that the rules were in effect prior to that.

Mr. Burman: No. End of 2014, enforced beginning in 2015. We had never had an 11 bedroom house until about then.

Mr. Greenstein: All I know is, the Master Association through its covenance and architectural guidelines, had parking control in place before the county codified it. You shouldn't see ever an 11 bedroom house. It's frustrating to me that it only has two parking spaces. And the fact that we had it grandfathered, if that's the case. I'm assuming you're accurate.

Mr. Staley: Nancy Derrick told me that was the case because she didn't believe it either.

Mr. Greenstein: Getting back to parking stuff that we do have some control over. It's clear and there is no legal opinion needed relative to parking or blocking the sidewalk. We already went through this, we pulled out the statute, it's a violation of state law to block a sidewalk. But the only entity that can do anything about it legally, unless we discuss some other possibilities, which is outside our scope, is law enforcement. We don't have any law enforcement to invoke fines or penalties or anything when it comes to blocking a sidewalk. If you look at the statute for blocking a sidewalk, it is something that you can get a ticket for. But you have to interest Osceola County to spend resources to give out tickets for people who block sidewalks.

Mr. Staley: Victor, are your patrols knocking on doors when a car is blocking the sidewalk?

Mr. Vargas: Yes, we do. A lot of time they don't move the vehicle. I even reach out to the sheriff department and we don't get any help.

Mr. Staley: I understand that, but you are knocking on doors?

Mr. Vargas: A lot of times we put notes on the vehicle to let them know that it's not allowed.

Ms. Harley: Some of them are just lazy. The guests are just lazy. That driveway fits six cars, but they choose to put two in the middle of the driveway and then park the third one on the lawn.

Mr. Staley: Mr. Dowling's letter talked about building a parking lot on parcel #1. I don't know if we're going to discuss that or not at some point but some people are lazy people will not even walk 50 yards to park legally. They're not going to walk 200 yards to park in a designated parking lot. It's just a fact of life. His people have done a tremendous job trying to keep it clean.

Mr. Greenstein: I've got the documentation and we've discussed it at prior meetings, so I am comfortable in saying this that it is a violation of Florida Statute to park a vehicle and block a sidewalk blocking pedestrian traffic. Absolute fact. Osceola County Sheriff could ticket that vehicle if they cared to do so. In a similar fashion, I know for a fact that the bedroom to parking space count thing is codified in Osceola County code and yet our covenants address it as well. What I guess I'm saying is, could covenants be adopted to prohibit the specific behaviors that we are seeing? Parking on the apron, parking on the sidewalk, impeding and interfering with one's peaceful enjoyment of their own property. Out of community interest, could the Master be the one to actually put some teeth into it?

Mr. Burman: The Master Association, everybody's individual lot is covered by the Master Association and it ends at the right-of-way to the CDD. The HOA can technically say we're going to set a rule and say no more parking in the street, but we can only enforce against the people whose names are on the deed. There is no remedy against the guest. It doesn't really work. Once you get past the boundary where the Association has control and some other entity has control, the rights almost diminish. It would be very very difficult.

Mr. Greenstein: And that's why I'm saying that neutral zone, we've done some administrative things to make residents responsible for the apron. The apron is not platted to you. It's not on your property plan. It's not part of your lot. Yet you are responsible for maintaining that apron. If you had a big crack and someone walked on it and fell, you'd be the one sued. It would be your insurance policy they would be banging up against. I think a lot of these behaviors have to do with peaceful enjoyment of one's property with safety and the overall look. I mean, I don't want to use any examples, but it's atrocious to me personally to see vehicles spewed across roadways and on driveways and on vacant lots. It's like a Woodstock kind of feel for me and it's out of control. I think we know what the rules are, and we know who need to enforce those rules, but we can't get anywhere because it's not high on the pecking order for the Osceola County Sheriff to come in and give tickets.

Ms. Harley: I think it also needs to be expected that at this moment in time these particular issues are highlighted purely because we only have a domestic market coming into the Resort right now. Normally if we had international market as well, you're going to have people picking up a 15 person minibus. You would have maybe two vehicles on that driveway. Right now, we're only having domestic market so we're probably getting eight vehicles coming from all over. Once international resumes, I do think you'll see this problem diminish. It's not going to go away; it's never going to go away because we're always going to have some domestic market. But it's not going to be as huge as it is right now.

Mr. Staley: I think that's right. I think the property management companies make it clear that parking is limited. And you mustn't park on the roads. I think we can find a way of asking the property management companies to reemphasize that. But I think also something for the ACB to consider is, for me I am naive, a garage is a garage. It's not an amusement arcade, it's not a gymnasium. Do you have the authority to say this is a garage, you cannot convert it?

Mr. Burman: We don't. We can't control the inside of the house. The county has some control of the conversion. They have the same limitations that we would, and they can't walk up

and peer through the windows and try to prove what's going on. Nor would they if they had the right. It's a challenge and why we consider the garage not really being a parking space.

Ms. Harley: And that's where you'll find more and more now, even with construction, they will put the doorway in the garage, they will put a window in the garage with the full intent to use the space. Talking now not as a Board member but as a property manager for short term rentals it's a wasted space as a garage and it will serve far more revenue when it's converted into something else. That's why they do it.

Mr. Staley: To clarify, you do not consider the garage for the purposes of this matrix?

Mr. Burman: No, not like you just said. There's consideration of the garages as a non-parking space on lots depending on how the house's outhouse site plan looks. I'll have to have the architect speak to that, but it's not a rule that says we disregard all the garages.

Mr. Greenstein: If it's a four bedroom house we're not going to have a parking problem. But basically, you look at the garage like on Liberty Bluff, it's a narrow small lot, two in the garage and two on the driveway. When you get the big builds, and the point I really want to make here is that this guide that we use for new builds, what the county has now have to code for a permit, is all well and good if you would have only those numbers. One car per bedroom kind of thing. This is number of cars per bedroom. When a house is ten bedrooms but sleeps 35 or 25 or any other large number, you're going to get a lot more vehicles. And we'll get submissions that show ten parking spaces, but the number of occupants there, because they are traveling locally, it's a family reunion or whatever they may have 15 or 20 cars. So, that particular metric that we use is insufficient.

Mr. Staley: What we can do is keep making sure Victor has all the tools he needs. Make sure the ACB is totally on top of this. Make sure the property management companies are doing what they can do to advise people not to bring a fleet of vehicles. Because it's on a 35-foot lot, come on guys, how many cars can you get on a 35-foot lot? That's all we can do.

Mr. Greenstein: Again, it's a parking violation. It's not viewed, whether it's done through community watch or whether it's done through Victor at security, on the pecking order it's a low priority item. I heard what Supervisor Staley said about towing. Towing has to be an approach that forces compliance. It really is voluntary compliance in a sense. But if they don't see that there are some serious outcomes as a result of their behavior, they are just going to continue to behave the way they are. Again, I know David you clarified for us what Graham was saying about the towing and everything, but we're so limited on all these other violations because we don't have

the authority to enforce the rules. Which is why I ask whether or not going down the Master road from a convenience standpoint could at all help us.

Mr. Burman: And I'll look at that because when a car is on a sidewalk it's partly on the lot and partly off the lot. So, there's a grey area there and we'll try to figure that out.

Mr. Greenstein: And then, the other point and then I'll let it go. All I know is we have lots of things in the covenants as homeowners, as property owners that we have to adhere to. Whether it's a roof that looks really dirty or trash cans that sit out all day or any of the other rules we have. The infamous fines committee. That is something that the Master has power over and that's why I was looking along the lines of that venue being the one to get people to wake up and just park across the street. We have parking spaces on one side. There are parking spaces. They have to be willing to cross the street and park on the other side. And we'll annoy the heck out of them until they get it right. And that's basically what it is.

Mr. Staley: I just would like to say thank you to Victor because I know how his team is. I've spoken to a lot of them for a long time. Thank you for what you're doing. Keep up the good work.

Mr. Vargas: Thank you.

Ms. Adams: Alright. Moving on in the agenda we're down to staff reports. Attorney?

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Staff Reports

A. Attorney

Ms. Trucco: Right now, the only updates we have is that the TECO easement agreement sent comments to opposing counsel. They're reviewing those and as soon as we get those back, we will be able to finalize. Hopefully we'll have that by the next Board meeting. The only other update is the completion certificate for the series 2015, 2016 and 2017 bonds. We have completed those. We've sent them to the District engineer. Those certificates are required under the bond indenture documents for each series of bonds. We will have a resolution formally adopting and approving those completion certificates for you all at the next board meeting. I also have on our to do list that we will do some research into the resident only entrance that we discussed today. Otherwise, I have no updates for the Board today, thanks.

B. Engineer

Mr. Boyd: I don't have anything in addition to what we have already talked about.

Ms. Adams: Alrighty.

C. District Manager's Report**i. Action Items List**

Ms. Adams: Included in your agenda packet is the action item list for Reunion East and Reunion West CDD. Many of these items have been touched on in regard to various ongoing projects. I don't have any additional notes in addition to what was included in the agenda packet, but happy to answer any questions that Board members may have or if you want to have anything on the record for discussion, I'm happy to lead that.

Mr. Staley: I know we've mentioned Mr. Dowling's letter. I presume no one has any comments on that. I know I go by the survey results where parking was rejected by 75% of the people who responded, and the outdoor fitness was supported by 65% of the people. So, I have no further suggestions on what we do with parcel 1. I assume the rest of the Board is in agreement with that.

Mr. Greenstein: I am.

Mr. Burman: Yeah, I love the idea of extra parking, but I don't think it's going to solve anything.

Ms. Harley: I'm not in agreement.

Mr. Staley: I understand what Sharron is saying but Mr. Dowling himself says he thinks he could put 25 cars onto that, honestly after the conversation we've had about people with ten vehicles. 25 cars will look after four or five homes probably. What about the people around that parking lot? It would just be a nightmare for them.

Mr. Burman: And really, you can't. Most of the space in a parking lot is in grass. You might get five or six or ten. Somewhere in that ballpark, but it won't be 20.

Mr. Staley: And I don't think people will walk 100 yards. They won't walk 50 at the moment. We know that. I appreciate it and I understand his prospective. He owns a lot of lots around that particular parcel of land, it would obviously be of value to his lots to have that parking, but I think everything we talked about before suggests we are making the right decision.

Ms. Harley: Really if you took the number of owners on the CDD west and you actually said how many of those responded, the percentage would be very small.

Mr. Burman: They always are.

Mr. Staley: That's unfortunate that they have their opportunity to speak up. There were in that particular survey, if you exclude Wyndham who had like 241 votes, there were 367 responses. That's significant.

Ms. Harley: How many owners have you got on the CDD west?

Mr. Staley: Presumably they are owners. No one else would be able to respond.

Ms. Adams: Yes, and Board members, you might recall that we did receive some input under separate cover outside of electronic responses including one from Mr. Dowling and that response was extrapolated based on lot ownership and factored into the results.

Mr. Staley: I just want to make sure we did justice to Mr. Dowling's letter.

Ms. Adams: Any other comments regarding the action item list? Questions? Comments?

ii. Approval of Check Register

Ms. Adams: Included in Tab 2 of your agenda packet is a check register for May 1st through May 31st, 2021.

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: The next item in your agenda packet is for informational purposes only. No Board action is required. These are your unaudited financials through April 30th. It is probably notable that this information you have already reviewed in your proposed budget as your proposed budget was updated to include this data as well.

D. Security Report

i. Parking Violations and Towing Reports

Ms. Adams: We also have on the agenda the parking violations and towing report. We've already had discussion regarding this matter. Unless there is any further comment from Victor regarding any security reports. If not, we're down to other business and supervisor's requests.

Mr. Staley: Could I ask Victor; do you have the same information for Encore and Reunion?

Mr. Vargas: No.

Mr. Staley: You don't?

Ms. Adams: It may be notable that Reunion security will be starting to assume security operations for Encore at Reunion West imminently, so there is that transition. Keep in mind until there is additional Board action, they would not have the ability to issue warnings or enforce with towing, but they are assuming security operations. In terms of what will be included in the data that they provide, that will be contingent on future board action.

Mr. Staley: On that subject, we should ask the POA to come back with a final deliberation. Because if you think about it we made a decision to move forward with one-sided parking and we were asked to delay while they monitored the situation.

Ms. Adams: Just to summarize that in executive summary, they requested that all street parking is restricted the Board was concerned that that was overly restricted and would not allow sufficient parking for visitors and guests. This Board adopted rules that are consistent with the other parts of Reunion and the POA has asked that this Board not take any further action as they determine what need there is for signage and parking restrictions and operations is monitoring the situations in terms of free flow of traffic and the ability for emergency vehicles to access the streets.

Mr. Burman: The Board election is in November, and I wouldn't expect any sort of answer before that.

Mr. Greenstein: I know we basically try to give them a 30-day turn around on that when saying we wanted their plan for this meeting. It is an expenditure putting in the signs. I guess if there was an overarching emergency safety issue that was brought to our attention, I would probably say that we gave them the time and they didn't respond so were going to go ahead and implement. However, absent the emergency safety approach since it is a significant expense, I think we should hold off. I think we should go back to them in writing and tell them that we need their plan. We gave them 30 additional days, they failed to respond.

Ms. Adams: Well, just so the Board members are aware, they have made contact with district management staff and have enquired to get legal confirmation regarding the signage requirements for no towing. I think they have concerns about the beauty of the community in addition to their concerns about public safety issues. I advised the Board that the implementation of the signs is on hold and that we're currently monitoring the situation. If we want to expedite action, I'm happy to do so. But at this time, I did tell them it was on hold.

Mr. Greenstein: I don't want to turn this into an indefinite thing, and it just marches on. Now, you're saying there's going to be an election?

Mr. Burman: Right now, their position is that they believe everything is status quo, nothing is going to happen at Reunion West, and they are fine with that. That's their opinion right now. I don't think there is any reason to tweak them. We don't have any need to go in there, right? We don't feel like have to.

Ms. Harley: The biggest problem they have in Encore, and I have told, because they have a security committee that has one of the Boards on that committee and I've met with them several times. The biggest problem they have is that they don't have proactive security in there currently. So I think when Victor and his team go in there that's going to make a huge difference.

Mr. Greenstein: We will reevaluate based upon the changes.

Ms. Adams: Give Reunion security an opportunity to go in and evaluate, provide additional feedback about parking needs, and in the meantime the rule is place and the next step to move forward would be to install the signage and amend the agreement with Reunion security through the POA and then to amend the agreement with Bolton's Towing as well.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Other Business

Ms. Harley: Can I just raise one issue? Nothing related to the parking or anything. I know we had an incident in the Reunion waterpark last week. Which thankfully the child was fine. But the numbers in Central Florida and Osceola County of children drowning is increasing week by week. On all the CDD owned pools, are we absolutely 100% sure we've got all the correct signage and all the correct access and everything to those pools?

Ms. Adams: Yes, I can defer to Alan on that, but these pools are in compliance with public codes for public pools and in addition to that they are subject to routine inspections from the health department that ensure compliance with said rules.

Ms. Burman: The problem is the momentary thing like you mentioned, somebody props the gate open and then some toddler walks in because the gate is open. But how do you control that 24/7? It would have to be a self-closing gate.

Ms. Harley: The same as the waterpark incident, you have to have parents that actually take the responsibility of supervision. It's the same in the homes. We're beating it in all of our homes right now to make sure we've got as many things in place as possible. So, I just wanted to make sure we've got no problems on any of the CDD pools.

Ms. Adams: Yes, they are all current and in compliance with code.

Mr. Scheerer: New permits were just issued. We had all the life rings checked for code. Emergency phones. The latches were in place until we make the switch. They keycard will be in place until we make the switch to the modified gates, but we are in total compliance, and we have seven day a week service, not only from janitorial but from the pool company. They are really good to report anything that's needing to be corrected.

Ms. Adams: And just so this Board is aware, the emergency phones are not a requirement from any State of Florida for public pools, in the past the Board had made a decision and Reunion East top go above and beyond and to provide these emergency phones which provide emergency rescue instructions in addition to dispatching emergency services if they are utilized.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Supervisor's Requests

Ms. Adams: Any other supervisor's requests?

Mr. Staley: I have one request. At the budget workshop a couple of weeks ago, I asked if there was any upcoming expenditure needed on the Whitemarsh Way area where the cul-de-sac is. At the moment we didn't see any need because we weren't aware of any development, but I'm pleased to find out that I think Kingwood Orlando Reunion Development, LLC, are well down the road in trying to get a permit to build homes in that cul-de-sac area and to change the shape of the road. So obviously, there will be some need to get involved somewhere along the line in whatever we have to do. I have no idea if that's a bond issue for development or whatever, but I just wanted to let you know that's looking as if it's moving forward and I find it very interesting that there are going to be some homes down there. And I have to say, it looks like there are provisions to parking.

Mr. Harley: I was just going to say, make sure they follow that matrix.

Mr. Staley: So, that's a thing for information, just keep our eyes on that, Alan and Tricia.

Mr. Scheerer: Yes, sir.

Mr. Staley: And the one request is a lot of people think parking is our biggest issue in Reunion. Personally, I think trash is a bigger issue. I know we tell people who ask questions about trash that we're not responsible for trash it's the HOA. But when you see trash cans lying in the road, when you see liter all over the road, when you see that dirt and smell that comes from trash lying in the road, I think that becomes something that we should be concerned about. I know we can't do anything directly but some of you, perhaps David, can think about, what can the CDD do to help in the battle against trash because it is getting worse. I'm sorry if no one agrees with me. You just have to drive around on a Sunday morning. In theory on a Sunday morning there shouldn't be a trash can in sight. You drive around on a Sunday morning and it's overflowing all over the place. So, David, if there is anything we can do. If you need us to spend some money. If that's allowed.

Ms. Adams: No, it's not allowed.

Mr. Staley: There has got to be a way we can deal with trash. Mr. Witcher had an issue this week. It was disgusting what was going on next door to his home.

Mr. Burman: And the racoons.

Mr. Staley: I drove down Muirfield Loop one Sunday morning at 9:00 in the morning. In the theory no trash can should be on the street according to our rules. They were all over the place. Bulging with litter and it was on the floor. We have to be able to do something as the CDD instead of just passing the message onto David. So, give some thought to it David and perhaps next month what can we do to help? What can we do to help solve the problem?

Mr. Burman: That is tough and Don's on that committee and he knows how many fines we levy every single month for that sort of stuff. And there was a long period where it was really bad, and we got the committee together and started paying extra special attention to it. It got much better but admittedly I think it's getting worse now. I don't know why it is, I'm sure there is going to be another travel boom coming up when international markets open up and it's only going to get worse and worse and worse.

Mr. Staley: Just like people will park illegally just because they are lazy, people will throw trash on the street just because they are lazy and they won't bother with it. Maybe we have to hire a constant roving trash taxi.

Mr. Burman: That has been a solution on our radar for ten years. But it's an expensive proposition. And every time we have brought it up so far, the members and the Board were against spending the kind of money it takes.

Mr. Staley: I have lived here 15 years and I've never been asked if I would contribute to a trash taxi.

Mr. Burman: There have been surveys. You're probably a part of that small percentage that didn't respond to the survey. That survey was do you want to spend an extra \$25 a month on roving trash taxi and the answer was an overwhelming no.

Mr. Staley: Can we put it on the agenda for the next meeting, please? To talk about this.

Ms. Adams: It's not a CDD matter.

Mr. Staley: So, we're going to just ignore it?

Ms. Adams: It's not a CDD matter. Just like we wouldn't put anything for Osceola County on the agenda or anything for Resort business in the agenda.

Mr. Staley: When trash is lying in the street and we're responsible for the streets?

Ms. Adams: If it's on the CDD road that does become a CDD matter.

Mr. Staley: That's my point. So maybe, and I know I'm being extreme here just to make a point, maybe we have to have a truck that drives 24/7 picking up trash off the road.

Ms. Adams: And that's not a part of the proposed budget.

Mr. Staley: We have to do something. I know it's not part of our proposed budget, but I hate telling residents who ask me what we're doing about the trash that it's not our problem. Nothing happens.

Mr. Burman: That's not true.

Ms. Staley: Well, you can't fine them. Can you fine them as soon as you send a photograph?

Mr. Burman: Yes.

Mr. Scheerer: They get a letter immediately.

Mr. Burman: A letter and a fine.

Mr. Staley: Is that fine the \$1,000 maximum?

Mr. Burman: No, it's per day. Limited by \$100 per day and a maximum of \$1,000.

Mr. Staley: So, that isn't deterring people. We think we're solving the problem, do we?

Mr. Greenstein: Graham, these are the kinds of issues that we really should be having at a town hall. We're tied. We cannot spend funds for trash. I know you are making a connection where if it's in the street and since we manage the roadways then yeah, we can probably pay for Alan's folks to have brooms or some other to pick up. But again, we still go back to the source of the trash. If we know it's coming from a particular resident, that's what you have to stop.

Ms. Harley: There's something you need to understand as well, the larger homes the county issued the new cans, and they only allowed a maximum of two cans. So, if you have that 11 bedroom house that sleeps 30 people they are only allowed to have two trash cans. They are no permitted to have anymore.

Mr. Greenstein: So how are they getting rid of the trash?

Ms. Harley: We're paying privately. Obviously, it's not on the exact same schedule as the county. Depending on how busy the resort is, depends on how long it takes them to get around to do it.

Mr. Burman: So, equity is not an issue. I'm glad you brought that up. Don doesn't rent his house; he shouldn't need five garbage cans. Should he have to pay for the 11 bedrooms?

Ms. Harley: But my thing is, I would pay for more trashcans for the larger homes. If we were allowed to do that I would definitely do it. We're always going to have the trash problem. The problem that you have is that not everyone is going to manage it the same.

Mr. Burman: The other problem the HOA has is opening up the spicket. One of the condos did this. They took an assessment, we have six or seven owners who leave their trash out, let's just get the guy to go pick it up. When people figured out, they were picking up the six or seven, all of a sudden there were 300 every day. So, it wasn't a \$100 a day problem anymore, now it's a \$5,000 a day problem.

Ms. Harley: And I know this is not CDD business, but for me one of the solutions might be that if the resorts through the HOA if we could have an additional dumpster somewhere and the property managers pay for that dumpster. It's the location that we would need.

Mr. Burman: We've talked to Kingwood about giving us spaces for a compactor. We're trying to accommodate that.

Mr. Greenstein: As soon as you made that comment, I'm thinking about the dump at the dumpsters is currently every day, probably before 9:00 in the morning they are overflowing. I think we have overnight people that do it at night and that dump all kinds of stuff over there. But this is CDD not Master or HOA, but I would recommend because it keeps coming up and we keep spending time discussing these issues, we're really hamstrung on how we can resolve a lot of them. But we need a true town hall. A true town hall held by the Master in anticipation, and prior to budget year, we're only required once a year to have a meeting, but I think the community needs a town hall type meeting where the common problems are addressed. Because you want to get a sense of what the community wants and what they are willing to do.

Mr. Burman: Kingwood doesn't mind if we do it. We've done that before as Kingwood controlled the association. The problem is it's not going to resolve a problem in a town hall. I'm all for having it. We've done it before. We'll do it again, that's all fine. And everybody who's a stake holder can be in attendance to that. But to say we're going to resolve the problem of trash at a town hall.

Mr. Staley: I agree with that. We have to have working bodies that work on these problems. All I am saying is that the CDD can help support you if that's necessary.

Mr. Greenstein: And we can present potential solutions and what the price tags of those solutions are and how they worked elsewhere or not worked elsewhere. We spin our wheels talking about it. From the day we moved in in 2003 we've had trash problems.

Mr. Staley: I'm sure the staff is tearing their hair out saying this has nothing to do with the CDD, but we are a group that I'd like to think we are action orientated. We have an issue with trash. So, if we can put our collective thoughts together, to help the HOA, the Master to find solutions, please bounce ideas off us. I know we can't agenda it for next time, but don't be surprised if I bring up trash for any other business.

Ms. Adams: There's always supervisor's requests.

Mr. Staley: We have to solve this problem because it's disgusting. I feel sorry for the renters that come here for the first time and trash is on their driveway when they arrive. It's not the sort of thing you want to see when you arrive at a top resort. Enough said. Let's see if we can work together to find some solutions.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Next Meeting Date

Ms. Adams: Our next meeting date is July 8, 2021 at 11:30 a.m. Do we have a motion to adjourn?

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Adjournment

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

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


Secretary/Assistant Secretary


Chairman/Vice Chairman