

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, August 12, 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 <i>by phone</i>	Assistant Secretary
Sharon Harley	Assistant Secretary
Graham Staley	Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

Tricia Adams	District Manager
Kristen Trucco	District Counsel
Xabier Guerricagoita	Boyd Civil Engineering
Alan Scheerer	Field Operations Manager
Victor Vargas	Reunion Security
Mike Smith	Yellowstone
Nicole Ailes	Yellowstone

**FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Roll Call**

Ms. Adams called the meeting to order at 11:30 a.m. and called the roll. Three 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. This is an opportunity for any members of the public to make a comment to the Board of Supervisors. If you would like to make a comment, please state your name and address for the record.

Mr. Bill Witcher (1268 Grand Traverse Pkwy): As a new full-time resident, I am curious about my tax bill. In the section where it is Reunion CDD West, it shows two different line items of Debt Service and Maintenance. Am I understanding that correctly?

Ms. Adams: Yes.

Mr. Witcher: It appears that we ended up at a 27% increase when I do the math against my 2020 tax bill for maintenance.

Ms. Adams: Board members, would you like for me to address the question?

Mr. Greenstein: You can explain what we would do.

Ms. Adams: Okay. This is an opportunity to make a statement to the Board and often times your question is answered during Board discussion. Anything that is not answered will follow up outside of the meeting. Do you have any other statements to make to the Board?

Mr. Witcher: No, I didn't.

Ms. Adams: Thank you, Mr. Witcher.

### **THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS**

#### **Approval of the Minutes of the July 8, 2021 Meeting**

Ms. Adams: A draft copy of the July 8<sup>th</sup> meeting minutes has been included in the agenda packet. I did receive under a separate cover comments from Supervisor Staley regarding two non-substantive changes so any approval would be subject to incorporating those changes.

Mr. Greenstein: Is there a motion to approve the minutes with the changes?

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein, seconded by Mr. Staley, with all in favor, the Minutes of the July 8, 2021 Meeting, were approved as amended.

### **FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

#### **Public Hearing**

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

#### **A. Consideration of Resolution 2021-11 Adopting the Fiscal Year 2022 Budget and Relating to the Annual Appropriations**

Ms. Adams: During the public hearing we are required to offer an opportunity for members of the public to make a statement to the Board of Supervisors. Would the Board like to have the budget discussion first and then open it up to comments, or would you like to take comments first?

Mr. Staley: I think we should have the discussion. It might enlighten all of the residents who are here and possibly answer their questions.

Ms. Adams: As the Board recalls, you kicked off this year's budget cycle back in May. The Board approved a proposed budget. That proposed budget did contemplate an increase to your Operations & Maintenance assessment. Following that proposed budget approval, the Board did have a public workshop. That workshop was held via Zoom and all members of Reunion were invited to attend. We invited residents through HOA email blast to attend the budget workshop.

Following that, there have been some Board discussions at various meetings and that brings us to today when we are considering the Resolution 2021-11 which is adopting the Fiscal Year 2022 budget and the appropriations. This proposed budget has been included in the agenda packet for Board members and there are also copies of the budget at the back of the room for members of the public. Board members, the most salient changes since you have approved your proposed budget is to update the financials. This proposed budget now includes actual financials through June 30, which gives a good picture of most of the fiscal year. Board members, we have walked through the budget on several occasions. Can you please provide direction on if you would like me to walk through the items that are driving the increase or any other information?

Mr. Staley: We have studied this at length at the workshop. We have had the discussion. I think we should discuss some things for the benefit of the public who read the minutes later.

Ms. Adams: Alright, that sounds good. Moving through the budget on page 1, it shows your Operations & Maintenance fees coming in as revenues as well as your debt service fees. The debt service fees, which are paying back your bond, and your operations and maintenance fees, are listed as one item by Osceola County tax collector. The property appraiser does put it on the TRIM notice. That is the way that they do it. If you would like to see how that is broken up, I do have a copy of the tax roll that shows the amount for debt service and the amount for proposed operations and maintenance fees. The administrative expenses do not have substantive changes here. There are some discrete increases as you will see comparing your adopted budget for Fiscal Year 2021 to your proposed budget for Fiscal Year 2022. It is a difference of about \$4,000 with all of the combined changes. The next section is where you see the more substantive changes. This is your maintenance and field expenses. The increases that are driving this anticipated increase in operations and maintenance fees are increased areas to maintain. This past fiscal year, the property at Reunion West Encore has been turned over to the District. The District now maintains landscaping, pond maintenance and other entry gates as it is customary with the remainder of Reunion. We are also anticipating at Reunion East for Reunion Village to come onboard. Those amounts have been budgeted for Fiscal Year 2022. There is a cost share agreement between Reunion East and Reunion West that is based on the number of platted lots. There is also reciprocity that anyone at Reunion East or Reunion West can use any of the amenities at either District as well. Those are the most substantive changes. The other change that is proposed for Reunion West is a contemplated transfer out to your Capital Fund, which is your R&M fund. On page 2 of the budget, you will see that in Fiscal Year 2021 there was no planned

contribution made. However, we are proposing a contribution of \$259,377 in the Fiscal Year 2022. Those capital reserves go to cover your major infrastructure when that needs to be replaced such as storm water systems, roads, entrance gates, roof replacements, etc. All of those things are considered capital expenses. Page 3 of the budget is your per unit assessment comparison chart. You will see the contemplated operations and maintenance fee increase for a multifamily home. The proposed increase is \$198.70 per unit. For a single-family home, the proposed increase for the year is \$265.02 or a little over \$20 a month. There is also a proposed increase for the golf parcels. For single-family homes, if the Board adopts the budget as it stands, your operation and maintenance fee would be \$1,001.29 for the year. The remainder of the budget is a helpful narrative which has details regarding each line item. There is also information regarding your amortization schedule for your bond payments. These are all managed internally through accounting and through the trustee. Do the Board members have any questions or comments or areas that we would like to highlight further for the record?

Mr. Greenstein: I want to point out that the shared costs, the common expenses that are shared between East and West, are split and have changed for this upcoming fiscal year based upon the additional platted lots. It turns out it is 47% for the West and 53% for the East. In our current fiscal year, it was 48% West and 52% East. The debt service generally is a fixed amount. However, the Board, and I will give Supervisor Staley full credit for bringing this up as early as he did, is looking toward refinancing one of the series of bonds. If the market stays anywhere in the ballpark of where it is, it will represent a reduction in debt service starting at a possible midterm Fiscal Year 2022 item, right?

Ms. Adams: Correct. The no call provision expires on May 1, 2022 but we can refund 90 days in advance of that. The Board will have the ability to determine if you want to reduce the term, the number of years, the payment amount or if you want to extract project funds.

Mr. Greenstein: While we have to look at those issues, just like an individual homeowner deciding to cash out on a refinance or hold to the amount that is going to be subject to the loan, so can the Board. It is another indication that we are trying to exercise proper fiduciary responsibility to make sure that the reserves are maintained. We are playing a bit of catch up here, but as we went through the workshop, we identified every item in the reserve study and we believe we can adopt a budget that starts the rebuilding process. That keeps us in a pretty realistic posture when it comes to the surprise items. We cannot with absolute certainty say that we are going to have an expenditure in a particular period of time. The original budget that was planned, and if

you just look at O&M, see when I look at the assessment, I am looking at the total number, even though debt service normally stays steady it could possibly go down depending on decisions that the Board makes when we refinance that series of bonds. The \$265,000 as the total of the assessment, I am thinking, "Oh, it is in the 10% range." Even though from a pure O&M standpoint it does equate to the 27%. The original proposal budget was 36%.

Mr. Staley: It still is 36%.

Mr. Greenstein: It still comes out to 36%?

Mr. Staley: I will clarify that. The general fund is a fairly modest increase which reflects the increased scope of services which we discussed. Where the big increases come in are the operating expenses and the replacement and maintenance fund. As we discussed before, for the total of West and East combined because we have to look at the total, in 2021 we are expected to spend \$454,000. Our budget for 2022, for the whole of East and West, is at \$900,000. I have expressed some doubt as to if we are going to spend \$900,000 comparing it to what we spent in 2021. If we don't spend it, we can carry it forward. Assuming we adopt this budget and spend \$900,000, our balance for our replacement and maintenance fund will actually go down in 2022 from \$861,000 down to \$693,000. Even with a big assessment increase, we will have to get over that hump so to speak for future years. We are not actually increasing our reserves at the end of next year, we are just treading water. The assessment will pave the way for building those reserves in the future. We have to build those reserves because they show significant expenditures 3-5 years out. I come back to what I have been saying about the workshop. As soon as we get past the fiscal year end, I think we should start work on a 5-year plan. The models, how we operate, and replacement reserve quantities over the next 5 years. I have done all of the math; I am not going to bore you with it. We have to maintain this level of assessments in order to build those reserves to meet the expenditures in years 3, 4 and 5. I would like at the end of this discussion for us to commit to starting work on a 5-year plan. We can see how the numbers work over the long term. Back to Mr. Witcher's question, I think the math is that if you look at the operating expenses, the increase is 36% and it goes up from \$736 to just over \$1,000. That is a 36% increase, but because the debt service is almost three times the level of the operating expenses, it dilutes the difference. In my case it is 9.8% overall. That 9.8% does mask the 36% increase on the operating expenses and a flat debt service payment. As Tricia said, we have to start building reserves and we have to start covering the increased expenses. That is what I conclude after the discussions we have had. I would like us to commit to the 5-year plan. I am happy to work with anybody on that

because the math is not looking very good unless we maintain this level of assessments in the future.

Ms. Adams: Staff would be happy to add that 5-year plan to the action item list so we can start to track that. Mr. Chairman, would you like to take public comments regarding Resolution 2021-11?

Mr. Greenstein: Yes.

Ms. Adams: Are there any members of the public who would like to make a comment regarding Resolution 2021-11? Seeing none,

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein, seconded by Mr. Burman, with all in favor, Resolution 2021-11 Adopting the Fiscal Year 2022 Budget and Relating to Annual Appropriation, were approved.

**B. Consideration of Resolution 2021-12 Imposing Special Assessments and Certifying an Assessment Roll**

Ms. Adams: The next item on the agenda is Resolution 2021-12. This is a companion resolution to the budget that you just adopted. You just adopted your budget, now we are funding it with the assessment roll. The assessment roll is an attachment to Resolution 2021-12 but in the interest of conserving resources we just have one copy of the assessment roll. Any Board members that want to review that I am happy to provide that for review. There is typically not a lot of discussion on this because it imposes the assessment and determines that it is going to be collected through the tax roll. Are there any questions or comments?

Mr. Greenstein: I would hope after all of these years I can rely on GMS accounting and our Treasurer to ensure that the roll that is going to be presented to the county will be proper.

Mr. Staley: Just to clarify, but for every lot of the West, is every lot assessed as the same single-family assessment with the debt service assessment as well?

Ms. Adams: Just to clarify, if it was determined in the original assessment methodology as a single-family home, yes, they are all the same. That is different for multi-family. The debt service is not always the same. It depends on which bond you fall into.

Mr. Greenstein: That is because there are different phases of development.

Mr. Staley: Understood. So, everyone's letter was tailored to where they fall in terms of the debt service?

Ms. Adams: Yes, as is the tax roll.

Mr. Staley: So, a single-family home for the whole of the West will have the same assessment?

Ms. Adams: The same operations and maintenance assessment, not the same debt service assessment.

Mr. Staley: Whether you have a vacant lot or a nonvacant lot?

Ms. Adams: That is a good question. It is based on platted lots. As soon as they are platted, then they go on the tax roll, and they are assessed the full freight in terms of operations and maintenance fees and debt service.

Mr. Staley: Thank you for the clarification.

Ms. Adams: Any public comments regarding Resolution 2021-12?

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein, seconded by Mr. Staley, with all in favor, Resolution 2021-12 Imposing Special Assessments and Certifying an Assessment Roll, were approved.

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

## **FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

### **Consideration of Landscape Architect Proposals for Amenity Development**

Ms. Adams: As the Board recalls, earlier in the calendar year you identified two parcels and engaged with residents in terms of feedback regarding how those parcels could potentially be developed into useful amenities. Ultimately the Board determined based on feedback and further discussion that the best use of the parcels was to develop a playground and an outdoor fitness station. The Board has reviewed the potential scope for those and engaged with the engineer. There has been some ground work done in terms of authorizing a survey, and that survey is now being executed. The next step is to look at what you want your park to look like. This morning we have Xabier with us and he is going to go through the proposals and present them to the Board.

Mr. Guerricagoita: Good morning. Board members, we solicited a proposal from 3 landscape architects. Of those 3, only 1 responded with a proposal. In the discussion here, there is another route or option to consider. This is to go directly to the manufacture suppliers because they do have a lot of in-house capability with preparing the plans which would cut back on the cost or the need to have a landscape architect come up with their own design and then send that over to a manufacturer to come up with. We have provided the proposal that we obtained, correct Tricia?

Ms. Adams: Yes. That was handed out because this came in late in the day yesterday. It was handed out under a separate cover. Board members, in front of you is a quote with ParkForms. You also have a workbook titled Reunion West with ParkForms. The proposal for the landscape architect is included in your agenda packet titled "Landscape Dynamics".

Mr. Guerricagoita: The other option to consider is to go with the company like ParkForms. There are some other names out there as well that we can get proposals from. This is the one that we are able to obtain in time to present here for the Board. If you look at the quote from ParkForms, they have a detailed quote for you for the play structure in the small area. They have two quotes for the larger area with one option without shade and the second option with shade. It is a pretty detailed estimate there for you to consider and take a look at. This is another option rather than getting a landscape architect if we did happen to send it back to a manufacturer to come up with the actual design structure.

Mr. Staley: I have a question regarding the landscape dynamics. So, they will design something, and then we have to go find someone to try to build it?

Mr. Guerricagoita: That is correct. For the most part they are right off the shelf. Again, it would streamline the process for sure to have them come up with whatever design you want and they basically put it into production and have it delivered. We do have some rough estimates. We asked ParkForms about the completion of the design. They said generally they could turn around in a week once they basically are authorized and ready to go, they can come up with the final design in a week. Then there is the permitting process. Osceola County does require a site plan approval for play structures. That would be the only thing that ParkForms will not be able to handle. A District Engineer or Landscape Architect could do that upon behalf of the CDD. The next component was how long is it going to take to get the construction materials delivered. The estimated time once everything is permitted and ready to go was 8-10 weeks for production, 5 days for transit, and 2 weeks for installation. You are looking at approximately 13-14 weeks from once the design is finalized and permitted.

Mr. Staley: Would we also have to contract for the fencing as well separately?

Mr. Guerricagoita: There may be some other elements that are not included in their bid that would need to be required then we would have to get someone who does that work to come up with the price to do that.

Mr. Staley: You said there are other manufacturers that could be prepared to do a turn-key type of solution?



Mr. Guerricagoita: Yes, we have names of a couple of other ones. I believe Playtopia was one that was given to us. American Parks was another one. There are other companies out there. This is by no means the only option. It is one of several that could be considered for the play areas.

Mr. Staley: What do the members of the Board think? I would suggest us getting a couple of turn-key proposals. We can wait 2-3 weeks to get that. I think this is the right solution.

Mr. Greenstein: Absolutely. We had great success on the East side project. It is a real eye opener to see if you just read the exclusions from Landscape Dynamic. It is the typical, "We can help you with this and that but it is really something that the providers of the equipment can handle."

Mr. Guerricagoita: That is one of the reasons why we didn't get much interest in proposals from landscape architects because they know that they can't compete with the manufacturers that actually do that stuff. They can do a lot of the stuff in house.

Mr. Staley: While we have the time, we could also look at the fencing and get quotes in for it.

Ms. Adams: In terms of looking at apples to apples comparisons, does the Board have a direction they are leaning in terms of the smaller play area or the larger play area, and with or without a shade structure?

Mr. Greenstein: I think it should definitely have a shade structure. We don't have natural shade from trees there so I think we need the shade structure.

Mr. Staley: The difference is not huge.

Ms. Adams: So, the larger one with shade?

Mr. Greenstein: We have to give residents return on their investment.

Ms. Adams: Another thing that may not be included in this is if we need to have some landscape finishing. We can engage Yellowstone along the way.

Mr. Staley: This cost is pretty reasonable, I think.

Mr. Scheerer: American Parks did the same thing on the East. They did everything. They did put a fence up around that playground. Different conditions, but we did add the sidewalk after the work was done.

Ms. Adams: We can take this as Board direction and there is no action required because you will be taking action when you eventually approve a proposal. We will work in tandem with the manufacturer and inhouse engineering and Xabier in terms of gathering information for a

fence proposal, sidewalk and we will just know that there is an allowance for landscaping included in there. This does not address the outdoor fitness stations.

Mr. Guerricagoita: We will package it up in one proposal. We could also do one for the play equipment and another for the exercise.

Ms. Adams: Any other discussion? Seeing none,

## **SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

### **Ratification of Survey Proposal from ASM Related to Amenity Development**

Ms. Adams: The Board approved a survey in order to get started on parcel development for both parcels which is needed as part of the development process. The Board approved the survey back in May. This is simply being brought back for Board ratification. The total amount for Parcel 1 the survey is \$1,250. For Parcel 2 it is \$775. This would be inclusive for both parcels, the playground development and the outdoor fitness center development.

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein, seconded by Mr. Burman, with all in favor, the Survey Proposal from ASM Related to Amenity Development, was ratified.

## **SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

### **Staff Reports**

#### **A. Attorney**

Ms. Trucco: We were asked to inquire with Bond Counsel if they would charge the District a fee to inquire about potentially closing the Sinclair road entrance to residents only. Right now, it is open to the public. The District's bond counsel did express some concern and they feel that it is necessary to investigate and do research on their end to see if this conflicts with any of our obligations under the bond documents. Initial concerns are one that that gate may have been constructed using bond funds so closing that gate from the public entering conflicts with the idea of it being open to the public. Anything that the District owns and maintains must be open to the public. That is the first initial concern that they had. That the actual gate may have been constructed using bond funds. Secondly, the historical use of that gate has been open to the public. You can use the gate and the public can enter through the gate to enter onto the roads which are open to the public. To take the step to close that gate for public entrance creates the appearance that we are closing the roads as well and making them for private use only. Those are their two concerns. They need to do some research to render a formal legal opinion. They provided an estimate in the amount of \$5,000 to do so. I know on the action item list there are a couple other avenues the District was pursuing. I can try to answer any questions you may have. They provided

an estimate in the ballpark of \$5,000 and that is the District's Bond Counsel. I had one other update. It is the TECO gas agreement we have been negotiating. We are almost done. We are requesting one more addition for the District's insurance and indemnification requirements that we have in most all of our agreements with contractors. It is nearly finalized and we will likely have it on the agenda next month for ratification and approval but I just wanted to provide that update on the other agreement. Those were the two things that we have been working on and other than that we don't have any legal updates for the Board.

Ms. Adams: At last month's meeting the Board directed staff to implement a temporary maintenance of traffic plan internally within the District with the intention of separating visitor traffic from resident traffic at the earliest time possible on Sinclair with the ultimate goal being expediting resident traffic. Alan worked with the District engineer regarding the number of cones that would be appropriate and the cones were ordered. They were installed the last week of July. There has also been some temporary signage that has been ordered but not yet installed and that signage is reiterating the message that visitor traffic should move to the left and resident traffic should move to the right. That signage is still pending and in addition to the cones and signage there was direction to have a more dynamic presence with Reunion security being in the front lines and directing traffic at the critical places of separation. Victor Vargas is here with Reunion security. He has been on the front lines since the implementation to managing this. Would the Board like to hear comments from him at this time?

Mr. Greenstein: Absolutely.

Mr. Vargas: The last couple of weeks have been under control. When we have the signs, it will help big time. Right now, we just have the specific gates. After 4 p.m. and going into 6 or 7 o'clock and asking the guests or residents to get into the appropriate lane. I heard from the team and it is working out right now. We still have some homeowners that like the ideas and some that don't like them. It is just temporary. I don't have anything negative to say.

Ms. Adams: I will mention that even though we are waiting for additional temporary signage, there is signage installed advising visitors to move into the left lane and residents to move into the right lane. There is also painting on the roads. Very large painting that identifies which lane is for which. Drivers are still letting security know that they are confused about where to go and we are hoping that additional temporary signage will help. We are hoping that will confirm that we have the language correct and that it is understandable and then that can be replicated into permanent signage. This is ready for Board discussion.

Mr. Stanley: The signage probably wouldn't say "Valid Access Cards Only" because who does that effect? The sign just saying "Residents" can be confusing and people who are just guests here renting properties have an access card so they can use that residential lane.

Ms. Adams: Ultimately, we want to keep the signage as short as possible. When guests register and receive their card, they are advised that they can go through the resident lane. They are verbally told, "You can go through the residential lane," so identifying it as a resident's lane is a clear and concise way to identify it. We are not sure that language is correct yet because we want to run it through some paces and see where people may still be confused. When guests receive their card, they are told, "You can now go through the resident lane."

Mr. Greenstein: For example, a truck, or any vehicle that has a clearance issue, has to go through the resident lane. People will learn. The FedEx guys know. The key thing overall is that it seems to have helped and I have only seen a cone run over or knocked out of the way maybe 2 days out of the last 30. I am not going through that gate every day, but I go through it a few times a week. Most people are being alerted that there is something going on there. Our signage is ever so slightly past the point of where the decision needs to be made. We continue to work with the county even though right now there isn't anyone to really talk to apparently because you want to force people to make that decision earlier than they are currently making it. A couple of residents from the West side indicated that they thought the cones were working. On a permanent basis, if we were to proceed with this, we would do something more permanent. If we are going to encroach on Sinclair Road and get anywhere near that area that technically doesn't belong to us, we have to get the blessing of the county in order for us to do it. Cones are not very pretty. The ones that are more permanent, I gave the example of when you are coming off 192 over by Disney and it segregates the traffic and you have unimpeded access. You don't go through the traffic light at Griffin Road. These things really can help. On this issue that we asked counsel to look at as far as the legal ramifications of closing the gate, every one of these gates were erected with public funds I believe. I would be shocked if someone showed us that somehow one gate was done without public funds. Beyond that issue, the gates were put there for a purpose. It was to distribute the flow of traffic into the resort. I am kind of speaking to the East side now for a second, I am the Chair and not the entire Board, but to close off a gate and create all of that traffic basically to have to come in through the main gate where there is no place for the traffic to queue up, they would basically just be out on 532 in the left-hand lane, presents all kinds of other issues. I think

we are taking prudent steps to try to create the traffic atmosphere that we want for anyone who is doing official business with the resort to be able to use that right hand lane.

Mr. Staley: Regarding the gate closure, I tend to agree that we should delay that decision because we want to try and keep that gate open if we can. It has got to work for the residents and guests. I sent Tricia a list of pros and cons regarding closing that gate and to be honest the cons were greater than the pros. I think we could delay that decision on the legal research for a while but going back to the signage. Let's say that we could get the signage right. Unfortunately, some people do not want to learn. They understand it is for residents and pass holders only, but what I have seen and heard people say is that that gate is closer to the barriers. There is a gap. It is maybe 20 yards after the end of the cones where people are cutting across to the left. We have to find a way to stop people from doing that. That is what I am seeing people do. They will continue doing it because they know they can bluff their way through because that gap is quite large. It is about 50 yards before you get to the island that separates the two gates. That is when people are cutting across, I have seen them do it. If you can stop them from doing that it would be marvelous but some people make a genuine mistake. I don't know how we are going to solve that problem because you have to let them come back to the left. It separates the people who make a genuine mistake from the people who are just trying to get on. If we ever get a busy day, I think you will find that is will become a bigger problem and residents will be disappointed that people are abusing the system with the cones. Give it some thought please because it is not an easy one to solve.

Mr. Greenstein: Victor, while we are engaged in discussion, I am pretty sure I read it in the minutes but thank you for expediting the receipt of access cards for the pools. Sharon at the last meeting asked if the access card for the pools and fitness center would actually work at the gates at entry.

Mr. Vargas: Yes.

Mr. Greenstein: I did a test on mine on Liberty Bluff and actually stopped because I have the RFID tag, so I had to stay far enough away that the RFID wouldn't trip it and I walked up and swiped it and nothing happened. Hopefully, they truly may just be a freak thing with my card but those cards will actually work everything.

Mr. Vargas: A lot of the old access cards you need to touch the reader with them.

Mr. Greenstein: Okay, first I gave it a swipe then I touched it but I will try it again.

Mr. Staley: Just a suggestion, but a lot of people are interested in what we are doing with those codes. I think we should attach something to the minutes that says, "This is what we have learned." People are curious. You can't do it on Facebook. We need to communicate what we are doing and if it is working or not. Maybe a week before the next meeting if you want to let me know that you have some thoughts, I will sit with you and prepare a one pager or something and circulate it so all you have to do is talk to me and I will write it all down.

Mr. Greenstein: It is the kind of thing that even though it is ours to deal with because security is executed through the master that artemis would be happy if we provided that public document letting people know what is going on with the experiment so we can get it out to everyone that way.

Mr. Staley: Or we could attach it to the agenda.

Ms. Adams: Understood. For the record, I want to note that Sharon has joined the meeting so future votes will include her.

*\*Ms. Harley joined the meeting at this time\**

Ms. Adams: Along those same lines with Sinclair Gate, we also have been working with the District Engineer in terms of interface with Osceola County for a temporary maintenance and traffic plan farther out on the county road. Xabier may have an update on the status.

Mr. Guerricagoita: I don't have an update since our last meeting. We are struggling because our original contact that we were speaking with at Osceola County is no longer there. They are trying to connect us to whoever is going to take over and give us permanent direction on it.

Mr. Greenstein: As I said at the last meeting, I see this as an opportunity. We are going to keep pushing and keep moving in this direction administratively until we are told to seize and desist. So far, we have done nothing to impede on the Sinclair Road jurisdiction but we are moving in that direction. We will just keep moving. We are not going to wait for the county.

Ms. Adams: To let the Board know in regards to the presentation of a white paper, I conferred with the Chairman of the Board and there was discussion based on the items that were on the agenda today that today would not be the right day to present that. If that is something that the Board would like to see formalized, and a white paper developed regarding the pros and cons of Sinclair gate being closed to the public I am happy to do that. It sounds like what the Board wants at this point is to direct efforts into these maintenance and traffic plans and see what can

be done to expediate resident traffic without closing the gate. Am I reading the room correctly that this is where we are?

Mr. Greenstein: I think it is clear. I am not going to approve \$5,000 to counsel to give us an answer on that issue until we determine there is an absolute need for that issue.

Ms. Adams: Sounds good. Moving back to the staff reports.

**B. Engineer**

Mr. Guerricagoita: I do not have anything further.

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 an action item list under tab 1 in your agenda packet. The items for Reunion West look to start on page 3. We have already had an update on the development of the recreational parcels for Grand Traverse Parkway and Valhalla Terrace. No updates on the Encore transition at Reunion West. We are still working through a couple of budget items for that location. No update on the refunding of the 2004-1 bonds as that project is on hold until the fall.

Mr. Staley: At what point should we start work on that? We can price in November.

Ms. Adams: During the presentation from FMS, they suggested we start working on it in November and get ready to close as early as February 1<sup>st</sup> because that is actually the 90 days before the no call provision expires. Between November and February there is plenty of time to work through the elements of the bond refunding. If the Board would like to discuss anything in advance of that I would be happy to do so, otherwise we will reengage FMS in November. The parking rules for Encore has no changes. We are working in tandem with Reunion security who is now contracted for security services in that area and they are providing feedback regarding any needs that we may have to implement parking rules in the vicinity. No update on the nearby elevation development. There are no changes from the county and no notifications. The Sinclair gate we have already discussed and I don't think there is anything further to make note of on that. Duke street lights there is no update and they are still waiting for materials to come in but hopefully they should be arriving in August and as soon as the materials are here, they will get

started on that work. Beautification of the Sinclair near the lift station. Alan met with Sharon; do you want to provide an update for the Board?

Mr. Scheerer: Mike Smith, myself and Sharon met yesterday. We tried to meet sooner but it just didn't work out. We have an idea of what she is looking at for some home improvements. About halfway up Tradition Boulevard to Sinclair Road starting just past the lift station and all the way up to the gates. Mike is going to be working to implement a plan with a couple different options for the palm trees. Hopefully we will have something on the agenda for discussion for next month.

Ms. Adams: Any input or questions from the Board? The next item on the action items list is related to the trash overflow and the potential to possibly identify a parcel that could be used for trash dumpsters to be stored on sight so that overflow trash could be gathered at one place and stored in dumpsters and then eventually hauled away. Alan investigated about seven CDD parcels. Most of those there was some concerns regarding how close they were to existing residential development and also because there were utility easements that ran across those parcels, there were some limitations. Out of the seven, there was one identified as the most likely parcel in terms of lack of impediment. There is a hand out today that is a print out from the Osceola County property appraiser's office. It identifies a parcel that is actually nearby Sinclair Gate where that lift station is. I believe all of the Board members have that parcel in front of you. I will make a couple remarks about this parcel. Do you see where there is the lift station carve out in the parcel. You will see that is where Sinclair and Tradition merge, but there is what is called the Sinclair Gate over to the side. There is also some land that has been platted for residential housing but not yet developed. You will see on the other side of the lift station that there is some residential development that will eventually be there. Right now, this area is being used for overflow parking for employees. Alan also identified another parcel but that is owned by Kingwood/Reunion Resort and that is at the end of White Marsh Way. We haven't engaged in discussion because there is not Board direction to do so in determining if Reunion Resort or Kingwood would be willing to use that parcel for the purpose of identifying a location to house trash dumpsters.

Ms. Harley: I think the White Marsh Way one is going to depend on what their development is in that area. They are going to develop it.

Ms. Adams: Other considerations that the Board has is that we learned from Xabier last month that if the Board wants to identify a place for dumpster storage is that the county has



requirements in regards for fencing and visually concealing those kinds of areas. That is a consideration. There are also some barriers on the road and the width of the road may not accommodate dump trucks or other utility equipment that may need to go in and out of there. This has not been fully vetted. This is a first pass through with the Board in terms of the earnest interest and exploring feasibility of licensing with another organization in regards to a trash dumpster location. I want to see if there are any comments from the District Engineer or District Counsel on this matter. We have said we want to make sure the CDD resources are used for CDD purposes but we do have an ability to license with other organizations and certainly utilities fall within the resident and lifestyle parameters that are here with Reunion.

Ms. Trucco: I would just comment that if the Board was interested in this parcel, it would be worth someone from the District staff or myself or the District Engineer reaching out to the county to see the feasibility. You brought up a good point. Can dumpsters or dump trucks access this parcel?

Ms. Harley: Yes, that was Alan's concern with that parcel.

Mr. Greenstein: The location yes.

Ms. Harley: You wouldn't actually see it that much. When you do see it more than anything is when you are in Eagle Trace because it is much lower. On the approach up here on Tradition, you don't really see it especially if there are fencing requirements then I think that will disguise it. I think they are going to have the worst view of it.

Mr. Staley: It is a question of whether we have a dumpster or have that outside of a house. That is not very nice if you live next door to that house. We have got to work together with property management companies, Kingwood, and the HOA to try to find a solution. Alan, are you saying in your experience that this could work?

Mr. Scheerer: I have one concern. Could it work? Yes. My concern right now is there is a parallel road from Tradition Boulevard access road to get to that lift station and there are retaining walls on each side. I don't know that the retaining wall provides enough space for a roll off dumpster. There are a couple of drop off dumpsters. I think there may be some concern with that. We would have to reach out to a vendor to see. There is a retaining wall and then guard rails along the wall. I think it is a good spot. It is out of the way and by a lift station. It is just a matter of access. I don't know if we can widen that. There may be some expenses in widening that in order to get access. We could have to put in some wall protection and barriers and there could be an added expense for that.

Mr. Staley: I think it starts with Kingwood and the HOA, the preferred management companies, to work together with us to find a solution.

Ms. Harley: I can talk to the partners. Everyone wants to find a solution.

Mr. Staley: The trash is disgusting.

Ms. Harley: Kingwood falls into line anytime we ask them for help, even when it is a busy period. Everyone is onboard with it.

Mr. Staley: To be honest, it is not inside of the boundaries of the resort. I have a couple things in mind, we could've destroyed some of the preserve which I don't think anyone wants to do.

Mr. Scheerer: We have other access areas, but there we basically get into some retention ponds. I didn't move any of those. There was one area at the end of Sandy Ridge on the East, which is a retention area as well. Sometimes it is wet and sometimes it is not. It is by the emergency access road. I don't know that it is a viable spot at the end of Sandy Ridge back in there.

Mr. Staley: Who owns this wooded area on the south side?

Ms. Adams: It is likely a CDD natural area. A conservation area.

Ms. Harley: The good thing about that is that people don't really know that it is there. It might be a deterrent because of where it is.

Mr. Staley: This solution has to have daily collections. Honestly the amount of trash that is being generated from these properties you almost need daily collections on 2-3 dumpsters. You all see more trash than I do.

Mr. Burman: The road is probably not the problem. In fact, maybe it should encourage it. Maybe it should be a drive-thru where people take their trash anytime they want and toss it in. Anything to get the trash off of the streets will help whether it comes from management companies, residents, owners or guests or anybody.

Mr. Scheerer: That area is owned by Reunion West CDD.

Ms. Adams: Is it designated conservation?

Mr. Scheerer: I would say yes.

Mr. Staley: I think the problem is so severe that we have to try everything we can to make this work. If this is the only viable spot, White Marsh is not perfect. You have dump trucks having to go through residential areas to get to the White Marsh. Here, the dump truck can pick it up on Sinclair and be gone.

Mr. Greenstein: I think White Marsh is off the table based upon the developer's intent to develop the area of Kingwood. What about O-3? Alan, who owns O-3? Is that county?

Mr. Scheerer: Where is O-3?

Mr. Greenstein: It is before you hit the turn.

Mr. Scheerer: We do. But remember, that is going to be a road.

Mr. Greenstein: Again, like everything else around here, it moves pretty slowly. I am concerned about the location. We are trying our best to manage traffic better into the entry, but to have a turnoff in here for the dumpster site and then needing to get back onto the road you have to engineer it with a driveway so that you can then make a left and go back to exit the resort on Sinclair Road. The way it is engineered now is going to require some roadway work. Sinclair Road extension was just mentioned, which is true, I have to assume that since I have not seen any engineering of said extension, that it is not going to encroach on any CDD property and that if anything the road is going to veer more to the west or north of us rather than cutting straight into our conservation area. I don't know what the routing of Sinclair Road is going to be. I am curious about the O-3 parcel.

Mr. Scheerer: It is only like a third of an acre. It is a very small spot. If you look at it, it is 0.35 acres. It is not a big parcel property.

Mr. Burman: This is probably too much detail to talk about right this second, but it would have to be some sort of drive-thru for trucks and cars to go through. Graham, is this something we want to pursue? We need to start talking about those things. There are a thousand other details beyond this.

Ms. Adams: If there is an appetite on this, then staff will develop action steps that need to be taken.

Mr. Scheerer: If the lift station spot is the most viable spot, we are going to need to engage an engineer to attach some modifications and changes that we are going to need.

Mr. Staley: From what I am hearing, the CDD and the property management company and Kingwood and the HOA are working together to find a solution. This is the best we have gotten so far.

Mr. Greenstein: I agree with that statement, but I am saying our CDD input is to approve use of land that we own for this purpose. Almost every other issue falls elsewhere. I don't see that beyond a licensing agreement that there is that much involvement from the CDD.

Ms. Harley: The fact that it is on CDD land, does it not have to be sanctioned?

Ms. Adams: It is premature for the Board to approve or sanction anything right now. I would say right now we need to decide if there is an appetite to explore feasibility. There are funding considerations for the modifications that would be required in order to have it designated as a dumpster location.

Mr. Staley: That is why I think the next step should be the CDD expressing support for this exploration and to leave the plans with David to follow up with Anthony to see if this will work. He may have an additional idea that feeds on top of it. We have got to find a solution.

Mr. Greenstein: I agree.

Ms. Adams: Does the District Engineer have any preliminary thoughts on what steps would need to be taken in order to get the permit for that purpose?

Mr. Guerricagoita: We would have to go through the Osceola County permitting for the structure. That enclosure is considered a structure so we have to go through the building department.

Ms. Adams: At the last meeting you mentioned a barrier.

Mr. Guerricagoita: The enclosure yes.

Ms. Adams: For the enclosure, is there also a type of surface requirement?

Mr. Guerricagoita: Yes, it needs to be a hard surface of some kind.

Mr. Stanley: From what I have seen, the existing Sinclair Road almost goes right into the existing Sinclair Road.

Ms. Adams: I know that it may be an issue to have additional utility trucks in an already congested area. Alan and I discussed it, and often utility trucks are here in morning hours when the traffic at the gate is not as much of an issue. It is very rare to see them during peak traffic hours.

Ms. Harley: I am sure we could schedule them as well.

Mr. Scheerer: It is not like the regular trash service you get at say the community center. They come on certain days and they pick up the garbage.

Ms. Adams: It sounds like there is consensus on the Board to explore feasibility. You would like for David to take leadership in terms of conveying to Kingwood the possibility and to get feedback regarding participation. Is there a formal short term rental organization here? What is the best way if that is going to be a stake holder that is contributing formally to this? Is that going to be through the association or is that going to be a separate stakeholder?

Ms. Harley: I think it would have to be a separate conversation.

Mr. Burman: The only way we could do it is through the HOA. I don't think we can force rental companies to do anything. If it is going to be an equal applied cost it would be through the HOA.

Ms. Adams: Okay. So, the HOA would have the responsibility to determine funding for the dumpster services?

Mr. Burman: That is my opinion. I am telling you that if it is going to be an HOA expense it has to be applied equally. Everybody or nobody.

Ms. Harley: Who funds all of the dumpsters that are around the resort now? That is CDD property, correct?

Mr. Scheerer: There is only one. The HOA does pick that dumpster up every day. Sometimes twice a day. All of the other dumpsters are paid for by the condos and villas. The ones close to the building may be CDD, but all of the other dumpsters are HOA. They have their own set of problems. They sit there all day long while trucks drive in, dump in the dumpster, and drive off. They didn't come from the condo. It is not just single-family homes that are having problems.

Mr. Staley: I think we know what is going to be a problem. Homeowners have to pay increased assessment to fund the operation of the dumpster. The property management companies who are not prepared to do the right thing and clear trash up in a timely fashion. That is going to be a big issue. We have property management companies that will not deal with the issue and we know that.

Mr. Greenstein: You hit the nail on the head. That is why I said CDD involvement is strictly limited to use of the property and the conditions that we may indicate have to be adhered to in order to use that property under the licensing agreement. Everything else about it has to be planned out and costed out through this.

Mr. Burman: This is going to be \$100,000 of work. Landscaping and planning are going to be a lot of money. Where does that come from.

Mr. Staley: Personally, I would pay for that just to make my existence better. I know a lot of people have a problem with that. Residents struggle with why property management companies don't abide by code of conduct. I know you can't enforce a code of conduct on them, but they don't understand why not. You first use the code of conduct on the homeowners.

Mr. Burman: No, they are applied equally. Homeowners have to abide by the rules as much as management companies do, probably more. The question is, why doesn't anybody follow it.

Mr. Staley: There were two property management companies that came last week and immediately dealt with a situation but it shouldn't be happening in the first place. It happens when someone checked out and they basically dumped 10 lbs. worth of trash on the road and on the side of the road. That should not happen in the first place because there should be a code of conduct that means the property management companies get rid of that the day that people check out. I know you can't enforce that. There is no way to enforce that across the rest of the property management companies.

Mr. Burman: The owner of that house gets the fine. If we enforce it, we enforce it within the limits of the law and that is the problem.

Ms. Harley: The difficulty we have right now is that they can only work with the two that they have. In instances like that, you can have the guest that puts all of their trash on the curb as they are leaving, and you could have already booked a 3<sup>rd</sup> party company to come remove that trash but you can't guarantee that they are going to be there within minutes of the guest putting the trash out. The other issue you have is that the guest goes out and the cleaners go in and now it is 4 o'clock in the afternoon before they have gotten the trash. It is how you service it.

Mr. Staley: I don't understand why property management companies don't bring the trashcans out to the street. Why does it have to wait until Saturday and Sunday? That is what happens. The can comes out on the day they leave. Why can't they put the trash out during the four days that we have trash collection? If they aren't going to do it, why won't the property management company drag those cans out for them?

Mr. Burman: With all of these reasons, we are committed to supporting an effort. While we are talking about you personally, I am not delegating you as a CDD member to do this. This is something I view as a messenger for the Master Association and your relationship with Kingwood and the significant property managers of Reunion to get an effort going and I know the CDD will support that effort to the extent that we can. This problem is not going away it is only getting worse and we need to do something about it. As a homeowner and resident, I want to see it resolved too.

Mr. Burman: I have a meeting with Anthony at 2. I will mention this. I doubt they are going to come up with \$100,000. This is probably going to have to be done by the HOA and how we get that funding is going to be a question. The developer and anyone in that group are technically the HOA too they wear two hats. I don't think Kingwood is going to be like, "Alright, I will write a check for \$100,000."

Ms. Harley: Rightfully so. It is not just their problem. I do think that the property managers should contribute to this as well.

Mr. Burman: The other problem is, especially with this site, it is not going to benefit Reunion East at all. Nobody is going to drive from Homestead over here.

Ms. Harley: We will. Property managers will. I get what you are saying about individual owners.

Mr. Greenstein: At one time, Osceola County pushed back really hard on anything other than the once-a-week trash pickup. We worked it out to get 3 day a week trash pickup. What would it take for a 7 day a week pickup, or a 5 day a week?

Mr. Burman: It would be the least expensive option that is for sure. It is only \$4 to add the 2 extra pickups.

Mr. Greenstein: Do it.

Mr. Staley: I am not convinced that renters will put trashcans out. I have watched. People don't put trashcans out until Saturday or Sunday.

Mr. Greenstein: We take any step we possibly can. I think if renters were told. I don't want buzzards. I don't want trash flying all over the place. If we can get additional pick-up days, I think we should investigate. Again, the master can take the lead and get the discussion going because it is not a CDD subject.

Mr. Staley: When trash is on the road it is a CDD issue. That is what I keep emphasizing.

Mr. Greenstein: Right.

Mr. Staley: My final comment would be that I know it is complicated, but I am conscience that we must not adopt a solution here that actually prevents solving the root cause which occurs at the house itself. That is where the root cause is. It is that we are not using the existing facility that we have which is 4 days a week trash pickup. We are not utilizing it because renters are on vacation. They are not here to drag trash down.

Mr. Greenstein: Officially we have 3 right. The other day is a recycling day. You remember when they came back and gave us some ridiculous number for the extra days of pickup. If it is not that expensive to have additional days of pickup, why wouldn't we consider that?

Ms. Adams: We brought this into the CDD as a CDD matter in terms of licensing with the HOA so there are going to be some restrictions on Board members talking outside of noticed meetings. We can schedule a workshop and Board members can discuss to your heart's content regarding all of the different aspects because it is complicated and there are multiple stakeholders.

There is the CDD as the property owner, but then there are other organizations that will benefit from it.

Mr. Greenstein: They are already doing Saturdays. They have Monday, Thursday, and Saturday. That is going to put more days in there and flow.

Mr. Staley: Sunday is actually the biggest problem.

**ii. Approval of Check Register**

Ms. Adams: The next item on the agenda does require Board action. This is approval of the check register from July 1<sup>st</sup> through July 31<sup>th</sup> and it is included in your agenda packet under tab 2 and the detailed summary is behind it. The total amount is \$39,012.60.

Mr. Greenstein: Motion to approve the check register.

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein, seconded by Ms. Harley, the Check Register, was approved.

**iii. Balance Sheet and Income Statement**

Ms. Adams: Are there any comments on the financials? Hearing none,

**iv. Approval of Fiscal Year 2022 Meeting Schedule**

Ms. Adams: The next item on the agenda does require Board action. I will note that this meeting schedule has been set up on the same day of the month, the second Thursday, starting at 11:30 a.m. which has been the meeting start time since we had more residents appointed to the Board. Does the Board want to continue to meet at 11:30 a.m. or do you want to consider a different meeting time?

Mr. Staley: I don't like us cutting short discussions. Because of the Sunshine Law, we can't talk to each other except once a month. That is my only big issue. If the East would prepare to stick around for half an hour if we finish early, I would like to start at 11.

Mr. Greenstein: I have no problem proposing a change to 11:00 a.m. whether we use the full two hours or not. If it breaks a half hour early then fine, they go across the street and grab a snack and come back and start the meeting at 1:00 p.m. Let's make it 11:00.

Ms. Adams: This would approve the Fiscal Year 2022 meeting schedule starting in October on the second Thursday of the month at 11:00 a.m.



On MOTION by Mr. Burman, seconded by Ms. Harley, the Fiscal Year 2022 Meeting Schedule, was approved.

**D. Security Report**

**i. 63 Parking Violations and 1 Vehicle Tow**

Ms. Adams: We have a security report regarding information that was provided to the Board under separate cover. A summary is that there were 63 parking violations issued and 1 vehicle was towed during the month of July.

**EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Other Business**

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

Mr. Staley: I have a quick question. We have a religious holiday coming up which concerns structures and trash. Are there any plans on managing this cycle? I assume you guys are involved with Kingwood and managing what is likely to be another fairly difficult 2-week period with trash in particular.

Mr. Burman: The HOA is in the same boat it is always in. We can't happily manage anything for anybody.

Ms. Harley: We will be working with Kingwood to ask them, and it will probably be White Marsh because it is the most practical.

Mr. Staley: Do we know where the central location is going to be this time?

Ms. Harley: This doesn't have a central location. This is the holiday where despite the fact that they say you cannot have temporary structures but they will put them up.

Mr. Burman: And there are different groups.

Ms. Harley: Each home will put up a tent structure but will not have a solid roof. We will work with HOA and give them any information we have.

Mr. Burman: We will have our people out every day patrolling. They are taking notes and taking pictures. We can't go pick up the trash.

Mr. Staley: Sharon is right. The tents are going to happen. There is nothing we can do about it. They will just pay the fine. The trash is the bigger issue.

Ms. Harley: That is going to be a high priority for us. The good thing is apart from those guests, it is quiet time for everything else. All resources can be focused there.

**NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Supervisor's Requests**

Ms. Adams: Any other supervisor requests? Seeing none,

**TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Next Meeting Date**

Ms. Adams: Your next meeting is September 9<sup>th</sup> at 11:30 a.m.

**ELEVENTH 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~~