

**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, **January 13, 2022** at 11:00 a.m. at Heritage Crossing Community Center, 7715 Heritage Crossing Way, Reunion, FL.

Present and constituting a quorum:

Mark Greenstein
David Burman
Graham Staley
Michael Mancke

Chairman
Vice Chairman
Assistant Secretary
Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

Tricia Adams
Kristen Trucco
Alan Scheerer
Victor Vargas
Jon Kessler *via Zoom*
Steve Boyd *joined late*

District Manager
District Counsel
Field Operations Manager
Reunion Security
FMS
Boyd Civil Engineering

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

Roll Call

Ms. Adams called the meeting to order and called the roll. Four Board members were in attendance constituting a quorum.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS

Public Comment Period

Ms. Adams: We also have some members of the public who have joined us in the audience, as well as on Zoom. We are expecting Jon Kessler to call in. Jon, if you're on the public line, I'm not sure if you know how to raise your hand using the star 9 function or I can do a test on that line. Just checking with the telephone number with the last four digits 3781. Is that Jon?

Mr. Kessler: Yes, hi.

Ms. Adams: Perfect. Thank you for joining us. We'll be getting to your presentation in just a moment. This is an opportunity for any members of the public to make a comment to the Board

of Supervisors. Is there anyone here? Yes, sir. If you can state your first and last name, as well as your address?

Bill Witcher (1268 Grand Traverse Parkway): I'm Bill Witcher and I live at 1268 Grand Traverse Parkway. I'm on the Reunion Homeowners Community watch. This is really a parking question that I have. As you go down Grand Traverse and you come to the little common area there at Valhalla and you come up to the stop sign, parking is allowed on both sides of that street while everywhere else when I do my community watch, generally, there's no parking on one side of the street, but there's that stretch right in there where there are not any 'No Parking' signs on either side of the road. I do notice it gets very congested when there are a lot of residents. I'm not so sure that firetrucks would actually be able to get through that area. I would like someone to take a look at that parking situation. Thank you.

Mr. Scheerer: No problem. Thank you for bringing that to our attention, sir.

Mr. Greenstein: Just for my clarification, that's the area that the one side of the street would be the grassy area behind the mailbox kiosks?

Mr. Witcher: Right where the playgrounds are.

Mr. Greenstein: We do have plans and we can look at those plans for traffic control around that area because you will have youngsters in that area, so it's good that you bring it up. We would have caught up with it, but it's good that you bring it up now because generally, it wasn't the idea that there would be parking on both sides of the roadway. Thank you.

Ms. Adams: Any other members of the public here to make a comment to the Board of Supervisors? Seeing none. We do have someone attending on Zoom. If you would like to make a comment, please raise your hand. Mr. Chairman, I don't see any Zoom attendees who would like to make a comment to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Greenstein: Thank you. We can proceed.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS

Approval of the Minutes of the December 9, 2021 Meeting

Ms. Adams: The next item on the agenda is approval of the minutes from the December 9th, 2021 meeting. We have received comments which have been incorporated into the draft of the meeting minutes from Supervisor Staley. Do we have any other meeting minute comments or corrections?

Mr. Greenstein: I have no changes.

Mr. Burman: None from me.

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein, seconded by Mr. Staley, with all in favor, the Minutes of the December 9, 2021 Meeting, were approved as amended to include Supervisor corrections.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Discussion of 'No Parking' Rules

Ms. Adams: We have a discussion item on the agenda which is discussion of the 'No Parking' rules, and I believe Supervisor Staley you have requested this item perhaps as it relates to commercial vehicles?

Mr. Staley: Yes. I think it's for clarification for myself and also for residents because we can put it into the minutes. As I read the rules that we published in September 2020, I think it was, there's a section on commercial vehicles that basically I think it says, they are allowed to park on both sides of the road, in other words, anywhere, while they're in the pursuit of their profession or whatever. Whether it'd be a property management company cleaning the house or an electrician doing work or whatever. Because I often get asked, why can those commercial vehicles park everywhere? Because it actually can get quite hairy in certain situations where they're doing so. But our rules allow them to do so. I just wanted to clarify if my reading is correct.

Ms. Adams: Yes, that is a good point. There is an allowance for commercial vehicles that are servicing residential properties here at Reunion to park in the road while they're doing so. That being said, if there's a situation where traffic is being blocked or otherwise, there's not a free flow of traffic or there is a safety issue, security can certainly address that and make sure that the roadways are clear.

Mr. Staley: That was a follow up because I've had someone park outside my house on the wrong side of the road and there was no danger as far as I can see, but the security actually stopped and knocked on my door and asked them to move. So I wondered if Victor's people are on the same page as the rules. Do they understand that the commercial vehicles are allowed to park on both sides of the road? Victor?

Mr. Vargas: Not on both sides. That is the reason they knocked on your door.

Mr. Staley: I'm not encouraging them to park on both sides. I'd love them to park in line with our rules, but I think there's some confusion. You can see there is some confusion between security and homeowners, etc.

Mr. Greenstein: I do think it needs to be clarified because I think the intent during discussions of this item prior to the putting into writing was that it would be temporary, let's say when making a delivery. I can appreciate the fact that someone cannot go across the street easily and then will temporarily park in front of the residents on the side of the street that does not allow parking, but I think it should be temporary and the person should put their flashers on. It should not be a continuing situation.

Mr. Staley: Well, it actually says, Mark, except during the period of delivery, or the provision of services to the adjacent residential units. That basically gives them permission to be there all day if it's a long service call.

Mr. Greenstein: I think we need to take a look at that.

Mr. Staley: I think we do need to take a look. Even if it says where possible, park on the right side of the road, if not possible, or something.

Ms. Adams: If staff could make a note of that, and I'm going to assume that Board members don't want to schedule a rule hearing for this matter, but the next time that we do have a related parking rule hearing to address this at the same time. We're going to have at least one additional section at Reunion Village for Reunion East. I don't know that there's any additional parking areas at Reunion West, but we can monitor this and add it to the action item list and decide if it rises to the level and we need to schedule a hearing.

Mr. Staley: In the meantime, Victor's people could give him some feedback on what they're experiencing in the field in practice as to whether or not it's an issue.

Ms. Adams: This time of year, we are getting to peak traffic at Reunion. It is a good time to monitor.

Mr. Staley: That's fine.

Mr. Greenstein: I assume that the rules of the folks for Reunion East are identical to the ones at Reunion West?

Ms. Adams: Correct. The only difference is the maps that are attached.

Mr. Staley: Thanks for clarity.

Mr. Greenstein: Yes, thank you.

Ms. Adams: Any other discussion regarding the parking rules? Hearing none, we will move on to the next item.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Financing Matters Related to 2004-1 Bond Refunding

A. FMS Status Update

Ms. Adams: Another agenda item is related to the refunding of the 2004 bond. Board members have an interest in taking advantage of the historically low interest rates and refunding that with the Series 2022 bond with a lower interest rate. We have a few related agenda items to go over. First and foremost, we have an update from FMS and Jon Kessler is on the line. Jon?

Mr. Kessler: Hi, everyone. A couple of meetings back we adopted a bond delegation resolution authorizing us to go out and market the bonds. To refresh things, the call date on the bonds is not until May 1, but we are able to refinance them 90 days before the call date. We were going to come back to you around this time and give you an update. We sent to you a summary. When we originally showed you the refinancing opportunity, there was about 18% savings, we think if we go into the market right now, even with the backup and rates that we've just had, we're going to be a little bit more than 20%. We definitely think it makes sense to go ahead and get started. The offering document is ready and actually is posted, but we wanted to give you an update and suggest what we think is the right time to go ahead and do this. I don't know if you have any questions, but just wanted to give you that update as we said we would do earlier.

Ms. Adams: Jon, the refinancing analysis, I don't think that's in the agenda packet. Is that the document you sent yesterday?

Mr. Kessler: Yeah, we sent that yesterday because we wanted to update it.

Ms. Adams: We can provide that to Board members, but in the meantime, can you go through that line by line?

Mr. Kessler: In a nutshell, before, we had shown you a summary that showed about 18.9% savings. Based upon market conditions right now we think we can achieve about 21% in your debt service reduction. Couple of percentage points higher and as you know, since we started the year, the interest rates went back up. We think it's the right time to go out and get this done. We're going to be pushing the closing out until the end of February to minimize the negative arbitrage on the escrow that we have until May 1. But, that's essentially the update.

Ms. Adams: Does anyone having any question for Jon? Otherwise, we are going to go through the supplementary assessment methodology that has all of the preliminary numbers plugged in for Board members to read carefully.

Mr. Staley: Just on Jon's comments and morning, Jon, you just mentioned going to the end of February. Obviously, there's a lot of talk about the Fed taking some action because of inflation. Are we putting ourselves at risk of an interest rate hike?

Mr. Kessler: Sorry, just to clarify things. The way in which this works is we put together perspectives which has been brought before you already, but that has been posted and sent out to investors today. We're going to actually price the bonds and lock in the rate next week, but we're going to delay the closing until the mid to end of February. As of next week, the Districts lock in on rate. It's just a matter of pricing and we can kind of push that out around 30 days, which we'll do, which benefits you because again, for a very short period of time until May 1, you're going to have two different bonds outstanding. That's the February date that I'm referring to, just the funding date.

Mr. Staley: Perfect. One other question while you're on the line. For \$13 million bonds, how many bondholders would you expect? I'm not expecting a precise number, but is it 20?

Mr. Kessler: That's a good question. We'll probably end up with maybe probably about five, I would guess. The mutual funds that we market these bonds to, they have minimum of \$10 billion of assets, so on a \$30 million deal, one of them could take it down, but we like to spread it around. I would anticipate about five would participate.

Mr. Staley: Perfect.

Mr. Kessler: That also helps drive down the rate a bit when you have more competition.

Mr. Staley: Perfect. Thank you.

Ms. Adams: Any other question for, Jon?

Mr. Greenstein: Jon, I think we've got it so that the timing is right.

Mr. Kessler: Yeah. Timing is perfect, exactly.

Mr. Greenstein: We have some room to work with, so this is good.

Ms. Adams: All right. Thank you, Jon.

Mr. Greenstein: Yes. Thank you.

Mr. Kessler: No problem. We'll report back probably the next meeting. The District will be coordinating with the chair just on procuring signatures for closing. We'll handle that probably

by mail, I'm guessing, or maybe they go to your office and sign. We'll figure that out with bond counsel.

Ms. Adams: Sounds good.

B. Consideration of Revised Supplemental Assessment Methodology Report

Ms. Adams: Also related to the Series 2022 project is the report that's included in your agenda packet. This is tabbed on your iPads. It is your Supplemental Assessment Methodology Report. This ties back to your Master Assessment Methodology Report from 2004. The basic purpose of this report is to show how the debt is allocated fairly for the residential units as well as the golf course units here at Reunion West CDD. There is quite a bit of narrative and history included in the report. I'm certain that Board members have reviewed the information and there is likely not any benefit of me going through this section by section verbatim. What I'll typically do is go through the tables, but I will pause and ask if there's any questions regarding the narrative sections of the report, the background, or any of the information related to how this is proportioned out.

Mr. Staley: Well, I think we need to make sure the minutes are clear that this is not an extra assessment. If you read the language, it does read as if we're going to suddenly put another assessment onto owners. We know that's not the case. It's a change in assessment.

Ms. Adams: Exactly. It's a change in assessment, it's new. The fact that it's new, but at the same time the old debt is being refunded, so homeowners will no longer be burdened by the old debt but instead will have a lower interest rate debt service payments resulting in a lower payment per household.

Mr. Staley: If you can make sure that's clear.

Ms. Trucco: Just for the record, this is a refunding of the Series 2004-1 bonds.

Mr. Staley: The other question I had was, as you read through it, it's obviously 713 units. It's not really clear, again, to someone who's not in this meeting, it's not really clear which units that applies to. For example, does it apply to Eagle Trace which is against the Sinclair gate? I don't think it does.

Ms. Adams: Let me go through these tables because that might be helpful. Just to be clear, the way that 2004-1 was assessed, which we will be retiring and the new project name will be Series 2022, the way that this was assessed was basically the first areas that were platted were the

first that were assessed. There's not necessarily a geographical concentration other than the fact as they were platted first, they received those first assessments. I will go through the tax bill and help to identify the parcels. We also have the ability to direct mail the residential units that will be receiving the lower debt service fees and make them aware once the numbers are finalized that on their tax bill in 2022 in November when they receive their tax bill that they will have a lower debt service payment on it.

Mr. Staley: That will be a very good idea because it's \$330 a year.

Ms. Adams: Yes. These are preliminary numbers, but starting with Table 1, you just mentioned the equivalent residential units and how those are proportioned out. It's identifying that a single-family unit is equivalent to two ERUs, or two equivalent residential units, and the golf course property is equivalent to 25 equivalent residential units. There are a total of 713 parcels that will be affected. Table 2, starts to tie in the numbers that Board members have seen before when you saw your preliminary bond numbers, when you're looking at the par amount of the bond issue. The thing that is usually a keen interest to Board members, if you look at that bottom table, you'll see that they're estimating your average coupon and that will be 3%. You're exchanging that higher interest rate debt for this much lower interest rate debts, and that's where the savings will be realized.

Mr. Greenstein: For the record, what is our current interest rate on the '04 bonds?

Mr. Staley: Six and a quarter, I think.

Mr. Greenstein: It's in the sixes.

Ms. Adams: It is on the top of the budget page for that debt service account. Do you have that open?

Mr. Staley: Six and a quarter.

Mr. Greenstein: Six and a quarter. Knocking it in half, that's significant for the remaining terms.

Ms. Adams: You will see the par amount is \$12 million. There is the annual debt service payments and the maturity date. They're all spelled out. This is the same maturity date, May 1st, 2036. These are all preliminary numbers that will be finalized upon closing. The numbers will be locked in. Table 3 is showing par debt per unit, you'll see that the current balance is identified, and the estimated balance, and that it has the per unit debt decrease of \$773 estimated per household.

Mr. Staley: I'm not sure many people know that there's \$17,000 worth of debt that they're liable for. I'll be surprised if it's more than 5 or 10% know that. But we can answer questions.

Ms. Adams: It's not unusual for residents to have questions when they receive their tax bill and they are scrutinizing their tax bill. It does identify the debt service fees and fees associated with Reunion West and it does provide our office number to call for questions. It's not uncommon if someone does pay attention to their tax bill, they may have a question about the debt and what that was for or the operations and maintenance fees and what that covers.

Mr. Staley: Yes. I think you told me once before. Again, this is all for the minutes. Some people have actually paid that debt off.

Ms. Adams: Yes.

Mr. Staley: Which again surprises me because it means you have a vision for the next 14 years. That you are always going to be in that property, which may not be the case.

Ms. Adams: Yes, that's a good point. Residents do have the option of either making annual debt service payments or payment in a lump sum. Table 4 is the allocation of the Series 2022 refunding bonds and the annual assessments per unit. This is really the table that residents have the keenest interest in. The current assessment per unit net for these 712 residential properties is \$1,841. The preliminary numbers indicate that the savings should be around \$330, and the per unit net would be \$1,511. Now this net number, when it's finalized, it will get grossed up on the tax bill to include the collection fees as well as the discount for early payments. But there's quite a good savings per household of \$330 estimated with these preliminary numbers. Again, with this being offered, these numbers will be locked in here soon and ready for closing. We'll finalize the assessment methodology report, the supplemental assessment methodology report, with the final numbers, which we anticipate looking very much like these preliminary numbers. When you get to Table 5, this is the assessment roll and this is where you can see the specific parcel IDs. This is how we'll gather the information to do direct mailing to these effected properties.

Mr. Greenstein: Hopefully, as Graham has brought up, I think the more we can simplify what we're doing and who's effected without having to put little asterisks on things, because the rule may apply to 98% of that statement, but it's not perfectly true. But hopefully we'll be able to identify, for example, I'm assuming that the Bear's Den property which was developed after the golf course was modified, which was not in place. I don't think there were platted lots or any plan

for platted lots along that area. It was basically golf course property so that Bear's Den would not be included in this.

Ms. Adams: To be clear, when we notify residents about the lower debt service payments, only the residents who will have a lower debt service payment will receive that mailing. Residents whose debt service payments are not changing will not receive any notification.

Mr. Greenstein: I'm clear on that, but I think as far as having a map saying Bear's Den is not going to get it, Eagle Trace is not going to get it. It's the originally platted part of the DRI, part of the master plan community, those neighborhoods have this bond attached to it.

Mr. Staley: You may feel uncomfortable but what Mark's saying is, can you say the people who'll get this in general will be people living on Muirfield Loop; Golden Bear, Grand Traverse, Valhalla. Anything like that that translates it from the legal language into the practical language will be really helpful for people.

Ms. Adams: Anyone who's currently assessed the 2004-1 debt service fees, and those are identified on the tax bill, that debt will be refunded and it will be 2022 debt service fees which will be lower. But as far as me reciting the geographic areas that pertains to, I don't have that information available and I wouldn't want to state something on the record that I'm not 100% confident about.

Mr. Greenstein: I appreciate that. Hopefully between now and the time this goes into effect, we can come up with something that could be communicated on our behalf to explain to folks what's happening?

Mr. Staley: Maybe Tricia is right. It's got to be in the direct mail.

Mr. Greenstein: It is a legal document, it's absolutely going to be in direct mail.

Ms. Adams: This is a notification and this is more to report on the good work that the Board is doing and taking advantage of the historically low interest rates. This will universally be considered good news for all of the residents who have a lower payment. This is simply a notice. We have a simple notice that we've prepared for other Districts in similar circumstances when there's a refunding and a resulting reduced debt service payment. I can circulate that language to Board members for input and consideration, but I'm very confident it will go to the right people. If the Board members have a keen interest, we can add a column to the assessment roll that shows street names.

Mr. Greenstein: Yeah, because I think if you ran this and you ran it to include the street address, it's going to draw those conclusions.

Mr. Staley: Yeah, absolutely.

Ms. Adams: Just for Board member information purposes, your assessment roll, this is what it looks like as an attachment to your assessment methodology report. But it sounds like Board member would like to know more about the addresses.

Mr. Staley: Simply to be able to help people when they say "Does it apply to me?" Equally, people may read the minutes in 3-4 weeks' time, are you okay if I call you and say does this apply to me? Because people might. That's okay as well if they want to call you?

Ms. Adams: Right. Yeah, absolutely. The assessment roll is the last attachment, the last table for your supplementary and assessment methodology report. But again, it shows how the debt is portioned out among the residential units and the golf course. It shows that there's a fair assessment there. It also plugs in the preliminary numbers that have been provided by FMS and it gives Board members a good idea of where the savings will be, and how this will translate to tax bills for residents.

Mr. Staley: That's very clear. Mark raised a good question. Again for clarity, people living in Bear's Den don't get the CDD assessment, do they?

Mr. Greenstein: No, I didn't say that.

Mr. Staley: No, I'm saying that. You weren't saying that.

Ms. Adams: Yeah, I think what you're thinking is there are some private roads but they're still in the District. They're still in the District assessment area.

Mr. Burman: Bear's Den and Eagle Trace, both places are in Reunion West CDD.

Mr. Greenstein: They're within our jurisdiction, they're within CDD.

Mr. Staley: Even though the roads were developed privately?

Ms. Adams: Yeah, the developer paid for the construction of the roads, they're private roads, but they are in the District assessment area.

Mr. Greenstein: So they're not paying debt service on the roads through the CDD.

Mr. Staley: Okay. Got it.

Mr. Burman: Is that true? I don't understand that. There's a differentiation on the service on this O&M?

Mr. Staley: Except for debt.

Ms. Adams: Not the O&M but on the debt. District assets are only spent on qualified eligible expenses.

Mr. Burman: No, I know that. I'm sorry. What I meant to say do owners in Bear's Den pay a lower O&M assessment than other owners? Yes, so they all pay the same?

Mr. Greenstein: Debt service.

Mr. Staley: Debt service is different.

Mr. Burman: Debt service is different then, they pay a lower assessment.

Ms. Adams: Yes, I don't know that it's lower because it depends on the market conditions, but there are different debt service payments throughout Reunion West CDD.

Mr. Burman: Okay. That's good to know. I understood it was all the same, but it's not.

Mr. Greenstein: Yes.

Ms. Adams: The same O&M but different debt service. When we look at our unaudited financials, I will just note as we go through those so that you can see the various projects and how that effects the different debt service payments.

Mr. Staley: Good for clarity. Even though the road in Bear's Den is private, the storm drains are CDD?

Mr. Greenstein: Absolutely.

Mr. Staley: The street lights are CDD? Okay.

Mr. Greenstein: They just chose that because they wanted to have a control over the roadways. They chose not to draw down funds, not to use CDD funding to build the roads.

Mr. Staley: Got it.

Ms. Adams: The answer to that question was, yes. The storm water system and street lights are CDD. Any questions regarding the supplemental assessment methodology report? I do want get comments. We have Jan on the line. We also have Kristen here. Do you have any comments regarding the Series 2022 project, the status update from FMS, or the supplemental assessment methodology report, or anything that we should put on the record?

Ms. Trucco: I think you've covered it all. This is the refunding of the 2004-1 bonds so the assessments are reflecting the same from that refunding. The series name is Series 2022 refunding bonds. Again, the assessments will be re-calculated according to the supplemental assessment methodology report that's been presented to the Board today. If you have any questions, we can take them now. The Board did approve the delegation resolution at the members meetings, so that

is delegated to Mark to sign and finalize any additional documents that need to be done to close on the bonds.

Mr. Staley: Let's do it.

Ms. Adams: If we can just take action to approve the preliminary supplemental assessment methodology report.

On MOTION by Mr. Staley, seconded by Mr. Burman, with all in favor, the Revised Supplemental Assessment Methodology Report, was approved.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Staff Reports

A. Attorney

Ms. Adams: For staff reports, we have first attorney's report and Kristen is here.

Ms. Trucco: Thank you. I don't have any legal updates for the Board, which is a good thing surely. But we are working on the 2022 refunding bonds. We will keep you updated, we are just finalizing the documents, but if you have any questions for me, I can probably answer them now.

Ms. Adams: The next agenda item is actually the engineer's report and I did receive communication from Steve Boyd this morning. He was on his way to Reunion and unfortunately, he had a minor vehicle emergency and he's hoping to get here imminently. He is not quite here yet and if, at all feasible, I'd like for him to present the stormwater needs analysis report proposal. Mr. Chairman, if it's okay with you, I'd like to move down to the other items and we'll circle back and if need be, Kristen and I can cover the stormwater needs analysis proposal. We're going to just set that item aside and move on to the action items report.

C. District Manager's Report

i. Action Items List

Ms. Adams: There is an action item list for Reunion East as well as Reunion West included in your agenda packets. Reunion West items start on page 62 of your PDF. The first item is in regards to the development of the recreational parcels into the playground in the outdoor fitness station. We have had some back-and-forth communication with the vendor regarding the manufacturing, fabrication and permitting, and complimentary sidewalk work, concrete work, etc. Allan has been considering the landscaping, the fencing, and the items related to the completion

of these projects. We know that the Playtopia equipment is not expected until late in the first quarter of the calendar year.

Mr. Staley: First-quarter? Good, because before it was May.

Ms. Adams: Was this May?

Mr. Greenstein: It was May but this is March.

Ms. Adams: Okay. I may be mixing this up. There is no change in delivery date. If it was May last month then it's still May. I think that I just had a little bit of a brain misfire and was thinking of the fitness equipment due in March.

Mr. Greenstein: It's May.

Mr. Staley: It's May. That's a shame. Thought you were giving us some good news.

Ms. Adams: Let me put my glasses on.

Mr. Greenstein: Not a problem.

Mr. Staley: Just a question on the playground. As you're thinking this through for the fitness center, is it possible to save those big fir trees in that piece of land? Or one or two of them?

Mr. Scheerer: I don't want to speak for Mike. We could maybe implement two of them and leave them there, but I don't think we can remove and re-locate if that's what you're thinking.

Mr. Staley: No, I'm not. I'm just saying could we work around them? These pieces of equipment are very much standalone, you don't need a lot of space around them. There's no fencing going there. There are six pretty mature trees. It'd be nice to try to save them.

Mr. Scheerer: Sure. However the layout works out. Do you want the two outside ones or an outside and inside one?

Mr. Staley: Just something before we put a chainsaw to them. Let's just try to do that.

Mr. Scheerer: Sure. Of course.

Ms. Adams: Sounds good. Any other comments regarding the outdoor fitness center or the playground center? We just had an exhaustive update on the refunding of the Series 2004-1 assessment bonds with the Series 2022-1 project. Parking rules for Encore Reunion West. The homeowner's association has newly elected Board members and they had requested a meeting this week, which was to be held on Tuesday, however, they subsequently rescheduled the meeting for next week. They are interested in discussing the current situation with the parking rules at that neighborhood. I will update the Board members on that status next month. There is a development nearby Reunion that is under monitoring and I think that I updated the application numbers on

here. In case any Board members want to plug that number into the county's website, you can always find the most up-to-date status. But there is a certain amount of the project that's currently under review in Osceola County. Supervisor Staley, did you mention there was another project nearby Reunion West?

Mr. Staley: Yes. We pointed out this to the list as well. There's another one. It's the return of a project that was canceled I think two years ago between Sinclair and the 429 and Nicklaus number 13. Sixty acres are going to be developed along here so if you're playing number 13 on that left-hand side, all those trees, there'll be a development there. Eventually, years ago that was going to be a shopping center. It looks like 60 acres, 146 townhomes, and three future development tracks.

Mr. Greenstein: So they are moving forward?

Mr. Staley: Someone is moving forward, whether it's the same people or new people, I don't know. I've got someone who tracks this, my daughter. She checks all these website posted. We added that to the list so we'd keep our eyes on it. Again, they're free to develop whatever they feel to develop. At least if we keep a track on these, we can have some input perhaps at the appropriate point if we want to.

Mr. Greenstein: I guess we're going to need to start investing in bamboo.

Mr. Staley: Bamboo and trees. Not dissimilar to the one we've just discussed, the Elevation development where we'll have to be careful to make sure we try to make sure to protect the community as much as possible.

Ms. Adams: We'll identify if there's any pre-application review or application process for this new project and add it to the tracking list. No changes on the Sinclair gate situations. We do have the temporary maintenance of traffic plan in place on the Reunion roadways at Sinclair entrance. Duke street lights, I believe this project is completed. The Duke representative was going to check the work orders and confirm that information. We have some Ribbon Palms that were approved back in October. I believe we're waiting for the completion of the TECO gas line installation to be sure that there was a free and clear area and to make sure that the palms are protected from construction damage. Any update on that project, Alan?

Mr. Scheerer: When they started the I-4 project, they dedicated there may not be a desire by TECO to continue that down towards Sinclair Road Gate. They're going to be starting that project up again probably next week. We shouldn't have any problems along Traditional

Boulevard. We didn't have a whole lot over the I-4 bridge. It looks like TECO may look to increase that bore size from Grand Traverse to Palmetto so you'll see some activity there starting next week.

Mr. Staley: It's interesting, over the holidays myself and some of my neighbors noticed gas pressure problems. When everyone was using pools and everything over the holiday period so it's a project that clearly is needed. But I noticed they haven't replaced the sod.

Mr. Scheerer: That may be one of the last things.

Mr. Staley: Okay.

Mr. Scheerer: That may be two months down the road.

Mr. Staley: I thought they'd finished.

Mr. Scheerer: Well, they are finished in that location. But if they take out any sidewalks, usually, those are filled with asphalt or crushed shells for temporary. Then later, down the road once everything is completed. I'm assuming they have a time frame once they're done to verify that all of the pressures are correct. They don't have to make any other changes. It will be several months before they come back and replace the sod.

Ms. Adams: Alright. Thanks, Alan. The next item on here. This is more of a close out item. The Internet access in Heritage Crossings. Reunion reconfirmed that they are installing Internet services for Wi-Fi capability the first quarter of this calendar year. In the meantime, we're going to continue to provide temporary Wi-Fi services for Zoom posting. This morning, we did have originally four total participants, all of the participants have dropped off of the Zoom call. It is now available for residents and everyone else to Zoom into the meeting and we are using Zoom to record today's meeting as well. Then the next item is again just one that is in process. This item is here for the purposes of tracking. This is the Sinclair Road Expansion Project and right now we are in the PD&E phase, which is being facilitated by Kimley-Horn. As of January 7th it looks like, again, we're still in the PD&E phase which will take, I believe, another year to complete. In the meantime, we did circulate the most recent project newsletter to the Board so that you could again see those proposed alignments. Kimley-Horn has indicated when they are ready for public input, Reunion at-large will be notified and specifically Reunion Board members will also be notified on the scheduling of Kimley-Horn to come back for a meeting to provide a presentation and gathering from Board members regarding the proposed alignments.

Mr. Staley: Could that meeting be a public meeting? Well, it is a public meeting obviously but we need to give a lot of owners an opportunity to come and listen to them present.

Ms. Adams: Yes. What I usually see and Kimley-Horn is especially interested in Board member input, they're also interested in resident input from Reunion at-large. What I've seen in the past is they do quite an extensive public outreach to encourage people to participate in meetings that they facilitate for public input. Sometimes those meetings are held electronically via Zoom or other technologies, but they have also had road improvement meetings on-site at Reunion in the past. I would anticipate they will be using a similar approach for this Sinclair Road improvement project. Any questions regarding the action item list? Alright, let's take a step back on the agenda and circle back to staff reports and engineers report.

B. Engineer

i. Consideration of Proposal for Stormwater Needs Analysis Report

**This item was taken out of order*

Ms. Adams: Steve Boyd has joined the meeting today. Great to see you, Steve. Board members understood that you had a minor car emergency. Board members, included in your agenda packet is the proposal for the storm water needs analysis report. You likely recall that in the fall, you were presented legal information regarding a new law in Florida where special Districts are now required to gather information and report it to the local county. Based on the requirements from the state of Florida, Steve Boyd has prepared this proposal and I believe it is ready to be presented to the Board. If you are in your agenda packet it's on Page 57 of your PDF file.

Mr. Boyd: Thank you. We prepared this proposal based on the tasks that are required based on the statute report. We budgeted field time and then I've been working with Tricia's office to compile some cost information to project and also review some of our files to project the future maintenance costs that we would have to do. As well as anticipating quite a bit of existing work that needs to be done since we haven't really done any inspection that involved this range of facilities in several years. We're anticipating that as a part of the report we will not only be projecting future maintenance costs but that we will be identifying several active items that need to be dealt with. Alan has already identified one in Reunion East that we are going to be looking at. I am happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Scheerer: We are already doing some pre-maintenance items. We are checking off all of the inlets and things to help Yellowstone which is how we found the one on East.

Mr. Boyd: To jump ahead here, what I have budgeted, if you feel more comfortable doing it hourly or maximum, right now I have 16 hours of my time budgeted, I have 40 hours of the project engineer, 16 hours for any exhibits that need to be prepared and 8 hours of administration. If you would be more comfortable with us doing it hourly, I think that is a safe gap. But if we get into something that really blows the scope up, we would always come back to you.

Ms. Adams: Board members as it impacts the budget, this is a new Florida law. We are required to comply with Florida law. This analysis does need to be done. It is a new report. The proposed fee is \$13,200. This does have an impact to your budget. This will affect the administration portion of your budget. That is where this cost will be absorbed. It was not a budgeted expense. This new Florida law was not widely discussed or widely known before it went in place so this is not budgeted. But, it is a necessary step for the District to take in order to be in compliance with Florida law. I can also add that this fee is actually a little bit less than what I've seen in some other Florida Districts.

Ms. Trucco: You'll remember, this was a law that became effective January 1st. It requires all cities, counties, special Districts, CDDs, any government entity in Florida, to submit a report regarding its wastewater and stormwater systems. They call it a 20-year projected needs analysis report. We're required to submit it to the county by the end of June so we have a little bit of time. We asked the District engineers to compile the proposals. Just to add to Tricia this one is a bit lower than other CDDs that we work with.

Ms. Adams: I will just say on the timing too, although June sounds far away, this is quite a comprehensive report. We are, as a whole, as District Management Services trying to get these proposals before Boards for consideration in January in order for the engineer to have as much time as needed to gather the data. I just wanted to mention to you that the reason for this is the compliance with Florida law. What Steve was saying in terms of this being some practical benefit to the District as well and killing two birds with one stone, so to speak. But this will help to ensure that the stormwater system is up to par in terms of maintenance and operating properly. There's some added benefit that there is inspection of the stormwater system.

Mr. Greenstein: It's along that line that I was going to raise the issue for the sake of our constituency and for the Board and I am just looking for a brief overview and to strictly voice your opinion here, on what led the State to impose this report?

Ms. Adams: We're speculating but there was a wastewater incident in coastal Florida, but that is speculation.

Mr. Boyd: One thing is that the statute says is for wastewater systems and stormwater systems. The CDD is only responsible for stormwater here. They will have to do their own analysis regarding wastewater systems.

Mr. Greenstein: Your point is taken Tricia that there are two sides and we're responsible for stormwater management. We do periodic inspections at our facilities. To some extent, we're already complying with some aspects of this. We're complying with this new requirement. We may not document it, but I'm assuming we have ongoing inspections and sometimes we have to be reactive. Other times, we see some small thing and we are more proactive and we take action before we have a major problem.

Ms. Adams: Certainly.

Mr. Greenstein: Maybe this is forcing us, all Districts, to better solidify, or better focus their efforts to comply with this rule assuming there are ongoing inspections for this five-year plan that's going to need to be updated periodically. There will be some ongoing costs possibly above and beyond this one shot.

Ms. Adams: There's a cost for the report itself and then in terms of as a result of any inspections, if there are necessary repairs and maintenance, those would be funded out of your stormwater repair and maintenance, and that is considered each year as part of your annual budgeting process. So there would be funding available to address stormwater repairs if any were found to be needed. You asked a lot of questions in that and made several statements, but in terms of why the state of Florida was motivated to do this, I don't have that information or that data.

Ms. Trucco: It maybe because this is a public infrastructure it may be that they would like accounting documentation regarding ownership and maintenance of that so that responsibility if something did fail with the public infrastructure, it doesn't fall back on them, or at least there's something documented to say this entity is responsible for the repair and maintenance of this public infrastructure. We are looking into the legislative history of them all. I don't know what precipitated it, right now. I don't know every single event, but I imagine that the state has an interest in making sure it has documentation of ownership and maintenance of this public infrastructure, so that if there's an issue it doesn't fall back on them.

Mr. Greenstein: Does this proposal only apply to the West?

Ms. Trucco: Correct.

Mr. Greenstein: We have an identical one to the East?

Mr. Boyd: Correct.

Ms. Adams: Another positive outcome of this report is it does inform your reserve planning, your master planning, your budget planning, this will be a helpful report in terms of identifying budget needs potentially over the next five years or so.

Mr. Burman: Does this statute require it to be updated once a year, or in five years?

Ms. Adams: Every five years.

Mr. Burman: So this will create basically the template that can just be updated later.

Mr. Greenstein: It should be a living document which basically supports a system inspections and maintenance is necessary. I would hope that the report is not going to uncover any hidden problems that we have. I would assume we have it up. But again, obviously it's a requirement. Fiscally, it's impacting us to a degree because it was an unplanned item. I think Steve as you pointed out, any project of this sort, what we're familiar obviously with the subject matter of the area of work to be performed, but would I be correct in saying you've never prepared anything close to this before?

Mr. Boyd: That's true.

Mr. Greenstein: We are treading on new ground. The time requirement to do it. I totally agree that once this becomes an on the shelf project that we utilize, then when the next five-year certification period comes up, or what have you, it should not take the amount of leg work that this is going to take. We should be able to create the forms and templates that will just be updated the next time this is to be done and this becomes a very simple process at that point.

Mr. Staley: Correct me if I'm wrong, this is a 25-year vision, isn't it?

Ms. Adams: 20 years. It's reported every five.

Mr. Staley: So, Steve's got to think about what's going to happen to this infrastructure over the next 20 years.

Ms. Adams: Correct.

Mr. Staley: It might be very sketchy obviously. But 20 years. The other question I had was historically have we had a lot of issues with construction waste in the storm drains?

Mr. Scheerer: Not that I have heard.

Mr. Staley: That's good.

Mr. Scheerer: I don't know that we've had anything. We do get some construction concerns, we do have to tell them, hey, you should put sock pipe in front of the inlets and that type of thing. I don't know that we've ever had a blocked drain or anything. What we found around Christmas and New Year's, I didn't even know that pipe was there. That's a whole different animal. The other thing we had was just an act of nature coming off the I-4 bridge. On the East side, we had a wash out there by the I-4 bridge, we got the engineer involved and Encore, and other people so that was resolved through design by the engineer. Those were all unexpected. I'm not aware of the issues in the 16 years I've been here.

Mr. Staley: Good.

Mr. Boyd: Like I said, right now, I've worked with Mike at Yellowstone. We have been on the golf course. We do have some issues with some of the box drains in the sand traps. They get a little loaded with sand, we are pulling sand out and cleaning around the skimmers. We've evaluated a lot of that more so on the West. I think right now, we're trying to be proactive in that regard and trying to minimize future problems with drainage.

Mr. Staley: We have to trust Steve and his experience and his longevity.

Ms. Adams: Relative to similar proposals for other Districts this is on par if not slightly under par for cost.

Mr. Staley: Good.

Mr. Greenstein: What is your timeline for completion? When are we required by statute?

Mr. Boyd: We would have a two-month window for us to start to finish. To fit it in, and work it into the work load, and start the inspections and complete the report.

Ms. Adams: I think in your proposal, your proposing, presenting it to the Board in May, I think 2022. It says 2021 though.

Mr. Boyd: We start in March. I don't think it has to start immediately.

Mr. Greenstein: As in the June 30th deadline. Okay.

Ms. Adams: Page two goes over that timeline of planning to present that to the Board in May and submit it by June.

Mr. Greenstein: Normally it's pretty clear if we will be dealing with a fixed price or hourly, because they are both being administratively handled. Any thoughts on that?

Mr. Staley: I think it's not as if we're working with Steve for the first time. If you have to go with his recommendation, if it only takes him \$1,000 to do it and then fine, I'm sure he'll tell

us, but that's not going to be the case, I'm sure. I just have to go with his estimate. That is the best way to do it.

Mr. Greenstein: Tricia, how are we handling this?

Ms. Adams: The action the Board would take would be a motion to approve the proposal for stormwater needs analysis.

Mr. Greenstein: I got that. I was asking how is it being handling the other Districts?

Ms. Adams: Typically it's the District engineer who's been provided the information. The legal memorandum, parameters, as well as any spreadsheet from Florida Special Districts Association identified parameters for the report. Taking that information, District engineers are preparing their proposal for Board consideration. Is that the question?

Mr. Greenstein: Are all the District's handling it flat fee?

Ms. Adams: So far, all of the Districts had been handling it on a flat fee. In some cases, there's a flat fee plus additional reimbursable expenses. In this case there's a fee for the report \$13,200 with reimbursable expenses we'll say up to \$500.

Mr. Greenstein: Okay. It's funny, being a former government official, I know the impact these changes in regulation have.

Ms. Adams: Yes.

Mr. Greenstein: When you don't have adequate lead time, it forces you to concentrate the effort in almost a drop everything approach. That's why we asked for the due date for when we actually have to be compliant by. Again, using GMS experience and our experience with Steve and his firm, a motion to accept the proposal from Boyd Civil Engineering.

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein, seconded by Mr. Staley, the Stormwater Needs Analysis Report with Boyd Civil Engineering, was approved.
--

Ms. Adams: Under Engineer's Report, do we have any other matters that you would like to bring to the Board's attention, Steve?

Mr. Boyd: I don't have anything else.

ii. Approval of Check Register

Ms. Adams: Moving forward in the agenda to the check register which is on page 65 of your agenda packet. We have a check register from December 1st to December 31st, 2021. It is \$2.4 million and you'll note as you go through, a number of these large expenses are related to the transmittal of the debt service fees. When we receive the revenue from the tax bills, a portion of that goes to operations and maintenance expenses and a portion is transferred out to the trustee accounts for the debt service fees. If you look at page 1 of your check run summary, you'll see where debt service accounts for 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, and 2019 debt series, those transmittals are all paid. So when you see these numbers, a portion of that is related to those transmittal of that debt service funding. Happy to answer any questions you might have regarding the check run summary. This does require Board action.

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

iii. Balance Sheet and Income Statement

Ms. Adams: The next item in your agenda packet moving forward to section 3 starting on page 71 are your unaudited financials through November 30th, 2021. This is moving into the second month of your fiscal year. The first page is your balance sheet. Then moving on to page 2 and 3, this is where you start to see your actual spending versus your prorated expenses.

Mr. Staley: Question on page 2 if I could. On the landscape contract, the monthly budget is about \$38,000 or so a month?

Ms. Adams: Yeah.

Mr. Staley: After two months we spent \$91,000?

Ms. Adams: Yeah. In reviewing this budget I did notice that the monthly expenses which are detailed on, let's see. I'm just moving forward in the agenda packet. On page 85 your month-to-month spending. I noticed that in October the landscape contract amount was \$30,688, and then in November it was \$60,565. I reached out to Alan as well as our accounting. We will run detailed expenses for that. I wasn't sure from first glance if there were two months paid in November or if there were some once-a-year annual expenses related to mulch and some quarterly expenses related to annuals that may have hit the budget in November. But the budget was constructed based on your annual contracts as well as the mulch and the annuals and there would be some eventual

equalizing there, but yes, that's a good catch on that. I'll provide details to the Board on that answer to that question.

Mr. Staley: Then on page 3 on the O&M, when we budget these items, we budget them in terms of the nature of the item. But I see here when we start booking some actuals, we've got a line called capital outlay which I think is just a deposit for the playground and the fitness station. I'm just curious on process, why do you call it capital outlay and not playground?

Ms. Adams: Actually, I think that that line was for items that were not otherwise identified. So it could be contingency, it could be miscellaneous but I can get you details.

Mr. Staley: No, when we come to the O&M report itself the other one, the tracking form, we'll talk about it then as well.

Ms. Adams: Okay.

Mr. Staley: Because they talked about it being playground at that point. Okay, I'm just curious how it works.

Ms. Adams: Yes. Good questions there. There's a couple of things in your year-to-date spending where the prorated and the actuals, you'll see that we're over prorated. In every case I've looked at them, there's not a concern and we'll verify the landscaping. As you move forward through your unaudited financials, you'll see there's debt service funds for all of the different series of bonds and this is where we have the debt service payments that Supervisor Burman was pointing out earlier. Residents who are in the assessment area for 2015 debt may have a different debt service fee payment than those who live in other areas so that's how that works out. There's no action required on your unaudited financials but happy to answer any other questions Board members may have.

iv. Replacement and Maintenance Plan

Ms. Adams: The next item is a new item. This is your replacement and maintenance fund tracking. This is to both track the status of certain replacement and maintenance projects as well as to track the spending and where we are relative to the adopted budget. You may need to rotate the view on your iPads to see.

Mr. Staley: It's tough to do.

Ms. Adams: Yeah. If anyone needs assistance, let me know.

Mr. Staley: I'll turn the screen over. No, that doesn't work either.

Ms. Adams: There's a little view in your toolbar and you can click on that and rotate it. Anyway, this is a new sheet that's added for tracking the status of the project as well as the spending. Supervisor Staley did you have some comments on this or some requests to add information?

Mr. Staley: Yeah, I sent you a note on this. I think we're getting there. I would like to see another column, the first column. I'd like to see the first column being our actual budget which totals I think \$906,000. Because a lot of these items we budgeted for, some we didn't. But I like to see if we had an item that we budgeted for that we're not planning to work on, now that would be revealed by that. I'd like to see a grand total at the bottom. I'm just a finance guy I just would like to see a grand total. Then if you notice on the gate and gatehouse improvements, the math doesn't work, you've got 75 and 40. The same with the following category of pool furniture. It just needs a little bit of due diligence on this. But I think we're heading in the right direction because it allows us to say, what did we originally plan to do, what are we now doing, and how we're getting on with those projects we've decided to do. Then specifically under the budget, we budgeted \$167,000 for Seven Eagle's roof repair and I see that's now described as Seven Eagle's arbor repair. So I'm not sure what we're doing there.

Mr. Scheerer: That's it. It should say roof.

Mr. Staley: It should say roof. Again, of all the paper we produce for the community, this might be something of interest because it's what they're paying for. So this one I think it's going to be something that will allow the community to say, what's the CDD doing for me?

Mr. Scheerer: We're already getting ready to do some reporting on these projects so you may see some changes in that as well.

Ms. Adams: As soon as we get the final proposals on these, we'll have that new column that has your re-budgeted, and then we'll start to plug in your actuals.

Mr. Staley: Obviously, some things we may decide not to do but they should still appear on this sheet as something that was originally budgeted that's now been decided not to do, etc.

Mr. Scheerer: We just purchased a new heater so we just did that. Pool furniture is scheduled to be delivered within the next couple of weeks. We've already brought contractors out for pricing and start painting pools and arbors so you'll see a lot of that stuff. We're going to get moving forward as soon as we make sure the numbers match what we budgeted.

Mr. Staley: Good.

Ms. Adams: Sounds good. Any other comments on the replacement and maintenance plan?

D. Security Report

i. 136 Parking Violations and 0 Vehicles Towed

Ms. Adams: Victor Vargas, is Reunion's Head of security. He's joined us here in the meeting today. On your security report you'll notice there were 136 parking violations that were issued to vehicles improperly parked in Reunion. We also provided comprehensive data regarding security for members under separate cover. Any questions for Victor?

Mr. Staley: I think this is the third month I've asked the question, Victor. I think we need to really think about this. There were 136 parking violations, every single one of them was in Encore, according to the report. There were zero parking violations in the rest of the CDD. I just don't believe that. We're not that good in the rest of the CDD. I think there may be a reporting issue, perhaps, but every single parking incident was Encore. You're saying that excluding Encore, we're basically perfect in terms of parking compliance?

Mr. Burman: No, in terms of compliance upon requests.

Mr. Staley: In terms of compliance upon request.

Mr. Vargas: Now, the difference with Encore is that the only thing we can do which is just locating the violation. We cannot tow vehicles so if they refuse to move the vehicle, we have to do that.

Mr. Staley: Is that a change in the way you track things because it happened and this all started in October. In September you would have had 100 parking violations. That's great. If that's the way it is. It's great. I won't ask the question next month.

Ms. Adams: Any other questions related to Reunion security matters?

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Other Business

Ms. Adams: Any other business or supervisor requests?

Mr. Staley: I've got a few things if you bear with me. Again, a lot of it is education of the owners and the community and the small things, but I've been talking to Alan about having the monuments on the west side, just soft power washed, I think you call it, because they're getting mold all over them and a couple of residents have pointed that out, so the next time the power washers are on site, those monuments are going to be cleaned. My favorite subject of trash. I know trash is an HOA matter but we've always said when trash is on the roads, it becomes an issue for

us and we know there are one or two properties. Not many, one or two properties where we have consistent trash violations, where there may be anywhere from five to a dozen trash cans outside the house and on the road. Certainly, David has been a big help for this organization, but I've been communicating as to what remedies the CDD has when a road is blocked with trash cans and trash, and the feedback was, "We can call the sheriff." Well, we're not going to call the sheriff, not for trash. But I think what we should do is continue as residents and owners to contact the HOA because they will contact the property management companies and try to get it fixed as soon as possible. But I just wanted to know we don't have any remedies, as a CDD, do we? We can't impose any fines.

Ms. Adams: Well, I think he mentioned that this was a line-of-sight issue in this particular case and there is a line-of-sight issue where there is otherwise not the free flow of traffic. That is a traffic enforcement matter, but if it is related just to aesthetics this is an HOA matter.

Mr. Staley: Right. But again, if a trash can, or three or four trash cans are lying in the road, you're not going to call the sheriff. I don't think in practice.

Ms. Adams: Not unless there's a traffic hazard. If it's a line-of-sight issue or it's creating a traffic hazard, that would be a law enforcement matter. If it is an aesthetic issue that would be an HOA matter.

Mr. Staley: I hear what you're saying. What I'm saying in a practical sense, we're not recommending owners to call the sheriff for trash cans lying in the road.

Mr. Burman: In practical sense the sheriff is not showing up.

Mr. Staley: The sheriff is not showing up. Exactly. I think what my message is, and it has been for everyone who have asked me, send the email and the photographs to David's organization. They are responding I think quite quickly to those incidents, and I hope and I believe that the HOA have also targeted the continuous problem homes where trash cans are lying in the streets. That's again, to help educate people on what they should do because people sometimes don't know what to do about it. We talked about the parking. Something for popular research in the next months. I think there's a piece of land the CDD owns, that originally in the plans going back a long time, there was supposed to be a road between Castle Pines and Grand Traverse. That cuts between the fifth and the sixth holes and actually it's a platted road. There's a piece of road that the golf course uses to drive backwards and forwards, people used to walk on and it's fine. I'm just saying if the CDD owns that, before someone starts dumping stuff on there and it starts to wear and get

miserable, should we perhaps think of beautifying it a little bit? I know the home next to it has been marketed as having this open space next door. Fine, that's what alerted me to it and maybe with very little expense, we could put a path in there, a footpath rather than a road. A footpath and beautify it with some easy-to-maintain shrubs or something. Anything we can do to beautify the community, I think is money well-spent. Maybe we can all happily meet with.

Ms. Adams: Yeah, if there's consensus on the Board to direct staff, Alan can investigate the area and consider beautification, maybe work with Yellowstone.

Mr. Staley: Just to make sure we own it to start with, as a CDD.

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah, we're going to have some challenges with that. I know there's a tee box right there, on the golf course.

Mr. Staley: They may do, but whether you put a path there or not, people are still walking there.

Ms. Adams: Well, we don't want to encourage pedestrian traffic in an area that's not safe.

Mr. Staley: Fair point.

Mr. Scheerer: Like we have in Heritage Crossing. It's just a buffer area that allows emergency access in the event of a blockage. I think that's what that road is intended for, because we have those in Sandy Ridge, we have them in Heritage Crossing, we have them in Palmilla Court.

Mr. Staley: I'd love to understand, is it something we can beautify with some bushes to get the path or is it something we have to leave open as an emergency road?

Mr. Boyd: This cul-de-sac exceeded the length of a dead-end cul-de-sac street so what that does and there's a couple of other places in Reunion that are similar, but it provides an emergency access route for fire trucks and ambulances to get in or out. If there's a tree or some other reason the road is blocked, this is an alternative unpaved but stabilized route for emergency vehicles. That's the purpose. But the CDD doesn't own it.

Mr. Staley: That means we can't plant any trees or bushes there.

Mr. Boyd: There is a driving path that you can't obstruct. You need a 20-foot clear driving path. That's the key.

Mr. Staley: I was just curious because any opportunity we have to improve the visibility in the communities is worth looking at.

Mr. Boyd: I would say you're wise to keep an eye on it and make sure homeowners who are adjacent to it aren't planting trees and starting to take use as their own.

Mr. Staley: To be honest, I thought it was part of the golf course. Part of Kingwood property. To be honest.

Mr. Scheerer: There's also some lines in that area. David and I researched. We couldn't do it because of the gas line that runs there.

Mr. Staley: Okay. That's clear. I think that's it.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Supervisor's Requests

Ms. Adams: Any other business or supervisor requests?

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Next Meeting Date.

Ms. Adams: Your next meeting is February 10th.

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Adjournment

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

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


Secretary/Assistant Secretary


Chairman/Vice Chairman