

**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, **April 11, 2024**, at 11:00 a.m. via Zoom Communication Media Technology and at the Heritage Crossing Community Center, 7715 Heritage Crossing Way, Reunion, Florida.

Present and constituting a quorum:

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

Also present were:

Tricia Adams	District Manager
Kristen Trucco	District Counsel
James Curley	District Engineer
Alan Scheerer	Field Manager
Victor Vargas	Reunion Security
Garrett Huegel	Yellowstone Landscape
Pete Whitman	Yellowstone Landscape
Aura Zelada	Reunion West POA Manager, Artemis Lifestyles
Residents	

The following is a summary of the discussions and actions taken at the April 11, 2024 Reunion West Community Development District Board of Supervisors meeting.

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

Roll Call

Ms. Adams called the meeting to order at 11:01 a.m. and called the roll. All Supervisors were present in person, with the exception of Mr. Barry, who was attending by video conference.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS

Public Comment Period

There were no public comments.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS**Approval of the Minutes of the March 14,
2024 Board of Supervisors Meeting**

Ms. Adams presented the minutes of the March 14, 2024 Board of Supervisors meeting, which were included in the agenda package. Mr. Staley requested the following corrections:

- On Page 4 of 14, the District Engineer requested that the minutes reflect that no CDD money was expended on building Bears Den Lane. Ms. Adams pointed out that the minutes reflected that no bond funds were used.
- On Page 5 of 15, he questioned a small part of Bears Den Lane, but believed that he was referring to Jack Nicklaus Court. Ms. Adams would delete this sentence.
- On Page 10 of 14, he stated that the parcel at the corner of Fairfax Drive and Southfield Street, opposite the Clubhouse, was owned by the POA, but the land was owned by the POA. Ms. Adams would re-state that it was a POA owned parcel.
- On Page 13 of 14, "*Could be,*" should be changed to "*Could not*".

Mr. Staley had further corrections that he would provide under separate cover.

On MOTION by Mr. Barry seconded by Mr. Greenstein with all in favor the Minutes of the March 14, 2024 Board of Supervisors Meeting were approved as amended.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**Review of Sidewalk Installation Locations**

Ms. Adams reported that the Field Services Manager reviewed the residential parcels throughout Reunion West and provided helpful documents for Board review. In addition, District Counsel, researched pertinent legal matters relevant to the sidewalk construction discussion. Mr. Staley was shocked how many locations there were. Mr. Greenstein recalled that there were 250 to 300 vacant lots in both Reunion West and Reunion East. Mr. Staley confirmed that there were 158 vacant lots in Reunion West and 122 vacant lots in Reunion East. Ms. Trucco distributed a short document, identifying the best practices and considerations that staff recommended considering, if the Board decided to proceed with constructing sidewalks adjacent to vacant residential lots, which included: 1) Permitting Requirements, when the owner constructed a home on a vacant lot, Osceola County required a permit, which required the lot owner to construct a sidewalk and verge area, but if the CDD takes on the obligation to construct the sidewalk, the CDD would also need to go to the County for a permit, 2) Surveying, showing where the residential lot

**Reunion West CDD
Regular Meeting****April 11, 2024
Page 3 of 14**

ended and the roadway started, 3) Landowner Consent, stating the CDD is permitted to construct the sidewalk, the landowner agrees to repair any damage to the sidewalk, or reimburse the CDD, for any damage to the sidewalk during future home construction and acknowledgement that the CDD was permitted to construct a sidewalk in front of the home and is not obligated to construct the verge and/or apron areas by its election to construct the sidewalk. Also, the consent is recommended as a step to avoid conflicting with a possible Purchase Agreement, which could apply, obligating the current landowner to construct the sidewalk, and to avoid conflicting with possible current plans that may exist for the sidewalk. Liability for if the sidewalk was damaged is a factor. The CDD sidewalk construction however could appeal to the landowner as it would save the landowner money potentially, by the CDD constructing the sidewalk. However, if they did not sign the consent or decide not to pay the CDD in the event sidewalk was damaged during the home construction, the CDD could incur that cost or have to take legal action for any damages.

Ms. Adams presented a map, proposed cost for materials and unofficial survey, which were included in the agenda package and thanked Mr. Scheerer his efforts preparing these materials. Mr. Barry preferred not to have everyone's explicit approval, as the Board discussed at the last meeting, that it was impractical and probably would not happen. He asked if it was necessary to get the nearby property owner's consent. Ms. Trucco stated that she would need to know the exact lots, in order to determine if a construction agreement existed, as there was potential liability, if the CDD constructed the sidewalk, because someone could come back and try to bring a claim against the CDD. Without approaching the landowner, they did not know if there was a contract or existing plans in place that could conflict with the CDD's action. Mr. Staley pointed out if the Architectural Review Board (ARB) and the County approved the plans, it would apply and the CDD could specifically target those homes, to see if there was an agreement and if they were any plans or permits. Ms. Trucco agreed. Mr. Staley felt that a better solution, was to inform the landowner of the CDD's intention. Ms. Trucco pointed out that the intent was to protect the CDD as much as possible, by applying for the permit and having the County confirm whether any construction plans, permits or applications were submitted for a sidewalk was a step to try to protect the CDD. Mr. Barry pointed out if someone objected, it would not be enough to stop the installation of a sidewalk. Ms. Trucco explained that the CDD could likely move forward with the sidewalk installation, but recommended asking the landowner for documentation as limiting liability exposure is her concern. However, she did not think the landowner would object, based

**Reunion West CDD
Regular Meeting****April 11, 2024
Page 4 of 14**

on the fact that it would save them money from having to construct the sidewalk later, but wanted consent from the landowner to reimburse the CDD for any damages.

Mr. Staley preferred to have a policy to not pay anyone for the privilege of building the sidewalk. Ms. Trucco did not see any obligation requiring the CDD to pay for the right to construct the sidewalk, as the CDD would be going above and beyond and historically the sidewalk was built by the individual lot owner. Mr. Greenstein noted that the chart for Masters' Landing should be 35 feet and Legends Corner should be 55 feet. As an ARC Member, he reviewed plans for new homes all the time and he was concerned with the issue of the width of the driveway. For example, if the owner wanted to get the house approved and have space for three cars and landscaping on the side, they could not have a 20-foot pad, as the driveway pad was tied in with the width of the parking area and there was no standard driveway pad, but this was a practical issue, since there was no need to build driveway pads. While reviewing proposed costs, Mr. Scheerer pointed out that there would only be a sidewalk cost. Ms. Adams recalled that the estimated costs exclude the permit, survey and any legal expenses. Mr. Witcher asked if the CDD was obligated to install the driveway pad. Mr. Greenstein explained that there was no standard driveway pad. Ms. Harley asked if the sidewalk was across the access to the driveway. Mr. Greenstein explained that there was the roadway, the driveway pad, the sidewalk and finally the paver driveway next to the sidewalk. Mr. Staley asked if it was possible to install a plain vanilla sidewalk. Mr. Greenstein pointed out they must think about how to level it and prepare the area, so there was no height differential. Mr. Staley voiced concern that the sidewalks would get destroyed when construction takes place and that the homeowners would ask the CDD to pay for the cost of demolition, especially for the smaller lots. Mr. Greenstein pointed out that there must be discussion by the Board on whether to do one side of the street, where there needed to be a continuous sidewalk rather than install sidewalks on every vacant lot.

Mr. Staley felt that these were good points, but the Board's focus should be to install simple vanilla concrete sidewalks throughout the community and not worry about driveways. Following the legal terms that were laid out by District Counsel and proposed that a Board Member work with Ms. Trucco and the Field Manager to discuss the details. Ms. Trucco suggested taking each request on a case-by-case basis, depending on where the lots were located. For example, she reached out to counsel for LGI, a developer in Reunion Village, where it was explained that there was a Purchase Agreement, stating that LGI had a duty to construct a sidewalk when they

**Reunion West CDD
Regular Meeting**

**April 11, 2024
Page 5 of 14**

constructed the house, but that it appears there was no period of time on when they had to construct it by. The question was whether they could construct the sidewalk without consent, as there may be a cost for demolition. However, if there was permitting and approved construction plans, the County would probably dictate where the future sidewalk was required to be built and the best practice was to at least notify the landowner of the CDD's intention to construct the sidewalk, giving them 60 days if they had an objection and consent to reimburse the CDD for any damages. Mr. Staley pointed out that Reunion Village was different because the landowner was LGI and along with Encore, they built all of their sidewalks. Mr. Greenstein preferred to meet with the Master Association to coordinate this, before they proceeded further, as the construction of sidewalks was historically the responsibility of the builder. Mr. Staley agreed and suggested that a member of Reunion East CDD Board meet with Mr. Anthony Carll to discuss this matter further. Mr. Barry volunteered to meet with Mr. Carll, but voiced concern that the sidewalks would get damaged from contractors driving onto sidewalks and unloading roofing tiles and drywall and they should have a policy in place, indicating who would be responsible for any damages. Mr. Staley stated if someone damaged a sidewalk, by driving a vehicle over it, the responsible party would be responsible for repair it. Ms. Harley recalled that the resort had a Featured Builders Program and suggested having a conversation with the core group of builders, regarding the sidewalks. Mr. Staley felt that these issues could be worked out.

Ms. Trucco had no issue with Mr. Barry meeting with Mr. Carll, as long as it was a fact-finding, information gathering session only and that any decisions or agreements come back to the Board for final approval for insurance and other reasons. She also had reviewed the Master HOA's Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CC&Rs), but did not see anything regarding an obligation to construct a sidewalk and felt it was beneficial to reach out to all of the community stakeholders, for their feedback. Ms. Adams suggested having a discussion with the Featured Builders, as damage to the sidewalks might occur at a time when no one witnessed it. Mr. Staley suggested that the members of the Featured Builders Program meet with Kingwood on a regular basis. Mr. Staley asked if all sidewalks in Encore were completed. Ms. Adams pointed out that Encore Reunion West was outside of this scope of the materials presented because all of their sidewalks were installed. Mr. Staley pointed out this was a good discussion and thanked Ms. Trucco for providing a list of best practices. Mr. Greenstein thanked Mr. Barry for bringing up this matter. There was

Board consensus to delegate authority for Mr. Barry to meet with Mr. Carll and a member of the Reunion East CDD Board to discuss the sidewalk issue, including the financing.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**Consideration of Sign Installation Request
from The Crescent at Reunion**

Ms. Adams reported that in regards to The Terraces Project, the developer of The Crescent at Reunion, was seeking the consent of the Reunion West CDD Board, to install signage at Tradition Boulevard and Grand Traverse Parkway. However, there was not enough information for the Board to make a decision today, as the verbiage for the sign, was requested but had not yet been received. Mr. Staley questioned what the request was for. Ms. Adams explained that the request was to install one directional sign on Reunion West CDD property and three directional signs on Reunion East CDD property, to direct people to the project. In 2017, the Reunion East CDD Board adopted a policy regarding the installation of signs. The policy allows directional and wayfinding signage, as well as temporary signage for special events, to be installed on District and right-of-way (ROW) property; however, before any signage was installed, the Board needed to grant permission. It also provided for signs that were not in compliance with the policy, to be removed within 60-day grace period. In 2017, at the time that the signage policy was approved by the Reunion East CDD Board, the Board also approved a sign standard, which included two white posts with caps and the Reunion logo. At the time that the Reunion East CDD adopted this policy, the Reunion West CDD Board did not adopt a policy, but they joined in the spirit of it, by removing signs that were not in accordance with the policy and only having signs installed that complied to the signage standard. Ms. Adams inquired whether the Reunion West CDD Board wanted to consider a similar policy and if they did she would include a draft policy for Board consideration at the next meeting.

Mr. Barry asked if the homeowners that purchased property, would be Reunion Resort members. Ms. Adams confirmed that they were under the Master Association but did not know if they would be members of the private amenities managed by Kingwood Orlando Reunion Resort. Mr. Witcher asked if Crescent was asking for approval to get their logo on the sign. Ms. Adams indicated that the verbiage for the sign and what it would look like, was requested from the project developer, but she had not received it by this meeting. She questioned whether the Board wanted to adopt a signage policy or take sign installation requests on a case-by-case basis with having the Field Manager remove any signage that was on CDD property that was not approved by the Board.

**Reunion West CDD
Regular Meeting****April 11, 2024
Page 7 of 14**

Mr. Witcher recalled that the signs were updated on the east side with the new verbiage on the front and back of the sign, showing directions, but there was no new signage on the west side. Mr. Greenstein pointed out that while a policy did not exist on the west side, it was applied from an administrative standpoint and there were no instances where someone installed a sign without Board approval but recommended that such a policy be adopted. Mr. Staley agreed but wanted to review the policy first and questioned what happened if a Feature Builder wanted to install signs throughout the community. Mr. Greenstein pointed out there were standard signs that was controlled through the Master Association. Mr. Staley asked if they allowed other developers to install signage, as it set a precedence. Mr. Greenstein stated it would only be an issue for the Board, if they wanted to install a sign on CDD property and the Featured Builders Program was tightly controlled. Ms. Trucco offered to include in the policy, criteria that this Board could consider, such as the removal of signage that provided a cluttered look or was aesthetically displeasing and pointed out that anything the CDD approved, was always setting a precedent, but adopting a policy would prevent that. Mr. Staley asked if any policy that the CDD Board adopted, would also apply to Encore. Ms. Adams confirmed that the Reunion West CDD included the Encore neighborhood. Mr. Staley did not want to see Olive Garden or Longhorn signs all over the community. Mr. Greenstein pointed out that these restaurants were doing well without any additional signage, but the Reunion East CDD Board agreed to directional signs at Reunion Village and were responsible for updating the signs, if they wear out or there was a change in the name. There was Board consensus for Ms. Adams to include a draft sign policy on the next agenda, along with the request for The Crescent sign installation at Tradition Boulevard and Grand Traverse Parkway.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**Consideration of Proposal for Professional
Service Rate for District Engineer**

Ms. Adams presented a proposal for professional services for the District Engineer, which was included in the agenda package. The last Hourly Rate Schedule approved by the CDD Board, was in April of 2022 and the rate for the Principal Engineer was being increased from \$215 per hour to \$260 per hour, the Director of Engineering rate from \$215 per hour to \$250 per hour, the Project Manager/Senior Civil Engineer rate from \$180 per hour to \$190 per hour, the Project Engineer rate from \$150 per hour to \$160 per hour, the Senior Civil 3D Designer rate from \$135 per hour to \$145 per hour, the CAD Technician rate from \$100 per hour to \$120 per hour, the Project Coordinator rate from \$95 per hour to \$105 per hour and the Administrative/Permit

**Reunion West CDD
Regular Meeting**

**April 11, 2024
Page 8 of 14**

Technician rate from \$80 per hour to \$90 per hour. Mr. James Curley was present to answer any questions. There were no questions.

On MOTION by Ms. Harley seconded by Mr. Witcher with all in favor the Proposal for Professional Service Rate for District Engineer as stated above was approved.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Staff Reports

A. Attorney

i. Memorandum – Annual Reminder on Florida Laws for Public Officers

Ms. Trucco presented a Memorandum providing annual reminders to the Board on Florida Laws that apply to public officials, which focused on the following areas:

1. Code of Ethics Reminders: There was a Gifts Law, that applies to public officials, whereby Board Members are prohibited from accepting or asking for anything of value, based upon an understanding that such a thing would influence the official's vote, action or judgment. It also applied to their spouse or minor children. There was also a disclosure duty, for gifts having a value of greater than \$100, unless it was from a relative, whereby Board Members were required to disclose the gift on Form 9, unless they paid down the value of the gift to \$100 or less within 90 days of receiving it.
2. Voting Conflicts: Public officers were not allowed to vote on any measure that would result in their special private gain or loss or special private gain or loss of a principal, whom the officer receives compensation or something of like value from, of a parent organization or subsidiary of a corporate principal by whom the officer was retained, of a relative (parents, children, spouse, sibling, mother/father-in-law or son/daughter-in-law) or of a business associate. For example, if the Board Member owned an apartment complex or participated in a joint venture with someone, that is current and ongoing for profit, that person would be a business associate and they must abstain from voting on a measure that would result in that business associate's special private gain or loss; however, if a business associate was from 10 years ago and the officer no longer is associated then if they submitted a proposal, the Board Member was permitted to vote, because they were not in a current and ongoing business relationship for profit.

**Reunion West CDD
Regular Meeting**

**April 11, 2024
Page 9 of 14**

Ms. Trucco explained if a Board Member had a voting conflict, they were required to abstain from voting and fill out Form 8B and file it with Ms. Adams within 15 days of the vote occurring. However, the law distinguished between appointed and elected Board Members, with regard to disclosure prior to discussing an item, but if the Board Member had a voting conflict and still wanted to discuss the item, they were permitted to do so, but there were certain disclosure requirements. The best-case scenario was for the Board Member to disclose their conflict, prior to engaging in the discussion. If they were an appointed Board Member, there was a certain process that they needed to follow for discussions. However, counsel generally warns against discussion for items with conflicts to avoid being construed as a violation of the misuse of the Public Position Statute as described in the memorandum as a Board Member could not use their position to corruptly get some type of a gain or secure a special privilege or benefit or exemption for themselves.

3. Quorum and Sunshine Law Reminders: A majority of the Board must be physically present in order for the Board to take any official action. However, if three Board Members were physically present, a Board Member could attend by phone; however, they did not count for the quorum requirement and could only participate by telephone if their absence was due to an extraordinary circumstance such as an illness. Supervisors calling in were required to vote on every measure, unless there was a voting conflict. Regarding the Sunshine Law, Board Members were not permitted to discuss any item, upon which foreseeable action would be taken by the Board with another Supervisor on this Board, outside of a meeting, including text messages, virtual text messages and posts on social media, such as Facebook. Even if the Supervisor was not friends with another Supervisor, if a Supervisor reads a public post from another Supervisor, it could be construed as communicating with a Supervisor outside of a meeting, which was a violation of the Sunshine Law.
4. Public Records Reminder: Any document sent or received by a Supervisor, in connection with official business of the CDD, was considered a public record, which included text messages, emails and any documents sent or received in connection with the official business of the CDD. It must be retained for a statutory period of time as set forth on a chart that was created by the Division of Library Information Services of the Florida Department of State, which shows how long a

**Reunion West CDD
Regular Meeting****April 11, 2024
Page 10 of 14**

particular document must be retained for and how to dispose of it. District Counsel's recommendation was to send everything to GMS, the Records Custodian for the CDD, to retain for the statutorily required period of time.

Mr. Staley asked as a member of the Reunion West CDD Board, if could speak to Ms. Hobbs on the Reunion East CDD Board about CDD methods. Ms. Trucco confirmed that Mr. Staley could speak with Ms. Hobbs but could not speak with Mr. Greenstein outside of a meeting. Mr. Greenstein pointed out that there were two separate Boards. Mr. Staley belonged to Facebook groups and found them helpful to learn what was happening in the community; however, he never posted about CDD business and questioned whether he could directly message homeowners about a CDD matter. Ms. Trucco stated that it was permitted, but the message needed to be preserved for public records law and recommended that Mr. Staley screenshot the conversation and email it to the District Manager or otherwise save it. Mr. Staley appreciated the clarification. Mr. Witcher started his ethics training yesterday, but did not complete it, due to internet issues.

Ms. Trucco reported that the Traffic Enforcement Agreement was almost completed and would hopefully be brought back at the next meeting. Mr. Greenstein asked if there were any provision for monetary exchange. Ms. Trucco stated there was no such provision in the current version. She was working with the Reunion West POA on an extension but was waiting on approval of the proposed revisions that were discussed at a prior meeting, which the Board approved and delegated authority to the Chairman to provide the final sign off on. The inventory of every located plat and deed within the CDD boundaries, was completed and forwarded to the Title Examiner, to confirm that some of the tracts were not re-platted, but if it was not conveyed by deed, she wanted the Title Examiner to confirm whether the tract was part of a plat that was re-platted. As soon as it was completed, Ms. Trucco would report back to the Board. This also related to the tract related to the bocce ball court issue and there would be a discussion about the next steps, as there may be other tracts that were part of that same category, as far as a potential adverse claim of ownership. Ms. Trucco would confirm with a litigator about the Statute of Limitation period, in order to bring any potential claim, if the CDD decided to do that. It looked like the period was 2026, but if it was sooner, it would be brought back to the Board. As soon as the inventory was completed by the Title Examiner, they would jump into this other aspect of adverse claim of ownership if necessary. Mr. Witcher asked if she was expecting to have that information before

**Reunion West CDD
Regular Meeting**

**April 11, 2024
Page 11 of 14**

the May meeting. Ms. Trucco believed that they would have it by the May meeting, as it was provided to the Title Examiner a week and a half ago.

Mr. Staley asked if there were any eminent domain updates. Ms. Trucco had not received any updates as of yet. Mr. Greenstein recalled an announcement from the Governor last week about the I-4 widening and the prioritization of their area. It was not supposed to happen for 20 years but was due to start at the end of this calendar year and was wondering if the work would increase the amount of property that the Reunion East and Reunion West CDDs were going to have to consider under eminent domain. Ms. Trucco indicated that Eminent Domain Counsel had not reached out to her but would reach out to Mr. Kent Hip the head of the eminent domain department at Gray Robinson for an update. Mr. Greenstein pointed out that the announcement would not have been made if they did not have the plans and hopefully within a short period of time, they could determine how close the work would come within Reunion Village and the golf course on the west side of I-4. Ms. Trucco would provide an update at the next meeting.

ii. Sidewalk Construction Discussion

This item was discussed.

B. Engineer

Mr. Curley reported that they All County Paving (All County) committed to the repaving of the roads and Middlesex Paving (Middlesex) was re-looking at their numbers, but All County was the one Mr. Curley was pursuing. A resolution and an agreement from District Counsel that would be brought before the Board for consideration. Mr. Greenstein pointed out that was great news. Mr. Curly was informed by All County that they could start in August, but he wanted them to start earlier. At this time, he had not heard back from Middlesex.

C. Field Manager Updates

Mr. Scheerer reported that the generators outside of the back gate were the property of Toho Water Authority. There were some odor issues, which permeated into the guardhouse from time to time. Crews on site yesterday, in a manhole, doing whatever they had to do to clear whatever blockage was creating the sewer gas smell, not only at the lift station, but at the Sinclair Road gatehouse. Mr. Scheerer met with Jack Lott, Director of Traffic Operations Manager for Osceola County, to get all of the traffic signs upgraded and have the Sheriff's Department to come

**Reunion West CDD
Regular Meeting****April 11, 2024
Page 12 of 14**

into the community to enforce. They had a good drive through with Mr. Lott. Some signs were missing and there were some suggested changes, due to the DOT Manual changing, but Mr. Lott would provide an Efficiency List and an overview of his visit. Mr. Scheerer also met with Fausnight Stripe & Line (Fausnight), to review some of the new No Parking signs in the Valhalla area. They would provide modifications to Mr. Phil Fausnight, in order for that program to begin. One of the things that Mr. Lott mentioned, was the lack of roadway striping, but Mr. Scheerer informed him that they were in the process of working on a Request for Proposal (RFP), that would include all striping. The modifications to the No Parking Zone in Valhalla and Grand Traverse Parkway around the playground, were complete and all of the new signs were installed. Mr. Barry stated when the No Parking signs were installed several weeks ago, he was surprised that there were signs, especially in the Valhalla area around the playground, because on the other side of the playground, the No Parking signs were supposed to be removed and asked at a future meeting, whether they could discuss what they agreed to. For example, outside of his house, Mr. Barry did not expect to see No Parking signs, as well as entering the Eagle Estates area, further up on Grand Traverse Parkway, right before the exit and at some empty lots, as it was his understanding that there were only to be No Parking signs at the s-curve. Mr. Scheerer explained that all of the No Parking signs were along Grand Traverse Parkway, according to the parking map that was modified at the last meeting but would be happy to review the signage with Mr. Barry. Mr. Staley pointed out that there were No Parking signs on both sides of the back end of the playground, since yesterday. Mr. Staley indicated one No Parking sign was removed and two needed to be moved further back, down Grand Traverse Parkway, after the stop sign, right at the dead end and to the left of the big house, according to the Sign Plan and the Parking Rules that the Board adopted. Fausnight originally missed that and came back out to remediate it. Mr. Scheerer was happy to meet with Mr. Barry next week to discuss the No Parking signs.

Mr. Scheerer reported that many people were running over the flex stakes again. Since he missed the majority of the Reunion West CDD meeting last month, Mr. Scheerer was meeting with Ms. Aura Zelada, of the Reunion West POA next Wednesday at 8:00 a.m., to review the concepts for the playground equipment that she requested. When coming off of Tradition Boulevard, it may be brighter as all of the lights in the guardhouses were changed to LEDs. They did the same thing at the two manned guardhouses on the east side. Ms. Harley questioned the status of the Whitmarsh Mound. Mr. Scheerer met with Mr. Carll, who informed him that the project should

**Reunion West CDD
Regular Meeting**

**April 11, 2024
Page 13 of 14**

be complete by the end of the month. Mr. Greenstein requested that Mr. Scheerer straighten and secure signs that were leaning. Mr. Scheerer indicated that the signs were secured at the bottom and had concrete, but if signs needed to be re-set, they would remove and re-set them. One sign at the back of Twin Eagles Loop was re-set and another one was re-set on Grand Traverse Parkway, but Mr. Scheerer would continue to monitor the signs. The amenity issue with the Reunion West POA and Encore should come to a close soon. Ms. Adams pointed out that the Replacement and Maintenance Plan, was included in the agenda package. Mr. Staley recalled that there was a placeholder in the budget for the pavement work and asked if the amount of \$400,000 was in the ballpark. Mr. Curley would talk to All County about it. Mr. Staley pointed out that it was not critical and should be completed when it was the right time to do so. Ms. Adams indicated that they would know the exact amount soon, but the aggregated amount, looking at the overall Pavement Management Plan was \$504,498, which was the placeholder and would be used for pavement management, as well as roadway improvements and traffic calming.

D. District Manager's Report

i. Action Items List

This item was discussed.

ii. Approval of Check Register

Ms. Adams presented the Check Register from March 1, 2024 through March 31, 2024 in the amount of \$93,048.22, which was included in the agenda package.

On MOTION by Mr. Witcher seconded by Mr. Greenstein with all in favor the March Check Register was approved.
--

iii. Balance Sheet and Income Statement

Ms. Adams presented the Unaudited Financial Statements through February 29, 2024, which was included in the agenda package and were for informational purposes. No Board action was required.

iv. Replacement and Maintenance Plan

This item was discussed.

E. Security Report

Mr. Vargas provided the March Security Reports for the Reunion West POA and the Master Association, under separate cover. Mr. Staley asked if the notice that the POA sent to all homeowners, was distributed to the Board. Ms. Adams confirmed that it was provided to the Board. Mr. Staley asked if anything was ever sent to the homeowners on behalf of the Board. Ms. Adams recalled that a copy of the Parking Rules with a cover letter that had salient points of concerns from Board Members, was sent to homeowners. Mr. Staley felt that it was useful, simple and easy to understand. Mr. Witcher pointed out that it was done in a matter that got everyone’s attention.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Other Business

Mr. Staley reminded the Board that two Supervisor positions were up for re-election in November. Ms. Adams was presenting a resolution at the next meeting, regarding the General Election as well as a notification regarding the qualifying period and announcement of the number of registered voters within the District boundaries. Mr. Staley recalled that the qualifying period was in the middle of June. Ms. Adams confirmed that it was in June and was managed by the Osceola County Supervisor of Elections, but it would be announced at the next meeting. Mr. Staley noted that his seat and Ms. Harley’s seat were up for re-election.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Supervisor’s Requests

There being no comments, the next item followed.

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Next Meeting Date – May 9th, 2024

Ms. Adams stated that the next meeting was scheduled for May 9, 2024 at 11:00 a.m.

ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Adjournment

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

DocuSigned by:
Tricia Adams
3F3E5FA5C67E43B...
Secretary/Assistant Secretary

DocuSigned by:
Graham Staley
439F73A503AA4F2...
Chairman/Vice Chairman