

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, July 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  
David Burman  
Michael Manke *by phone*  
Sharon Harley  
Graham Staley

Chairman  
Vice Chairman  
Assistant Secretary  
Assistant Secretary  
Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

Tricia Adams  
Kristen Trucco  
Xabier Guerricagoita  
Alan Scheerer  
Victor Vargas  
Mike Smith

District Manager  
District Counsel  
Boyd Civil Engineering  
Field Operations Manager  
Reunion Security  
Yellowstone Landscape

**FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Roll Call**

Ms. Adams called the meeting to order at 11:30 a.m. and called the roll. Four Board members were present in person and one via phone constituting a quorum.

**SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Public Comment Period**

Ms. Adams: The first item for the agenda is the public comment period. Are there any members of the public who would like to make a comment to the Board of Supervisors? Board members, just so you're aware, we do have some public callers on the line today, so we will check in with them to see if they have any public comments to make. Any callers that would like to make a public comment, this is your opportunity to do so. Hearing none,

**THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Approval of the Minutes of the June 10, 2021 Meeting and the April 8, 2021 Continued Meeting**

Ms. Adams: The next item on the agenda is the approval of the June 10, 2021 Board of Supervisor's meeting and then we also have the minutes from the April 8<sup>th</sup> continued meeting for the Board to consider. I have received some corrections via email from Supervisor Staley. Are there any other comments or corrections for the meeting minutes? We can take these as a slate. Do we have a motion to approve?

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein, seconded by Mr. Burman, with all in favor, the Minutes of the June 10, 2021 Meeting and the April 8, 2021 Continued Meeting, were approved as amended.

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

#### **Consideration of Resolutions**

**A. 2021-08 Declaring the Series 2015 Project Complete**

**B. 2021-09 Declaring the Series 2016 Project Complete**

**C. 2021-10 Declaring the Series 2017 Project Complete**

Ms. Adams: The next item on the agenda is consideration of several resolutions declaring different series construction funds complete. This is related to development in Reunion West CDD. When the bonds were issued, there was an Engineer's Report that defined the eligible improvements. In order for the trustee to close out the construction fund there needs to be a declaration of the series being complete. We can take these as a slate, and Kristen has been working on the resolutions to accompany these series of completions that the District Engineer has reviewed and signed. Kristen, did you have any remarks?

Ms. Trucco: No, I think you have covered it mostly. I will say, this is a requirement under the initial bond documents included in the indenture that the engineer certified that the 2015, 2016 and 2017 projects that were constructed using each of those series bond funds are completed. The District Engineer has certified that in fact those projects are complete. So, these are resolutions approving the completion of each of those series.

Ms. Adams: So, we have Resolution 2021-08, 2021-09, and 2021-10 for the Series 2015, 2016, and 2017. Are there any comments or questions?

Mr. Staley: Just clarification for myself, on the first one, the 2015, says that the expenditures are in excess of \$4,285,000.

Ms. Adams: That's often the case. There are typically developer contributions that are recognized as part of the development process.

Mr. Burman: Which are separate and above the indenture?

Ms. Trucco: Correct, and that one is specified too in the indenture. Part of the requirement is that we state that the expenses were above that amount.

Mr. Staley: The other question I had refers to the Engineer's certificate. There's a total of \$24.4 million. I couldn't figure out what that had to do with anything.

Ms. Trucco: I'm sorry, which one are we looking at?

Mr. Staley: On the Engineer's certificate, after the 2015 bond. The fourth or fifth page of the Engineer's certificate.

Ms. Trucco: Yes, that's correct. That's the amount of cost that was listed in the Engineer's Cost Report as a total cost for the project.

Mr. Staley: Which covers all three of these bonds?

Ms. Trucco: It covers Phase 1 and 2 in table 2B of the Engineer's Cost Report. Which we'd have to go back and look at, but that's Phase 1 and 2; the total cost of development.

Mr. Greenstein: It does seem to be extraneous information. It's aggregated for the whole project.

Ms. Adams: Typically, you'll see that the eligible costs are much higher than what the bonds are actually issued for. That's not uncommon.

Ms. Trucco: This is just the engineer certifying that the 2015 project that is set forth in his Engineer's Report is complete. That is what is required under the indenture.

Mr. Staley: Fair enough.

Ms. Adams: Do we have a motion to approve?

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein, seconded by Ms. Harley, with all in favor, Resolution 2021-08 Declaring the Series 2015 Project Complete, Resolution 2021-09 Declaring the Series 2016 Project Complete, and Resolution 2021-10 Declaring the Series 2017 Project Complete, were approved.

## **FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

### **Discussion Items**

#### **A. Discussion of Sinclair Entrance (Request by Supervisor Staley)**

Ms. Adams: We do have some discussion items that were requested to be added to the agenda. One of the items has been an ongoing discussion regarding how to provide relief for residents who want expedited entry, or the easiest entry possible, when using that Sinclair entrance. The Board has been considering various options. Security has also implemented some additional staffing measures in order to expedite traffic to the best extent possible. We all understand that there are certain times of the week and days that the traffic is exacerbated. This traffic is being caused by people checking in, people returning from work and by heavy traffic on nearby roads. If there is an accident nearby, when visitor traffic is routed to the Sinclair Gate, it

becomes an untenable situation at the Sinclair gate for residents. The District Engineer has been interfacing with Osceola County in terms of an emergency MOT, or maintenance of traffic plan, out on the County road in order to better separate the traffic between visitors and residents. The goal of this being to expedite resident entry to the best extent possible. Steve is not here today but his colleague Xabier has joined us. Xabier is going to provide a report to the Board regarding the communication with Osceola County.

Mr. Guerricagoita: Thank you. For the record, I am Xabier Guerricagoita with Boyd Civil Engineering, District Engineer. Steve has been in contact with Osceola County about this. Our main contact with the County has left. He has resigned from the County. We are in a transitional period and are trying to find the right person to help us get this expedited. It's in process. Steve has made several communications with the County, but because our main contact is no longer there, we are trying to find out who the right person is that can get this pushed through.

Ms. Adams: Alright.

Mr. Staley: That's not really satisfactory, to be honest.

Ms. Adams: I have been copied on communication between the District Engineer and County staff. I have seen that he has earnestly been reaching out to have an audience with the County. I wasn't sure of the results of that.

Mr. Guerricagoita: We're trying to get in front of the right person to help us resolve this matter. Steve has been in communication with the County and trying to get this expedited because we know how urgent it is.

Mr. Greenstein: The flipside of this particular situation is that maybe it gives us some latitude to try to forge ahead with some testing or temporary evaluation of what our plan would be like and see where it takes us.

Mr. Staley: We agreed last meeting to do three things. Follow up with the County to get this emergency authority. We said we'd also try a temporary solution with cones to see if we could separate the traffic lower down toward the curve, which would require some additional staff to do that and to supervise it at peak times. The third thing was to figure out if it is legal to put a gate there that is accessed only by card or transponder. Those were the three action items. Could we talk about the first one? Can we try a solution with temporary cones? We talked about this in great detail last meeting. That's why it gets so frustrating. We talked about putting the cones in place on the corner and having a security guard there at peak times to separate them. Once they've been separated, in theory, they shouldn't be able to cross back again. If someone wants to drive

the cones, then that's a different issue. But in theory, we should be able to separate them with temporary cones and see if that works. We can try it for a couple of days and see if it works. We have to try things. I don't know if that's a practical solution.

Mr. Scheerer: We will have to determine the proper number of cones. Then we can purchase the cones, and Victor and his team can determine the proper time to send them out. We can also have them put the proper security officer in place to see how that works.

Mr. Staley: My idea is not to solve the problem, but it at least tells you what extra issues it gives you. If that was a concrete barrier, you're still going to have the same issue of people not being able to cross back.

Ms. Harley: I know the markings are on the road, but do we have any signs that far down?

Mr. Scheerer: We have it just past the lift station. As you come in off of Sinclair, there is a rather large sign that tells you, "Visitor this side, resident this side", and it shows the divided road. I am not the Traffic Engineer, but in my opinion, you would have to cone off not only the center lane but also the outside lane. You would be creating a visitor lane by itself, and people are crossing over. The right side would be the resident lane.

Mr. Staley: Where do you start? Where the sign is? You would have to start close to the corner.

Mr. Scheerer: The direction may be to start as close to Sinclair as possible. This is why the engineer was getting involved. Based on information from the County when Mark and I first started working this, we had to lead the striping away from that originally. We would probably start there, and then we'd have to leave a gap at the lift station because there are actually employees that come out from behind the lift station. For the landscape team we'd have to leave that open. That's not a big deal. We will just have to figure out the number of cones, order them and give them to security as quickly as possible.

Mr. Staley: If you can solve 70% of the problem it's better than nothing. It's a start.

Mr. Greenstein: The sooner we take control of that traffic before the turn, we have a fighting chance of controlling it.

Ms. Harley: Do the cards that are handed out to resort guests for their access into communal pools also operate those gates?

Mr. Vargas: Yes.

Ms. Harley: Would that not alleviate some of the problem for the people in that line? If we're saying it's residents, we're probably having several official resort guests that are in that line thinking they can't get through the other gate, but they already have the card.

Mr. Greenstein: We had a lengthy discussion about being very clear as to the definition of resident. It's really resident and registered guests. So, the signage probably needs to be changed.

Ms. Harley: I wouldn't say registered guests because they're going to consider themselves registered before they have entered for the first time, and they don't get that card until they have entered. So, it could be residents and passholders.

Mr. Greenstein: We could be more specific about who can actually proceed.

Ms. Harley: That might help to alleviate some of that line.

Mr. Burman: That's a good suggestion.

Mr. Greenstein: After you come out of the turn, the striped area on Tradition Boulevard between the lift station and Sinclair, we have the hash marked out on what I call the center of the roadway. That needs to be the left lane.

Mr. Scheerer: Well, I think that would be the plan with the cones.

Mr. Greenstein: Right, exactly. The cones are the only way we have two lanes coming out of the turn. Because coming out of the turn right now, based on traffic markings, there is only one lane and then it branches off to two. So, we want to create two right out of that turn. In fact, going into the turn. I don't have a problem, again, they'll tell me if I'm extending my authority, or our authority or whatever, but I think on a temporary basis with cones, that's really what the MOT was trying to achieve. We should be able to do this. The other question I had for you was how would these cones be installed in such a way that we don't damage a semipermanent installation? Something that if someone hits it, it's going to bend, but it's not going to be pushed out of the way. I am basically trying to get it to that next level of permanency because I think this can work.

Mr. Burman: But it's just a test.

Ms. Adams: Yes, even starting with detached cones is a step in the right direction.

Mr. Burman: If it works, then we come back with some pilons or something.

Mr. Scheerer: The more permanent solution would be the delineator posts. They adhere to the concrete, they are flexible. They are the big, tall, skinny, wired yellow posts you see that flex. If it works and we get permission to do it. But again, that cross hatching, that going before the lift station was a requirement for us to change our lane with the County.

Ms. Adams: Does the District Engineer or legal counsel have any comments regarding the District's ability to sequester that lane that has been hash marked, or crossed hatched, and make that into a guest visitor lane?

Mr. Guerricagoita: I think on a temporary basis to try to solve the traffic issue that you're experiencing at the gate that it is within your prerogative to do that. This being on a temporary basis until we get a formal answer from the County. Should the County come out and raise an issue, say again, "We're trying to solve a traffic issue that we are experiencing here, and this is what we have temporarily come up with. We have been in communications with the County and tried to get a formal determination on what the final solution is, but this is our interim plan."

Ms. Trucco: Would that be restricting the public?

Ms. Adams: No.

Ms. Trucco: I have a follow up on that third point that you had made about whether or not it would be legal to close off that gate to residents only. Jan and I spoke about it and I think the first step would be to ask for permission from Reunion East Board because there will be additional wear and tear on those roads. I think it will probably be permissible from a legal perspective, but it may be prudent for us to ask permission or approval consent from the Reunion East Board because it would be likely that there will be additional traffic on their public roads.

Mr. Staley: I understand the Chairman of the East Board is a very reasonable person.

Ms. Adams: That's as a first step.

Ms. Trucco: That would be a first step to see if we could get their consent approval acknowledgement that that's what we plan to do. Then, we will also run it past the District's bond counsel to confirm that they have no objections as well.

Mr. Greenstein: So, you're not opining right now on the legality of changing the status of the gate?

Ms. Trucco: We're saying let's go to Reunion East to get their approval consent.

Mr. Greenstein: You're saying let's go to the East, see what their input is and then you'll address the issue. Is that what you're hearing?

Mr. Staley: What I'm hearing is, if the East board agreed to it, then we can do it. As simple as that.

Ms. Trucco: Potentially. After we get approval, we'd like to run it past the District's bond counsel as well to make sure they have no objection.

Mr. Staley: That's not necessarily our solution, we just want to know if it's an option.

Ms. Trucco: Right, you had asked, and you wanted us to look into that and give some feedback.

Mr. Staley: The cone solution will solve other issues like these big delivery vehicles. It will solve the problem lower down the road, but you may still have issues at the gate itself, when you'd have to lift the barrier for the delivery vehicle.

Mr. Greenstein: A delivery vehicle is going to have to go into the resident gate because the overhang.

Mr. Staley: Someone needs to tell them to do that, and that's what the goal is.

Mr. Greenstein: Again, signage. We can come up with some less expensive signage options. It doesn't have to be the permanent signage. Is everyone familiar with when you come off of World Drive onto 192 from Disney, how you have preferred access? In other words, you are not brought into 192 traffic. You are separated from the 192 traffic for about a quarter of a mile if not more. You pass Griffin Road, and then you feed into 192. I'll take Osceola Parkway to World Drive if I have to go down Old Lake Wilson. Then I will take World Drive to 192 because, even if 192 is slammed, I'm getting the advantage of being cordoned off from all the other 192 traffic for a least a quarter of a mile if not more. Those barriers are white flexible, permanently attached, and they bend. That's what I'm envisioning for the turn at Sinclair to Traditions until we actually see an extension of Sinclair Road and real intersection there.

Mr. Staley: If I understand, that is not today's solution.

Mr. Greenstein: No, that's what we would be talking to the County about. What we are doing now is a nonpermanent prototype of a similar concept.

Mr. Staley: And using the prototype, you don't have to spend an awful lot of money to see if it works. I suspect Victor will need to talk to Anthony and Kingwood to make sure that they are comfortable with what we are planning to do. I'm sure Anthony has a view because he's concerned about it as well. Perhaps you could communicate to Anthony, so he knows what we are going to try. That would be helpful, I think.

Mr. Scheerer: Xabier, do you know the MOT requirements for distance between cones on that road?

Mr. Guerricagoita: I don't. We would need to check on that.

Mr. Scheerer: We're going to need to have the proper number of cones to make sure that we're in compliance with any MOT issues.



Mr. Staley: It would be great if Victor and Tricia if you could communicate sort of when we are going to try to do this. I'd like to see and watch.

Mr. Scheerer: Give me some time to purchase the cones because it's going to be a lot of cones.

Mr. Greenstein: Again, it's a lot of wasted area there. This is a lot of area for potential traffic control. This is step one.

Mr. Staley: You could try with the cones going 50 yards, 60 yards, 70 yards. You can try different things to see what works best, because you're giving people a heads up with the existing signage. So, you can start the cones closer to the gate house to see if that works. Or, if that's not working after a few hours or a few days, move it further down the street and see if that works. That's the beauty of it.

Mr. Greenstein: I think it's going to have to be pretty close to that turn if not in the turn in order for folks to get serious about getting into the proper lane.

Mr. Staley: Let us know through Tricia if you need anything else. We have to find a solution, it's becoming embarrassing.

Mr. Greenstein: It's a manageable item and we should manage it.

Ms. Adams: The District Engineer will follow up with Alan in terms of the recommendation for the distance between cones. Alan will purchase the cones and provide those to Victor for Reunion's security to implement. It should be implemented prior to next month's meeting. Also, I know Xabier and Steve are continuing to work with Osceola County on a permanent emergency MOT plan. We also have the legal opinion regarding options for a resident only gate that we're needing to take additional steps to come to a conclusion.

Mr. Staley: I think we can all in the meantime as a Board be thinking of the pros and cons of a resident only gate. We have not sat down to formally do the pros and cons. So, we can do that and have that conversation next month as well.

Mr. Burman: Did I hear it said that we're going to get the Reunion East Board's consent and bond counsel consent? Beyond that, there are no other impediments? If we were going to make that change?

Ms. Adams: Do you speculate that bond counsel would charge for an opinion?

Mr. Trucco: I'm not sure. I could find out and report back to you all next month.

Mr. Burman: Just so we know, so we have the thing ready to go should that become something we want to pursue.

Ms. Trucco: Okay, absolutely.

Ms. Adams: Any other discussion regarding the Sinclair gate issues or anything that wasn't covered that Board members wanted to bring up?

Mr. Greenstein: The only other thing I'll mention and it's a minor item. The RFID tags that connectivity with the reader, it kind of goes on and offline, as you know. Can we figure out what's going on with that? It seems to be happening the most at the Sinclair gate. It's rare that it happens at the Excitement resident only gate, but it does once in a while. It seems to be one day two days every week that it's down, so hopefully we can figure out what's going on with that.

Mr. Staley: I know we haven't gotten a final solution yet about the gated entrance between Reunion Village and Reunion. Just so we are all on the same page, if residents in Reunion Village have access to the entrance to the CDD facilities in the East and the West, will they have to be provided with a card to come through that entrance?

Ms. Adams: Yes.

Mr. Staley: So, every single resident of Reunion Village who is entitled to use those facilities will have a card. That will in turn increase the traffic because all those people will actually be using Reunion to get onto Spine Road.

Ms. Harley: They'll use it because it's mandatory that they take a membership to the Encore resort. So, they will use it to access Encore.

Mr. Burman: The main reason is that they are members of the CDD, they are paying, and they should have an access card.

Ms. Adams: They are Reunion residents, so they'll have access to the community.

Mr. Staley: Which is another reason why we have to find a solution to the Sinclair cut through because traffic is only going to increase coming from Reunion Village.

Mr. Greenstein: If the systems work, that's why I was mentioning the issues about the RFID tag not being picked up by the receiver by the antenna at all times, people will have their card in hand or they've got the RFID sticker on the window, you should go through that gate like that **\*\*SNAPS\*\***. It's opening and closing. It should be working, but sometimes we run into systemic issues and then that causes backups. When security sees or knows that that is the problem then they should just open up the resident only gate until it is fixed because it causes backups unnecessarily.

Ms. Adams: I think Victor received that message.

Mr. Staley: It's just a question of resilience. We need resilience in those gate systems.

Ms. Adams: Any other discussion regarding Sinclair gate or community access? Any wrap up comments, Kristen?

**B. Discussion of Reserve Study Year Plan (Requested by Supervisor Staley)**

Ms. Adams: The next item on the agenda is an item that was added per request. Discussion of the reserve study five-year plan. I believe in your agenda packet there is a copy. Albeit the print is quite small.

Mr. Staley: As I said before, I think it's really important that we build our reserves for the replacement and maintenance funds. Unlike the East, we don't have many reserves. We have something like \$800,000 reserves at the moment and the East has nearly \$3,000,000. We have to build our reserves, and I think that's one of the reasons we built in an increase into the assessment for 2022. In the May budget workshop, I presented a five-year plan using figures from the reserve study and from the budget for 2020 to see what would happen if we actually needed all that expenditure from the reserve study through 2026. As I said at the time, it would leave a deficit in the replacement of the reserve fund and the replacement and maintenance fund over nearly \$900,000 in 2026. Which obviously we can kick down the road and forget, or we can start to think in advance about what our solutions will be. That deficit is being driven by what was in the reserve study. If the reserve study is correct and the deficit in the reserve study is wrong then we won't have a deficit. At the workshop we said we would spend some time going through that five-year plan document, because I think all of us were somewhat surprised by the amount. I don't think we need to do that today, because that's a longer conversation. I do think we need to think about the first year of the five years which is 2022. That obviously ties in with our budget discussion. And then leave it to that, I noticed that in our budget for 2022, we've got a budget of \$906,000 for the replacement and maintenance fund. That's this very difficult sheet to read here. Plus, on top of that there is a \$250,000 contingency to make up that \$906,000. That's a lot of money. That \$906,000 compares to something like \$470,000 we're going to spend in 2021. I'm not convinced we're going to be able to spend \$906,000. That's one point we need to consider. The second thing is, and this is where the reserve study comes in, when you look at the five-year plan, we've got expenditure in here for 2022 of \$156,000. To the best of my understanding, virtually none of that is included in our budget for 2022. I can't see where the lines line up. Now, 156 out of 906 is plenty of room to move things around, but I think there's a conceptual issue here. If this reserve study is worth using, then we should have some symmetry between the reserve study and our

budget for next year, and I can't see it. An example of the reserve study says we're going to be spending \$49,000 on concrete sidewalks. I can't see that in our budget for next year. It says we're going to be spending \$38,000 on HVAC equipment for Seven Eagles pool. I can't see that in there. So, either the budget is wrong, or the reserve study is wrong. One or the other.

Mr. Scheerer: Can you say that again, sir?

Mr. Staley: The reserve study says \$38,000 for HVAC equipment in Seven Eagles pool pavilion. I can't see that in our budget for next year.

Ms. Adams: Supervisor Staley, one thing that may be helpful is on page 15 of the proposed budget it has a detail list for the proposed replacement and maintenance fund.

Mr. Greenstein: No, it's in East also, because it's a shared expense.

Ms. Adams: Yes, but each District has their own specific budget. Do you have a copy of the printed budget with you? So, page 15.

Ms. Staley: That's 2021. The heading says 2022, but then below it says updated expenses for 2021. The following page is the one I was to circulate today, which is a shortened version.

Ms. Adams: What you're seeing here is a partial list and I know that there is a comprehensive list for proposed budget Fiscal Year 2022 for capital expenses that does include allocations for roofing, for HVAC, and for sidewalk repairs.

Mr. Staley: Great. Could you circulate that before the next meeting? Because we're going to take a decision at the August meeting, aren't we, at the public meeting? If that's the case then that will solve my issue with correlation between the reserve study and the 2022 budget. That will ease my mind a little bit there. I know not everything in this reserve study is going to be necessary. We know that. It's a little bit of CYA I suspect. But there should be some of a relation. They shouldn't be completely disconnected.

Ms. Adams: I can assure you that Alan and I did review the reserve study in relation to the proposed capital expenses. That's what triggered examination of Seven Eagles roof and some of the other items. Now, the allowances for sidewalk, for HVAC, for pool equipment replacement, we understand those need to be in place every year. We don't necessarily designate the area or the particular pool or the particular gatehouse that will need an air conditioner, but we know that there needs to be an allowance because those types of things need to be replaced. With the age of this community, it's a reality that things have a useful life. They reach the end of their useful life and then they need to be replaced.

Mr. Scheerer: We're doing sidewalks right now. And we'll do them again next year.

Ms. Adams: I'll circulate both budgets again. I thought we went through this in the workshop where we showed a partial list and then we showed a comprehensive list including the items that were scheduled for Fiscal Year 2021 but had to be deferred to Fiscal Year 2022. This being either because of a lack of availability for contractors, a lack of materials or a spike in material expenses. We were looking to defer some of those things until a later time.

Mr. Staley: The final point of all of that, that total for the resort, not just the East and West, but for the combined resort, that total of \$906,000 obviously may not be a big challenge for the East but it is a big challenge for the West in the sense of what it means for assessments. I'm still as concerned as I was at the budget workshop, and as I was at the last meeting, that we are assessing an increase of 36% from residents and owners. We're proposing the reason for that is to build a reserve but also to meet our replacement and maintenance budget. If the replacement and maintenance budget is at \$906,000 for the resort as a whole is too high, because we could never spend it, then we are assessing when we don't need to assess. That's my concern. Now, I know we've got the ability to bring the assessment down next month, but we need to do a bit of work beforehand to make sure that that's the right thing to do. To put it into context, every ten percentage points of increase in the assessment is worth \$138,000. So, if we save \$250,000 out of the repair and maintenance budget, that makes a big difference in the assessment. That's why I am really fixated on this \$906,000 because if we don't need it, we can ease the burden on owners and residents in the West. It doesn't prevent us from having a big increase in future years. We can still do it. Does that make sense to everybody?

Ms. Adams: One thing that the Board is cognizant of is that in past years Reunion West has not been making a significant contribution if any to the reserve or the repair and maintenance fund which we use interchangeably for terminology. The reserve fund is the repair and maintenance fund. There's a sense that is something the Board might want to consider. When we looked at the current assessment level, we realized that given the current assessment level there would not be ability to make a contribution to the repair and maintenance fund and ultimately that's a Board decision. The Board has the discretion on the amount if any that is contributed to the repair and maintenance fund.

Mr. Staley: And obviously, if you go forward with the assessment that we've got in the proposed budget, it takes us 18% above the East for single family homes, for example. It doesn't even solve the problem.

Ms. Adams: And there's always going to be that disparity because Reunion East has the benefit of gaining revenue from the commercial properties as well as from the residential units, whereas that is not the situation on Reunion West. That will not change in the future.

Mr. Greenstein: In the same matter that decisions were made during the years when there were strategic defaults, foreclosure activities, all kinds of activity where decisions were made by the Board to keep things afloat and they felt that if you have a significant issue at the time, you're not really concerned with reserves for the future. It's kind of a survival mentality. With that in mind, I also recognize that we're on the Board and that you don't play catchup overnight. You phase it in over time. So, as long as we agree, no action is required today, but at the hearing at next month's meeting we have full range of authority to make the decision on how much of our budget will go to the replacement and maintenance funds for reserves. It should be a catchup. Again, we don't have to make a decision today, but I am in agreement that it's not the full load. It should be a lesser amount so that over some period of time, you basically get caught up, but it has to be a protracted period of time. It's not overnight.

Mr. Staley: The problem is, even with that 36% increase, we actually reduce our reserves at the end of 2022. We go from \$852,000 down to \$683,000. We're not even moving ourselves in the right direction.

Mr. Burman: That can happen and still be perfectly compliant in the reserve study. That reserve balance is not really an indication of whether we're healthy or not. Because there may be times if you replace the roof on a building one year and the reserves go down to zero, then they build back up again, and then you do the AC and they're down again. So, I wouldn't use that.

Mr. Staley: That's why I did a five-year plan. Because if you don't do the five-year plan, you don't know how those expenses are going to hit. As I said, we've got time to look at the future years, but we have a chance this year to at least start off in the right direction. The issue I've got is we can't do it in our solution because if we say we want to try to save \$300,000 from next year's budget, the East has to agree to that as well. I don't know how we organize that.

Mr. Greenstein: This may not relate directly to what you just said but the amount of the increase as a percentage doesn't rattle me so much.

Mr. Staley: The 36%?

Mr. Greenstein: It's the fact that it's trying to catchup in one fell swoop which I don't agree with. The problem took place over several years. You don't recapture several years of not funding overnight. What I am concerned about is that the assessments overall between East and

West, for a single-family home, should be withing a certain percentage of each other. Now, the reasons for the difference in most cases was debt services. West side was developed after the East. West side interest rates were higher at times. There have been refinancing and refunding and things of that nature. In fact, one of the things that, Graham you brought to our attention, and we are pursuing, is the refinancing of a series of bonds on the West side which will hopefully reduce debt service which would also help. We definitely want things to be fairly close between East and West overall because we do share so much and it shouldn't be a drastic difference, but for a number of years, the west was lower than the East. And that was because of the fact that they were trying to survive, and they weren't funding the reserve. The replacement fund.

Mr. Staley: Just for clarity for the minutes, with the assessment at 36% increase, that doesn't catch us up in one year. It actually doesn't get us moving forward at all. It gets us still going backwards. It's an issue. I'm sorry, there has to be an increase, because we've got to make a start. When we look at the five-year expenditure, as David rightly said, a lot of it comes in years three, four, and five. So, we've got time to build up. And the big expenditure comes in year five. So, we're not going to spend it until we get to the end. So, that's where the five-year line needs to come in. It could be in September or October and actually November when people come to pay their taxes. You may say it's an awful lot of money. It's not a lot of money, in dollar terms, really. I've had an email this morning from someone saying that it is a lot of money. I know it's an issue. I think if we continue this conversation that we have to find a way of identifying between now and August if there is something we can take out of the \$906,000 that we simply won't be able to spend anyway. And then we can look on the implication it has for our assessment. The East will also need to agree to that, whatever that decision is.

Ms. Adams: Supervisor Staley, just to avoid following up after the meeting and circulating, in the proposed budget for Fiscal Year 2022, that detailed capital list is on page 15 and 16.

Mr. Staley: Page 15 says 2021.

Ms. Adams: Yes, from 15 it continues on page 16 but this is where it's identifying, like under building improvements where you have a small list for building improvements, but then this expands it and you see where it says Seven Eagles roof replacement which ties back to the reserve study plus the actual field conditions of other things that have been deferred from the previous year like pool house, pressure wash, paint, stucco, all of that detail is in there.

Mr. Staley: So, you're saying there is nothing more detailed than page 16?

Ms. Adams: Page 15 and page 16.

Mr. Staley: I'm sorry, I may be talking in circles, page 15 is 2021. Forget what the heading says. But the Heading says Fiscal Year 2021. The document itself says Fiscal 2021 dated expenses. So that's 2021 which is a great list. It's a long list and you expect this very detail because we're almost at the end of 2021. But page 16 is the one that is a short list. It is the one that we circulated this morning. On top of this short list there's another \$247,000 to get to the \$906,000.

Ms. Adams: I hear what you're saying, and I recall we went through this during the workshop so let me just pull that together and circulate the information because I don't want for anyone to think that Board members were not provided with that detail because we did go through that in the workshop. For the record, I just want to be sure that that information has been made available for Board members and for the public. Also, there were some differences with the environment at Reunion this year. There has been some property that has been turned over to the District for responsibility for maintenance. This is the first year that we have impact with Reunion West Encore where the District is funding the landscaping and the maintenance of the sidewalks along with the expense that the CDD bears for that environment. For Fiscal Year 2022 we also know that we're bringing on Reunion Village as an additional expense. The way that the budgets are set up with the interlocal agreements and the reciprocity between the Districts for amenity use, when the community grows it impacts everyone. The good news is that you're going to have a good understanding of the full extent of the expenses community wide because with the development of Reunion Village, that's going to complete the District boundaries. You'll have good arms around the situation with having the projects fully developed.

Ms. Harley: Reunion East, right?

Ms. Adams: Yes, but because of the cost sharing there is an impact on the Reunion West budget when Reunion East has additional areas to maintain.

Mr. Burman: Likewise, West to East.

Ms. Adams: Likewise, Encore area has impacted Reunion East, correct. There is that reciprocity that ties back to the interlocal agreement where everyone benefits from the entire District amenity usage, and it's really looked at as one community to the best extent possible.

Mr. Staley: It's not that easy of a problem because we've got to smooth our growth and our reserves without impact in what the East may want to do.



Ms. Adams: The other big consideration for the Board is that there have been some roads in Reunion East that have been here for some time. They are in remarkably good condition, actually, but pavement management can be expensive. So, depending on whether or not you find a willing buyer for your roads will determine the extent that the reserves will need to be funded for pavement management which will start to impact the budget.

Ms. Staley: Fortunately, that's in 2026. That's clearly down the road.

Ms. Adams: Any other discussion regarding the reserve study or the budget? Otherwise, we are down to staff reports.

## **SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

### **Staff Reports**

#### **A. Attorney**

Ms. Trucco: We have nothing else to report to the Board today. I will say that regarding the TECO easement agreement that's on the agenda, we're just waiting for closing counsel to sign off on that and then that will be finalized and off of that chart. Otherwise, that's it. Thank you.

#### **B. Engineer**

Ms. Adams: And we have Engineer's report.

Mr. Guerricagoita: I have nothing else to report to the Board, unless you have any questions for me.

Ms. Adams: As we go through the action item list, there may be some questions that come up.

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

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

Ms. Adams: Under District manager's report, we do have some items that require Board action. I'll also mention that there are some items that tie into security related at Reunion West, specifically the Encore neighborhood. Apparently there had been a traffic backup on Old Lake Wilson Road and the County became involved. It did coincide with the time that Reunion security was contracted to take over security at Reunion West CDD Encore neighborhood which was a happy circumstance because there was a lot of cooperation and collaboration. Board members were copied on that correspondence and it looks like the temporary solution is working, and Reunion security is continuing to work on implementing other technologies to expedite traffic for that 4:00 p.m. check in time. All of the properties in that area have a 4:00 p.m. check in time if they are a short-term rental and it's a continuous issue. The other item related to security is we

have had a request from the POA. They have not formalized the request yet, but I believe it will be coming. They are considering how to manage their security gates that are not staffed when they are in disrepair. There are a couple of scenarios that might be happening and those will be brought forward to the Board when they're prepared for Board discussion.

Included in your agenda packet is an action item list and that is under tab C, I believe. The action items list includes an ongoing list of various projects and tasks for Reunion East CDD as well as Reunion West CDD. The first item for Reunion West is the parking rules for Encore. As the Board knows, you have adopted parking rules, however they have not been implemented yet with signage. Reunion Security and the POA are monitoring the situation to determine further steps that might need to be taken. The community nearby Reunion, the Elevation Development, I did get confirmation from County staff after the agenda packet was published that there is no application yet on file. So, that's still in the preapplication phase and still in a very preliminary discussion phase with the County. You all understand that the certificates of completion have been done and that will be taken off of the action item list. You will see that change in your financials with those construction accounts being closed in the future. Sinclair gate; still working through the multipronged solutions there. The TECO easement, Kristen just updated you on that. That's for that gas line, that four-inch gas line. That will be here in time for cold weather next year. We've been working on meeting notices and summary notes circulating to the residents as well as posting those on the websites. Duke has confirmed that they have completed their field verification. They have ordered materials, and as soon as they get here, they are going to be starting on the conversion of the streetlights. And then one item that we need, we are somewhat on hold, there was some brief Board discussion regarding beautification of Sinclair Road near the lift station and that being seen as a main community entrance. Is this something that the Board would like to see proposals on to consider? Is this something you would like to have on hold until you have a better understanding of where you want to be with your budget moving forward? What is the pleasure of the Board on this matter?

Ms. Harley: I think we need to do something.

Mr. Burman: It does look unapproved.

Ms. Harley: It's not becoming of the resort, if you'd like. And seeing as how most people's GPS now also send them that way, it just looks ugly.

Mr. Scheerer: If you want, I'll meet with them myself and Yellowstone can come up with some sort of a plan given the idea of what you would like to see there so Mike and I can put together maybe next week sometime if you have time.

Ms. Harley: Yes, that would be great.

Mr. Scheerer: Awesome, thank you.

Ms. Adams: That proposal can come to the Board for consideration and action at a future meeting. Everyone good with that? All right, sounds good. The way that this is inserted into the agenda packet, I'm not sure these pages are exactly in sequential order, but turning the next page, jumping down to Reunion West, the development of the recreational parcel on Grand Traverse Parkway and Valhalla Terrace, the Board approved the District Engineer engaging a landscape architect to come up with a site plan for both areas as well as a land survey. Xabier, did you have an update on that?

Mr. Guerricagoita: It's in process.

Mr. Staley: How long do you think that will take? So, we can get an expectation.

Mr. Greenstein: Yes, we need dates.

Mr. Staley: I have no idea how long it takes to do this.

Mr. Guerricagoita: I don't have the completion date for this, but I will make it a priority to find one.

Mr. Staley: I am just thinking ahead, if we do get to the stage in August where we have to prioritize some expenditures, personally I think we should prioritize the playground. We've approved moving forward with both, but if we have a choice of which one to move forward with, I think the playground might get more use.

Mr. Greenstein: My personal expectation was that once we completed the survey most recently at the last meeting, we took direction. We asked Steve to come up with engaging a landscape architect and come up with a plan. I was thinking that that process might take 90 to 120 days. I would hope at some point you would engage a landscape architect, and be able to report to us that we have someone working on it and that we have a proposal or choices of proposals or whatever by some particular date.

Ms. Harley: Who did the playgrounds on the Eastside?

Ms. Adams: Alan took the lead. He collaborated with the District Engineer and one of the Board members. The vendor that provided the equipment, that information has been provided to the District Engineer.

Ms. Harley: Because it probably makes sense to go the same route.

Mr. Scheerer: We were actually looking at the same style playground and the awning structure, they did a really nice job. It took a little time.

Ms. Harley: It might even be cheaper if they've drawn up the plans once.

Mr. Scheerer: And the County already has it, yes ma'am. The fitness area will be a whole other story.

Mr. Greenstein: It's a definite starting point.

Mr. Staley: I think we should have some very encouraging news at the next meeting on this. Honestly, we're dragging our heels on this.

Ms. Adams: The next item is in regard to the Encore transition. There had been some Board discussions regarding the landscape provider. We're still keeping that on the action item list as a tentative item to look at. Once we get past the budgeting cycle and other projects the Board is working on now, refunding the series 2001 bond issuance, the bonds can be priced as early as November, so we'll start to engage the underwriter in the fall and get on track with this. The next page is Reunion East items. Would the Board like to go through Reunion East items? Alright.

Mr. Staley: We use the facilities and we pay for the facilities, and Seven Eagles is not what it used to be. And we all know that. The furniture is going to make a big difference, but I just wondered because I have not inspected it or anything. Is there anything else that we need to be doing at Seven Eagles? It was a center piece. It was the first place the sales guys took you when you arrived 15 years ago.

Ms. Adams: Well, I think you hit the nail on the head when you said 15 years ago, because the overall facility has never been refurbished. It's been maintained. So, it's been painted, cleaned, and pressure washed. But in certain cases, the color of the paint, the style of the furnishings, it dates the facility.

Mr. Staley: It's just something for the East to consider because they are much closer to it then the West is. But it was a center piece and I'm not sure if it is a center piece anymore. Or needs to be. I just don't know.

Mr. Greenstein: It can be a lovely facility again. We do have on our agenda today a discussion of what we're going to do with the game room.

Mr. Burman: It's an easy trap to fall into. A high-end hotel wouldn't go 15 years without a refurbishment. When you get into an environment like that, let's just clean it and maintain it for

another ten years, but tastes change, and styles change. What was beautiful 15 years ago is just dated now.

Mr. Greenstein: We're all looking at it and that's something that can have input from West and East.

Mr. Staley: It's the role it plays, and I've not thought about it enough, but it's the role it plays in the whole community and how much use it gets and who uses it.

Ms. Adams: It gets a lot of use.

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

Ms. Adams: The next item on the agenda does require Board action. This is approval of the check register. Included in your agenda packet under tab 2 is your summary of checks from June 1<sup>st</sup> through June 30<sup>th</sup>. The total amount is \$465,723.94. The detailed check register is behind the check summary, and this does include a transfer out to your debt service fund.

Mr. Greenstein: Motion to approve the check register.

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein, seconded by Mr. Burman, 4-0 (Supervisor Manke left the meeting), the Check Register, was approved.

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

Ms. Adams: The next item is your balance sheet and income statement. This is your unaudited financials through March 31<sup>st</sup>. That is included in your agenda packet, under tab 3. There is no Board action required but I'm happy to answer any questions you may have. And again, you will see some changes in this moving forward because some of the construction funds are being closed out. You'll still see your debt service funds.

Mr. Staley: On Page 3, in the replacement and maintenance fund, it looks like we're going to be spending \$183,000 so far through May. And that equates to \$906,000 for next year. So that's my point. We're probably setting our expectations too high in terms we're going to spend. Just to demonstrate at what I was getting at earlier. And maybe I'm reading that wrong. Apologies if I am. But it's going to be tough to accelerate the rate of spending given how we are currently spending.

Ms. Adams: Any other comments on the financials?

## **D. Security Report**

### **i. Parking Violations and Towing Reports**

Ms. Adams: Otherwise, under separate cover we did provide the detailed parking and towing report for the month. Overall, there were 120 parking violations issued and one vehicle was towed for the last month. Any further discussion regarding security matters?

Mr. Staley: Any signs that parking compliance is getting better or worse? Getting better?

Mr. Burman: It seems better. I'm not out there every day, but it does seem better.

Ms. Harley: We couldn't have gone through that in any busier of a period. It was well managed. I think there were a couple of instances and security handled it and dealt with it.

Mr. Staley: I have noticed people are getting very creative as to how they park on the space available. I mean some people are trying to get ten cars, so the message is getting through.

## **SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

### **Other Business**

Ms. Adams: Any other business or Supervisor's requests?

Mr. Burman: It's not a request, but it may be interesting to this Board, but we got a package from the owner of the remaining Terraces Parcels. His name is Andrew Bucknall. I think he's Garrett's successor to those parcels. They planned another 96 units there and then two phases and so that's coming soon. They are members of the CDD obviously, so they would be part of that. Phase 2 is the biggest part of it. 80 of the units are in Phase 2 and that's not until 18 months from now at best. We're looking at two years probably before we see anything happen.

Mr. Greenstein: They may be testing the waters with Phase 1.

Mr. Staley: July the 4<sup>th</sup>. Any experiences from traffic or fireworks from July the 4<sup>th</sup>?

Mr. Vargas: After 9 p.m. it got a little bit out of control. Before 9 p.m. we did control all of that. But at 9 p.m. it was like everything went up at the same time. I told my guys to step back. They finished I would say by 11:00 p.m.

Ms. Harley: There were some great displays, I have to say.

Mr. Vargas: We did receive a lot of phone calls, but it was hard for us to do something about it. It was in every street pretty much.

## **EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

### **Supervisor's Requests**

Mr. Staley: The other subject, my favorite one. Trash on the roads. I know it'd probably be the biggest challenge for the HOA. I'm going to keep raising it because I've been thinking long and hard about what some of the solutions may be and I know that Sharon shares some of the same ideas, probably one of the solutions we may have is some sort of dumpster park. Because

the problem is with the rental homes. And the four rental companies, the so-called preferred partners, ought to be wanting to solve this problem.

Ms. Harley: And we do. We absolutely do. I just hired another trash guy today. That's five fulltime trash guys that I've got on staff. They are literally just going around and collecting the trash.

Mr. Burman: For how many homes?

Ms. Harley: It's 400 homes but when you think in Encore, we have a daily trash collection so mine are in addition to the daily trash collections. Where do we put the trash? We're not allowed to put it in the dumpsters in Reunion because we're told we're not allowed to do that.

Mr. Staley: There's nothing the CDD can do about it, but we have to find some land somewhere to put some dumpsters on. It may not be a long-term solution but if you saw the ones that we say on July the 4<sup>th</sup>. Guest arriving at a house.

Ms. Harley: As an example, yesterday in Encore, they suspended trash service because of the hurricane. So, we had no trash collected in Encore yesterday. It's an absolute nightmare. One missed day. It's fighting a losing battle. And honestly, I for one want to be proactive on this. All we need is where we can put it.

Mr. Burman: The HOA doesn't own any property. But is there any appetite among the CDD to try and find property that it owns? Not the recreational site.

Mr. Staley: Tricia is going to jump in here and she's going to say it's not what the land is for.

Ms. Adams: It's not that it's not what the land is for. I think my statements last month were in regard to the District cannot pay for private property issues.

Ms. Harley: So, who owns the land where this dumpster is?

Mr. Burman: CDD.

Ms. Harley: So, what difference does that make then. That is a dumpster on CDD property. What about the stables?

Mr. Burman: CDD.

Ms. Harley: What we're asking is for access to dumpsters that are on CDD property.

Mr. Greenstein: I'm sure solutions were offered and accepted between the HOA and the CDD on small scale projects.

Mr. Burman: Not for that, that's just a wild west issue over there.

Mr. Greenstein: The dumpsters have been there for a long time.

Ms. Adams: It's not unusual for dumpsters to be nearby a commercial building. That's pervasive.

Mr. Staley: Let's recap. The renters are here for vacation. They are not going to put trash out four days a week or seven days a week. They are just going to let it pile up. That's my belief. So, therefore the property management companies have to be proactive. Fines are a deterrent, but prevention is what we should be looking for. We're not trying to correct the situation through fines. We're trying to stop it from happening in the first place. Regarding those four property management companies who must look out for 70% of the properties, probably more. If we could get a solution for those four including Kingwood, then we've got a fighting chance of cracking the problem for the rest. Because everyone will hopefully follow suite. And what I think Sharron, as an example, needs is somewhere to put the trash.

Ms. Harley: My thing is, what are these dumpsters for? The dumpsters currently on the property?

Mr. Greenstein: Those two dumpsters, didn't the master put out some guidance at some point?

Mr. Burman: The Master does these.

Mr. Greenstein: There is a recycling one.

Mr. Burman: Not this one. There is no recycling one out there. I don't think there is recycling anywhere. The only other dumpsters belong to the club. I know the CDD can't pay for a facility like that, but if it were to identify a piece a land as big as this room.

Ms. Harley: I honestly don't need them to pay. I honestly believe that the property management companies in the program would be more than happy to pay for the dumpster, we just need a place to put it.

Mr. Burman: Well, that's what I'm getting at. If you identify the land and deed it to the association who could manage this whole thing. Is that a possibility? Would that be legal?

Ms. Trucco: I don't know bought, perhaps licensed. Because bond funds were used to construct all of this property, we have an issue with transferring. Same thing with the streets. There are bond implications by deeding property to a private entity. Is the dumpster overflowing? Are individuals able to throw things in the dumpsters right now?

Mr. Burman: By 2:00 it's full.

Mr. Greenstein: It's becoming a thimble and you need a gallon bucket. We need larger capacity.



Ms. Harley: The way it is now, we are not given access to the dumpsters. Do we use them occasionally? Yes. Do we get told off for it? Absolutely. The problem that you have is in here we have the County collections. They always come early in the morning which is great. Then the guest leaves at 10 a.m. The cleaner goes in and accumulates a ton of trash.

Mr. Staley: That's the picture you get on a Sunday morning.

Ms. Harley: And we have nowhere to put it.

Mr. Staley: It strikes me that we've got to have a meeting between the HOA and a member of the CDD and Kingwood. To see if we proactively together can find some land. Then, we'll have to address the issue of who pays for the collection.

Mr. Greenstein: We can address the issue and from a jurisdictional standpoint. Number one, there is no transfer of land required to do this. If we, just like we give condo associations an easement a license to occupy or make use of a property that is owned by the CDD we can do the same thing for this. No land transfer is required. The only CDD aspect of this issue is if we have any parcels that we feel, including East and West, that we can utilize for this purpose. Most of the trash is on the West side. We have East side issues too but most of the larger homes are on the West. You don't want to have to travel any greater length then you need to. But I think on both the West side and the East side, we should look at what neutral parcels we have that we could possibly utilize for this purpose. Funding the service, working out the logistics of it, and everything else, that's Master association, that's Kingwood. One of the areas I mentioned to you I think one day at an event or whatever was down Whitemarsh in the back. But I'm pretty sure, Michael is not on the line, but I don't know how quickly they are going to be developing that parcel. But behind 15 Nicolas down toward I-4, back in that area, there is the no-man's land. We have to look at the map.

Ms. Adams: What I hear is there is consensus among the Board members that you would like for the Field Operations Manager to investigate any potential parcels and if we need to, we can look at how it's zoned. Can we get staff comments before we move on, because we have Reunion East starting in a few minutes?

Mr. Staley: In the meantime, because that might take a bit of time, can I suggest that Sharon and David meet with Anthony, and see if he's prepared?

Ms. Adams: No. You can't do that because two Board members meeting would violate Sunshine Laws.

Ms. Trucco: There's one more consideration too is picking a location that we may want to look into Osceola County code or ordinances and rules and regulations that may apply to trash collection. I think you had mentioned you ran into something before.

Mr. Guerricagoita: Yes, you'll have to build an enclosure for it. You can't just leave a dumpster in open air. The County will require you to build a corral.

Mr. Staley: The point is in the next three months we've got a big holiday coming, and I have no idea where all that trash is going to go in three months' time. Anthony has land in Whitemarsh which he's not building on this week or next week or even this year probably. Maybe there's a solution there.

Ms. Adams: Any other comments from staff on the trash matter? Alright. Any other Supervisor's requests?

**NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Next Meeting Date**

Ms. Adams: Your next meeting is August 12<sup>th</sup> at 11:30.

**TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Adjournment**

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

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



Secretary/Assistant Secretary



Chairman/~~Vice Chairman~~