MINUTES OF MEETING REUNION WEST COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

The regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Reunion West Community Development District was held on Thursday, **July 13, 2023** at 11:00 a.m. via Zoom Communication Media Technology and at Reunion Grande, Room 1, 7593 Gathering Drive, Kissimmee, Florida.

Present and constituting a quorum:

Graham Staley Sharon Harley Michael Barry (*via Zoom*) Mark Greenstein William (Bill) Witcher Chairman Vice Chair Assistant Secretary Assistant Secretary Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

Tricia Adams	District Manager
Kristen Trucco	District Counsel
Steve Boyd	Boyd Civil Engineering
Alan Scheerer	Field Manager
Garrett Huegel	Yellowstone Landscape Services
Aura Zelada	Reunion West POA

The following is a summary of the discussions and actions taken at the July 13, 2023 Reunion West Community Development District Board of Supervisors meeting.

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

Ms. Adams called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m. and called the roll. All Supervisors were present with the exception of Ms. Harley who was not present at roll call.

Roll Call

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS

Public Comment Period

There being none, the next item followed.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS

Approval of Minutes of the June 8, 2023 Board of Supervisors Meeting

Ms. Adams presented the minutes of the June 8, 2023 Board of Supervisors meeting.

Mr. Greenstein pointed out that the minutes referred to the Repair & Maintenance (R&M) Plan, even though it was Replacement and Maintenance in other parts of the minutes. Ms. Adams noted the correction would be made to Replacement and Maintenance when referring to R&M. Mr. Witcher recalled discussion in the minutes about the vacant lot on Whitmarsh Way and Muirfield Loop and the hump that appeared on that lot. It looked similar to a leach field and no other lots in the community had similar humps. All builders signed the Reunion Resort & Club of Orlando Design Guidelines Rules & Regulations, agreeing to return the property to its original condition. Mr. Staley felt that the gas company created the mound and not the builder. Mr. Greenstein recalled in the past it was not noticeable as it was now and was surprised that no one complained about it. Mr. Staley requested that Mr. Huegel cut the grass on the mound. Mr. Scheerer would ask the gas company for permission to re-grade it to bring it down to a more acceptable level. Mr. Staley agreed as it was not the builder's issue and requested that pictures of the mound be circulated to the Board. Mr. Staley asked if Ms. Adams circulated a brief summary of what was discussed at the workshop. This was on a task list for Ms. Adams.

Ms. Harley joined the meeting.

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein seconded by Mr. Barry with all in favor the Minutes of the June 8, 2023 Board of Supervisors Meeting were approved as amended.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Consideration of Yellowstone Proposal for Monument Landscape Enhancement

Ms. Adams presented a proposal from Yellowstone Landscape (Yellowstone) for monument landscape enhancements in the amount of \$8,321.59. The Board had a brief discussion regarding enhancing the neighborhood entrance monuments with potential landscaping and Yellowstone provided photos of suggested vegetation. There were six community entrances. Mr. Scheerer worked with Yellowstone to provide this proposal. The landscape improvement was not budgeted for this current fiscal year, but the Board could approve it out of the Operating Budget. Mr. Witcher noted it was \$8,321.59 for six monument signs, another \$11,000 for the Fitness Center area, which was a separate proposal. Two monuments were double-sided. Mr. Staley questioned

why the proposal had amounts listed from \$40 to \$1. Mr. Huegel explained that there was 40 hours of labor for the installation of 16 15-Gallon Podocarpus, 25 3-gallon Trinettes, 16 6" spray heads, 1,200 (8-feet) of 1" pipe, 20 bags of mulch and miscellaneous irrigation parts. Yellow and green Trinettes would go behind the light so it did not block the light that illuminated the signage. This was a request from a resident. Mr. Greenstein wanted uniformity throughout the resort and this reflected the interest of the community; however, the landscaping blocked the monuments, versus monuments in Reunion East, which had landscaping that was lower to the ground that did not block the monuments. Ms. Harley did not mind the uniformity and felt that they were easy to maintain, but the landscaping in the front should be below the white coping. Mr. Scheerer stated that Trinettes would block the stone work on the monuments as they grow. At the request of Ms. Harley, Mr. Scheerer could move the Podocarpus to the sides of the column, so the brick and cap would be fully exposed and use Ixora or Bottlebrush instead of Trinettes. After further discussion, this item was tabled.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Consideration of Yellowstone Proposal for Outdoor Fitness Center Landscape Enhancement

Mr. Scheerer received a request for the outdoor Fitness Center on Grand Traverse Parkway and provided a proposal from Yellowstone in the amount of \$11,526.96 to remove, replace and enhance the outdoor Fitness Center. A rendering of the trees and what they would look like when they were fully grown, was provided. There would be some red Maples and Magnolias to replace the aging plant that was currently there. Mr. Staley clarified that the Maples would be in the verge and questioned what was on either side. Mr. Scheerer stated four Elms would be removed and replaced with two red Maples and Magnolias would be placed in the center between the sidewalk and outdoor Fitness Center, in order to reduce the amount of trees that were currently there. Mr. Greenstein felt that it was a good look as it showcased the outdoor Fitness Center. Mr. Scheerer pointed out once the red Maples grew in, it would look nice. Mr. Witcher questioned the height of a 65-Gallon Maples and 45-Gallon Magnolias. Mr. Huegel estimated the Maples would be seven to ten feet tall and the Magnolias would be seven to eight feet tall. Mr. Witcher was happy that the trees in the verge were being removed because they looked dead. It would open the area up and look nice. Mr. Scheerer agreed.

On MOTION Mr. Greenstein seconded by Ms. Harley with all in favor the proposal with Yellowstone Landscape for the outdoor Fitness Center landscape enhancement in the amount of \$11,526.96 was approved.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Review and Acceptance of Pavement Management Plan

Ms. Adams presented the Pavement Management Plan, which was prepared by the District Engineer. Mr. Boyd pointed out that it was in draft form as there were spelling errors, which would be corrected. It was in the same format that was provided to the Board last month with the same methodology and included all of the core roads in Reunion West, but not the roads built after 2015 by Encore. In the process of doing both Reunion East and Reunion West comparatively, they found that even the worst roads that need attention, were better off than many of the roads in other nearby areas such as Orlando and Kissimmee. There were only a few items that were urgent. As they proceeded with a plan for future repaying, the Board may defer it, but it was good to do it now and plan adequately. An alphabetical listing of the roads that were evaluated was provided with their condition and recommendations on Tables 2, 3 and 4, along with a map. There were a couple of locations that he could not take pictures of due to heavy traffic and would provide pictures in the final report. Mr. Boyd highlighted the following areas were repairs needed:

- Desert Mountain Court: Median work was recommended due to potholes exposing the base. Spot repairs needed to be made next to the curb as there was a gap between the original asphalt and the patch, due to water intrusion. A full repaving of Desert Mountain Court should be included in the 2025 to 2030 Plan.
- Outbound Lane of Tradition Boulevard: Major resurfacing was needed, approaching the gate at Sinclair Road, due to substantial alligator cracking. Approaching Sinclair Road, the stopping action was causing damage to the pavement.
- Castle Pines Court: A full re-paving would be included in the 2025 to 2030 Plan.
- Tradition Boulevard Segment C including the Outbound Portion of Tradition Boulevard from I-4 to the Sinclair Road Gatehouse: A full re-pavement should be included in the 2025 to 2030 Plan.

Mr. Boyd noted that pavement markings were in bad shape and needed to be replaced, regardless of when the re-paving operations proceeded, especially in crosswalks, as well as the yellow striping on inbound and outbound lanes on Tradition Boulevard. Ms. Adams requested that Mr. Boyd include just an inventory of the roads in the Encore neighborhoods in the final report, so the Board could plan for them in their long-range capital planning. Mr. Staley felt that Desert Mountain Court and Castle Pines Court were in worst shape than Muirfield Loop, due to construction damage, which surprised him. Mr. Boyd agreed. Mr. Greenstein also agreed, due to the length of Desert Mountain Court and the construction traffic. Mr. Boyd noted that many other areas may be damaged due to trucks parked along the road, which he would evaluate. Mr. Scheerer pointed out that many irrigation mainlines run right off the edge of the road underneath the verge, creating washouts and potholes on the edge of the curbing, were created from contractors digging up the road and then cold patching.

Mr. Staley wanted to digest this information and questioned how they would factor in the pavement markings. Mr. Boyd noted on Desert Mountain Court and other neighborhood streets, there were no centerline markings. Ms. Adams indicated it was a routine maintenance item that would be handled regardless of the Pavement Management Plan. Mr. Staley pointed out that Tradition Boulevard from I-4 to the Sinclair Road gatehouse needed pavement markings, but it would be re-paved in two years. Mr. Witcher asked if the re-surfacing process included using an asphalt grinder to take the top coat down and laying another 2 inches of asphalt. Mr. Boyd explained that they would mill the surface and put on a new surface to match the elevation. To develop the final step, they must take some core borings in the asphalt. Ms. Adams noted that the Reunion East CDD Board identified priority areas for milling and re-surfacing and there may be cost efficiencies by doing the work for Reunion West at the same time, in an effort to give the Board options. Mr. Boyd solicited geotechnical proposals, focusing on areas in Tables 2 and 3, which would be the priority areas for roadwork. Mr. Staley preferred to complete these areas in 2024 as well as line striping for Tradition Boulevard Segment D and Table 4. Mr. Boyd planned on re-striping stop bars at a minimum throughout the community and place vellow striping on Tradition Boulevard. Mr. Greenstein asked to do the work simultaneously with Reunion East.

Mr. Staley understood that the striping and stop bars for Tables 2 and 3, for Tradition Boulevard from the bridge to the Sinclair Road gatehouse, would be built into the 2024 budget. Mr. Scheerer recalled that Sinclair Road was completed when two entry lanes were modified from

the guardhouse to Sinclair Road and now, they needed to work from the traffic circle east over the bridge, straight to the gatehouse. Mr. Witcher was experienced with road repairs and inquired about reheating the asphalt to an appropriate temperature, re-raking, pressing with a roller to get additional life on the asphalt verses milling and resurfacing. Mr. Boyd advised that minor spider or alligator cracking was not much of a concern and sealing those areas temporarily would help aesthetically, but if the cracks were causing separation and ruts, they must mill and replace as the asphalt reached its lifespan. Mr. Witcher asked if Mr. Boyd had access to old records and whether it could be of benefit to the contractor. Mr. Boyd recalled that the roads were poured almost 20 years ago and the companies were no longer in existence. Mr. Staley wanted to review the report and continue the discussion at a later time. This item was deferred.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Consideration of Proposals for Geotechnical Services for Pavement Evaluation

A. UES

B. Intertek PSI

Ms. Adams presented proposals from UES in the amount of \$3,875 and from Intertek PSI (PSI) in the amount of \$8,225 for geotechnical services for the pavement evaluation. The results would be used by the District Engineer to develop a scope, in order to obtain proposals for the mill and resurfacing. Mr. Witcher noted that UES had many exclusions. Mr. Boyd spoke with UES about it and the largest was the utility locates, which did not affect Reunion West, as they would only be taking core samples, which would not affect the existing utilities. They did restore a patch of asphalt at the core sample locations and include maintenance of traffic. Mr. Boyd recommended the UES proposal based on the price. Mr. Staley agreed with Mr. Witcher on the exclusions and asked if PSI was not better than UES in terms of quality. Mr. Boyd pointed out that UES had been around for a long time and used to be Universal Engineering.

On MOTION Mr. Staley seconded by Mr. Greenstein with all in favor the proposal with UES for pavement evaluation geotechnical services in the amount of \$3,875 was approved.

Ms. Harley asked if the District was responsible for the Bears Den roads. Ms. Adams pointed out that the Bears Den roads were private. Ms. Harley questioned the three properties on

Grand Traverse Parkway that were part of Bears Den. Mr. Scheerer confirmed that Grand Traverse Parkway was a CDD road and the road right-of-way (ROW) would be the responsibility of the CDD. The District was maintaining sidewalks along the entire road. Mr. Staley noted that all of the roadways and parking lots within the condo units were the responsibility of the HOA. Mr. Boyd would get confirmation from UES on the items that were discussed. Ms. Adams would obtain an agreement. Mr. Boyd stated once they had the results of the core samples, they would prepare the final recommendations for the physical work. Mr. Staley questioned when the paving work would be completed. Mr. Boyd felt that Spring was ideal. Ms. Adams agreed there were fewer weather interruptions in the Spring. Based on early results from the geotechnical work, Ms. Adams would confer with the District Engineer to provide a rough estimate of funding amounts for roadwork at Reunion West, for the purpose of fiscal year 2024 budgeting. Mr. Boyd recommended that the Board amend the forecasting of the work, especially the 2025 through 2030 work, which could be pushed back, once they received the bids. Ms. Adams did not recommend engaging in milling and resurfacing every year, but to plan for three-to-five-year intervals and aggregate the work together for cost savings and efficiencies. As a special purpose Local Government, the CDD also had the ability to piggyback onto any Florida government paving contracts, such as State or County work, for cost savings or efficiencies. Mr. Greenstein questioned whether there was any damage from the TECO work on Tradition Boulevard. Mr. Boyd stated that there was one traverse crack on Tradition Boulevard on the east side of the gate, from when TECO crossed west of the gate.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Review and Discussion of Five-Year Plan

Ms. Adams reported that Mr. Staley updated the Five-Year Plan. Mr. Staley felt that one of the most important roles that the Board had was to ensure that the District's Operating Budget was suitable for their day-to-day needs, but just as important was that the R&M budget was sufficient and they were building up reserves to cover future expenditures. The major item was the roads. Mr. Staley looked at the Five-Year Plan over the years and this year made it simpler. On Page 2, the Reunion East and West R&M, listed the following projects for 2024:

- *Roof replacement for three pool houses at Homestead and Heritage Crossings*
- Seven Eagles exercise equipment. Reunion East maintained and operated Seven
 Eagles and phased the replacement of cardio equipment and popular equipment

such as treadmills and bicycles on a regular basis.

Asphalt pavement contingency of \$400,000

Ms. Adams would confer with Mr. Boyd off the record regarding using the actual estimated cost as the \$400,000 as a placeholder.

- Concrete sidewalks
- Tree trimming

Ms. Adams indicated that a tree pruning would be required to lift and trim Oak trees along the main roadways. Mr. Scheerer explained that it was a Class 2 tree trimming of all CDD street trees along property that the CDD maintained including 532, which was performed several years ago in stages. A company like Enviro Tree or Briggs would thin Oak trees, raise canopies to ensure they were 14 feet off of the road and 8 feet on the sidewalks and maintain trees along Reunion Boulevard, at the entrances, Excitement Drive, Gathering Drive on the golf course side, Watson Court and in the verge. This would be completed every two to three years. Yellowstone would hand trim some trees as part of their contract.

- No Parking signage for Reunion Village and allowance for sign replacement
- Pool equipment such as pool heaters
- Seven Eagles Linear Park bollard lighting
- Seven Eagles restroom partitions
- Seven Eagles pool and spa resurfacing
- The Stables refurbishment
- General contingency

Mr. Staley indicated that there was a placeholder amount of \$100,000 for the general contingency, which was subject to discussion by the Reunion East CDD Board on what projects the contingency should be used for. All other items were added by Mr. Boyd, Mr. Scheerer and Ms. Adams provided, were in the original Reserve Study. Ms. Adams would rely on feedback from the Board to identify the projects. When the Reserve Study was prepared, operations staff worked with a Reserve Advisor. It would be tied into the Fiscal Year 2024 budget. Mr. Witcher asked if the Board should continue to review this document. Ms. Adams explained that it would be updated based on the actuals and the updated preliminary Project List as well as any other updates or approved services. Mr. Staley noted a total of \$883,000 for the 2024 projects. The Reserve Study was prepared in 2021 but did not include all of the R&M items that the Board wanted. According

to Page 4 of the Five-Year Plan, in 2022 the Reserve Study reflected that \$156,000 was needed, but the Board spent \$596,000 or \$440,000 more than the Reserve Study including the playground and outdoor Fitness Center. All the Reserve Study could do, was to anticipate major infrastructure items, but was not an accurate estimate of what they would actually spend. In 2023, the Reserve Study reflected that \$239,000 would be spent in this current fiscal year and the District was on track to spend over \$1,054,000, with the Reunion Village gate system being one of the major items. For 2024, the Reserve Study reflected that \$590,000 would be spent, but the projects totaled \$883,000, for a difference of \$293,000. The Reserve Study for 2025 and 2026, reserved \$259,000 and \$1.3 million in 2026 because a large amount would be set aside for the roads. Mr. Staley felt that the Board could do a better job going forward and what Mr. Boyd presented today on the roads, would provide insight so that they could build a more reliable forecast for future years. Historically, the Board spent more money than the Reserve Study reflected that they should spend.

Mr. Staley presented the following line analysis of the Five-Year Plan:

- Line 1: Revenues for the General Fund of \$1.974 million was projected for revenue and assumed flat net assessments for 2025 and 2026.
- Line 2: Administrative expenses, which for 2024 increased by 3%.
- Line 3: Shared maintenance expenses, using a 3% inflation in the draft 2024 budget.
- Line 4: Direct maintenance expenses, which included a minor number that was extrapolated by 3%.
- Line 5: Savings
- Line 6: Excess revenues over expenses, which fluctuated between \$304,00 and \$437,000 per year.
- Line 7: Transfers Out to R&M Fund. Next year, \$400,000 would be transferred and in the final two years, it was assumed that the entire surplus of revenue over expenditures would be transferred into R&M reserves.
- Line 8: Excess Revenues after Transfers Out.
- Line 9: General Fund Balance at the beginning of the year, which was \$691,476 in 2022 and \$978,000 at end of 2026.

- Line 10: General Fund Balance at the end of 2022 which was \$869,000 and \$978,000 at end of 2026. The Board could use these funds for the increased operating expenses or it could be transferred to the R&M Fund.
- Line 11: R&M Fund for Reunion East and West, as recommended by the Reserve Study.
- Lines 12 & 13: Other R&M, reflecting what was overspent versus the Reserve Study. In 2023 the District would spend \$1.054 million. It was assumed that the District would spend \$531,000 above the Reserve Study in 2025, which was inflated in 2006.
- Line 14: An adjustment showing the \$400,000 contingency for the roads in the 2024 budget, which would be removed from the long-range plan for 2026, due to those funds being spent.
- Line 15: Total spent in the R&M Fund, which \$596,000 for 2022, \$1.054 million for 2023, \$883,000 for 2024 and \$791,000 and \$1.4 million for the following two years.
- Line 16: Shared expenses, which was 44% for Reunion West and 56% for Reunion East.
- Lines 17 21: Replacement and Maintenance Reserves for Reunion West, which was \$835,000 at the end of 2022. In 2023, \$294,000 would be transferred from the General Fund and total expenditures for the year was 44% of the total of \$1.54 million, leaving a balance of \$686,000. At the end of 2023, the R&M reserve would be reduced by \$150,000. In 2024, \$686,000 would be carried forward, \$400,000 would be transferred from the General Fund and total expenditures for the year, 44% of the \$883,000, would leave a balance of \$712,000. In 2025 and 2026, taking the opening balance and adding in transfers from the General Fund, taking out 44% of the expenditure, would leave a balance of \$732,000 in 2025 and \$410,000 in 2026. At the end of 2026, the \$410,000 in R&M Reserves and the \$978,000 in General Fund Balance would leave a total balance of \$1.4 million in reserves.

Mr. Staley felt that they had to have five years of estimates, extrapolating from the Operating Budget and every year, looking at the projects for R&M for the next couple of years and adding another year onto the end, to track monies available. If they had a \$5 million of

expenses in 2032, the Five-Year Plan would anticipate it and tell the Board how to manage expenses or increase assessments. Mr. Greenstein felt that this was a necessary process and Mr. Staley accurately identified their shortcomings. It showed that the District benefitted from the park and outdoor Fitness Center by having level assessments and maintaining reasonable contributions to the R&M Fund. Mr. Staley pointed out that as soon as the budget was finalized for the next year, the number for 2024 would be locked in. With the assistance of Mr. Boyd, Mr. Scheerer and Ms. Adams, the Board could discuss it and provide direction. Ms. Adams questioned the transferin from the General Fund to the R&M Fund for Fiscal Year 2025 and 2026. Mr. Staley stated that it takes the entire surplus of revenue over expenditures from the current year, which was \$352,000 in 2025 and \$304,000 in 2026. In 2023, \$294,000 was actually transferred into the R&M Fund, but \$259,000 should have been transferred in. Mr. Greenstein felt that there should be a sufficient cash balance to handle the delay in the receipt of revenue from the Tax Collector and in the next few months, they should have an estimate for what this repaying work would cost for the projects between 2025 and 2030. Mr. Barry felt this was a great analysis as it summarized the issues in a simple way. It should be as fine-tuned as possible so that the Board could decide whether to increase revenues.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Staff Reports

A. Attorney

Ms. Trucco recalled that several months ago, the Reunion West POA informed Ms. Adams that they were no longer going to maintain the landscaping in the verge area in front of residential homes. In the community there are ROWs platted on recorded plats. The original developers go through the plat approval process with the county. It was noted that the first plat appears was recorded in 2003 for this community. The verge area is the green space in between the curb and the home perimeter, which included the sidewalk, verge (green space with the tree) and the road. Historically, our understanding was the POA was responsible for the landscaping maintenance, but they believe they may have been maintaining the verge by mistake in some areas because the CDD owns the ROW. Staff reviewed the plats and the POA Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CC&Rs) and noted that several plats for Reunion West stated that the landscaping within the development, including trees in the ROW, were to be maintained by the Reunion West POA. The POA attorney ordered a title document search and after their review, they concluded that the maintenance of landscaping in ROW was assigned to the Reunion West POA in the plats

with the exception of Phase 1, wherein the plat did not assign such responsibility. However, to resolve the ongoing dispute, the POA proposed in Phase 1 to discuss charges for the POA to perform lawn mowing and tree-trimming. The POA stated they would have responsibility per the plat notes for landscaping maintenance in the remainder of verges for lawn mowing and tree trimming but that the CDD was responsible for sidewalk breakage and cleaning, irrigation and landscaping replacement. Ms. Trucco discussed response and option for requesting License Agreement with RW POA to resolve issue.

Mr. Staley preferred to have a License Agreement for Phase 1 for the POA to maintain the area, because the Reunion West POA would be paying for it one way or the other, through the CDD or POA assessments. Mr. Greenstein felt that this aligned with the intent of any past practice of what occurred within the Reunion East and West CDDs from inception and it has only been an issue regarding Encore Reunion West. Ms. Trucco identified 12 plats, 10 of which they conducted their review of. Mr. Greenstein felt that Phase 1 needed to be in line with the other plats and the rest of the community. Ms. Trucco agreed, it made sense for the CDD to grant a License Agreement to the POA to continue the maintenance and it did not make sense for the District to generate attorney's fees. Mr. Staley felt if there was a mistake, it needed it be corrected through the License Agreement. Mr. Greenstein asked if there was an indication that the Reunion West POA was willing to accept the License Agreement. Ms. Trucco did not know, but if there was an agreement that made the most sense they could try get something memorialized in writing.

Regarding the request was for the CDD to take over responsibility for repair of the sprinklers, Mr. Staley did not see any reason for the CDD to do that, because from a consistency perspective, the sprinklers would be handled by the HOA. Mr. Greenstein felt that it was attached to the rest of the residential system when the house was built. Mr. Witcher noted that they were collecting the fees to cover the expense. Mr. Staley understood that the CDD was responsible for sidewalk safety such as repairs and replacement, but if someone wanted their sidewalk to be cleaned it was not the CDD's responsibility. Mr. Scheerer confirmed that the CDD was not responsible for pressure washing sidewalks in front of residential homes. Ms. Trucco would work with Mr. Scheerer. Mr. Staley pointed out that the replacement of landscaping in the verges was a homeowner responsibility and they should be absorbing the cost. The POA could decide whether to raise assessments or have the homeowner to replace the landscaping themselves. Mr. Greenstein indicated that the only landscaping was grass and a tree, which was what the POA wanted to

maintain. Mr. Staley wanted consistency with what they were doing in both CDDs, but the CDD should not create an exception on who replaced the landscaping in those verge areas. Ms. Aura Zelada, of the Reunion West POA confirmed that the POA collected assessments and having a License Agreement was a good approach.

i. Presentation of Memo Regarding Ethics Training for Elected Officials and Other Legislative Updates

Ms. Trucco presented a Memorandum regarding the ethics training for all Supervisors and other legislative updates. There was an amendment to Section 112 of the Florida Statutes, which became effective on July 1, 2023, requiring each Supervisor as of January 1, 2024, to complete four hours of ethics training each calendar year. Board Members were required to certify on Form 1, that they completed the four hours of ethics training. Additional reminders would be provided to the Board closer to January. Resources were available for free on The Florida Commission on Ethics website to complete the requirement in 50-minute increments through training videos. Ms. Trucco reported a change in the Concealed Carry Law in the State of Florida; however, concealed weapons were still prohibited at CDD meetings. Also included, beginning July 1, 2023, a Supervisor was prohibited from communicating with a social media platform to request the removal of certain content. Lastly, there was a revision to Section 287, prohibiting any Supervisor from requesting documentation or giving preference to a vendor based on their social, political or ideological interests, when considering government contracts. Ms. Trucco was still working with Kingwood on the Irrigation System Operating Agreement and once this was completed they would discuss the encroachment issue.

B. Engineer i. Re

Review and Acceptance of Annual Engineer's Report - ADDED

Ms. Adams reported as part of the Trust Indenture, the District was required to have an Annual Engineer's Inspection. There was a letter in the agenda package from the District Engineer, ensuring that the District's master infrastructure was in good condition, there was adequate funding to maintain the infrastructure and adequate insurance on the infrastructure.

On MOTION Mr. Greenstein seconded by Mr. Witcher with all in favor the Annual Engineer's Report was accepted.

C. District Manager's Report

i. Action Items List

Ms. Adams presented the Action Items List, which was included in the agenda package.

ii. Approval of Check Register

Ms. Adams presented the Check Register from June 1, 2023 through June 30, 2023 in the amount of \$191,420.26.

On MOTION by Mr. Barry seconded by Mr. Staley with all in favor the June Check Register was approved.

iii. Balance Sheet and Income Statement

Ms. Adams presented the Unaudited Financial Statements through May 31, 2023, which were included in the agenda package for informational purposes.

iv. Replacement and Maintenance Plan

Ms. Adams presented the Replacement and Maintenance Plan, which was included in the agenda package.

D. Security Report

There being no comments, the next item followed.

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Other Business

There being no comments, the next item followed.

ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Supervisor's Requests

Mr. Staley recalled communication from the HOA regarding The Stables dumpster and questioned if the Reunion East CDD was going to increase collections from three days per week to daily collection. Mr. Greenstein would follow up with Kingwood.

TWELFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS	Next Meeting Date – August 10 th , 2023

The next meeting was scheduled for August 10, 2023 at 11:00 a.m.

July 13, 2023 Page 15 of 15

THIRTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Adjournment

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

---- DocuSigned by:

Tricia Adams 3F3E5FA5C67E43B.

DocuSigned by:

am Staley Grah 439F73A503AA4F2

Secretary/Assistant Secretary

Chairman/Vice Chairman