

**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, **May 9, 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	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	Artemis Lifestyles, Reunion West POA
Residents	

The following is a summary of the discussions and actions taken at the May 9, 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.

**Reunion West CDD
Regular Meeting****May 9, 2024
Page 2 of 16****SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS****Public Comment Period**

Ms. Adams opened the public comment period. Residents were asked to state their name and limit their comments to three minutes. Resident Randall Zapata of 450 Burma Street requested that the Board to consider looking at acquiring more amenities for members and private entities like different clubhouses, issuing a bond and having a third-party manage the entities on behalf of the members. Ms. Adams asked if the Board wanted this item to be addressed under action items. Mr. Staley felt that it was worth pursuing and requested that it be discussed under Other Business. There being no further comments, Ms. Adams closed the public comment period.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS**Approval of the Minutes of the April 11,
2024 Board of Supervisors Meeting**

Ms. Adams presented the minutes of the April 11, 2024 Board of Supervisors meeting, which were included in the agenda package. Mr. Staley stated on Page 5 of 14, he suggested that a member of Reunion West CDD Board meet with Mr. Anthony Carll and not the Reunion East CDD Board. Ms. Adams would make this change.

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein seconded by Ms. Harley with all in favor the Minutes of the April 11, 2024 Board of Supervisors Meeting were approved as amended.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**Consideration of Policy for Signage in
District Property and Rights of Way**

Ms. Adams presented a draft Policy for Signage on District Property and Rights-of-Way (ROW) pertaining to requests that come before the Board for the installation of signage on CDD ROW. The Reunion East CDD adopted a similar policy, but in order to have community cohesiveness, Reunion West performed an audit of property and any signage that had previously been installed, but not in compliance with Reunion East's policy, was removed at that time. The purpose of this item was for sign requests, such as the one that was being considered in the next agenda item. The concept that was introduced last month is that any signage must be approved by the Board of Supervisors and were limited to approving directional and informational signage. The policy was reviewed by District Counsel and there were no substantive changes to what was distributed at the last meeting. Ms. Adams asked if District Counsel had any comments regarding political signs. Ms. Trucco confirmed that there was a code in Osceola County, stating that political

**Reunion West CDD
Regular Meeting****May 9, 2024
Page 3 of 16**

signs could not be installed on public property, including road ROW and recommended including additional language in the policy, that any signage comply with all Osceola County Laws, Code Requirements and Florida Statutes. Mr. Staley agreed and recalled under Section 1.7, there were options to restrict the use of signage and felt that the Board should be able to act on any signage that was inappropriate and requested that language be included in Section 1.7. Mr. Staley questioned whether this was consistent with the policy that was adopted by the Reunion East CDD Board. Ms. Adams confirmed that it was consistent and updated by District Counsel to include language regarding compliance with State and Local Laws. Mr. Witcher felt that it was important to have this policy, because they were a single community that was divided into two separate entities.

Mr. Barry MOVED to approve a policy for signage on District property and rights-of-way, subject to including language restricting political signs and Ms. Harley seconded the motion.

Mr. Greenstein noted from an administrative standpoint, when it comes to signage, the Reunion East CDD Board adopted what the Master Association approved relative to featured builders and other signage, to have uniformity within the community on the design of the signs. Ms. Adams felt that was a good point and following last month's meeting, contacted the Master Association and requested that they provide their signage standards and policy. However, she was informed by the Master Association that they did not adopt a formal policy or standards. Mr. Greenstein explained if the sign was on CDD property, they could control it.

On VOICE VOTE with all in favor adopting a policy for signage on District property and rights-of-way, subject to including language restricting political signs was approved.

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

Ms. Adams received a request from the developer of The Crescent at Reunion, to install signage. The request was to install directional signage in Parcel 4 at Tradition Boulevard and Grand Traverse Parkway, which was in Reunion West CDD. The request, parcel identification for each District and a graphic along with a depiction of the signage, were included in the agenda package.

**Reunion West CDD
Regular Meeting****May 9, 2024
Page 4 of 16**

Ms. Harley was against installing the signage, because it did not conform to other Reunion signage standards. Mr. Greenstein agreed. Ms. Adams stated that a sign standard handout was provided to the Board at the last meeting. The key elements on the depiction, were the white posts with the caps, the Reunion motif with the three palm trees. She questioned whether the Reunion West CDD Board wanted the same design standard. Ms. Harley recalled that the Featured Builder signs when advertising for Bears Den, had the Bears Den logo, but it still had the Reunion logo, which confirmed with their signage. Mr. Witcher pointed out that all of their signage had black at the top with gold lettering. Ms. Harley felt that the design of the proposed signs looked tacky. Ms. Trucco agreed with the Board direction to go back to the requestor, as this was public property financed with bond funds for a private benefit and would check from a historical standpoint, on how the CDD handled marketing signage requests. Mr. Staley agreed with the signs not having pricing or QR codes. Mr. Staley believed that the sign would be placed before the I-4 bridge into the west side, but the way the sign was facing, it was leaving the resort and not entering it. Ms. Adams clarified that the sign would have a logo, directional arrow and an address. Ms. Adams would provide feedback to the developer regarding the posts with the end caps, arch at the top with the Reunion Palm logo, request that they remove the pricing and QR Codes and clarify the exact location. This item was deferred until the next meeting.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**Consideration of Resolution 2024-04
Relating to the 2024 General Election and
Qualifying Procedure**

Ms. Adams presented Resolution 2024-04, memorializing that there was a General Election in November of 2024 for Seat 1, currently held by Ms. Sharon Harley and Seat 2, currently held by Mr. Graham Staley. The CDD was required to announce on the record, the qualifying period, which was from Noon on June 10, 2024 through Noon on June 14, 2024. The election was administered by the Osceola County Supervisor of Elections office.

On MOTION by Mr. Witcher seconded by Mr. Greenstein with all in favor Resolution 2024-04 Relating to the 2024 General Election and Qualifying Procedure was approved.

Mr. Staley voiced concern that the minutes would not be published until June 6th and the qualifying period was on June 10th and requested that an email blast be sent out to residents. Mr.

**Reunion West CDD
Regular Meeting****May 9, 2024
Page 5 of 16**

Barry asked if there was a General Election in Reunion East. Ms. Adams explained that once CDDs transitioned to the qualified elector process, every time there was a General Election, which was every two years, there would be CDD seats listed on the ballot. They were all four-year terms and the seats were staggered. In one General Election cycle, there would be three seats and the next one, two seats would be on the ballot. In 2026, three seats would be up for General Election. Mr. Barry asked if Reunion East followed a similar approach of advertising. Mr. Staley recalled that it was discussed by the Reunion East CDD Board two years ago, but they voted not to do it. Mr. Barry felt that it should be consistent. Ms. Harley asked if residents voted at the General Election for these seats. Ms. Adams explained if there was more than one candidate who qualified for a seat, a citizen who was registered to vote in Osceola County and lived within the Reunion West CDD boundaries, would be able to vote in the General Election for whichever seat was contested. However, if only one person qualified, they would be considered a Board Member elect and would be seated the second Tuesday following the election, which would likely be in December, since Reunion West CDD meetings fall early in the month. Mr. Staley recalled that anyone who wanted to qualify, had to declare which seat they were running for, according to the Supervisor of Elections.

Mr. Barry asked if the process was mandated by the State. Ms. Adams explained that because the CDD was a government, the entire election process was facilitated by the Osceola County Elections Office. Districts follow Chapter 190 of Florida Statutes, which has information about the initial Landowners Election and what triggered a transition to the General Election process. Under the District Manager's Report, there was a report on the number of registered voters. This information was important because two conditions must be met in order to transition to the General Election process; the District must be established for at least six years and have at least 250 registered voters. However, even though this Board was now fully transitioned to the General Election process, this information was still required to be reported every year, because the Florida Statutes did not have any provision to stop reporting the number of registered voters. Mr. Barry asked if someone could select both seats. Mr. Staley would contact the Supervisor of Elections to find out. Ms. Harley asked if there was only this four-day period to qualify. Mr. Staley confirmed that there was only the four days and the best way to qualify, according to the Supervisor of Elections, was to physically go to their office and provide their Form 1, Financial Disclosure and Driver's License. Ms. Harley indicated that she would be in Africa during the qualification

**Reunion West CDD
Regular Meeting****May 9, 2024
Page 6 of 16**

period. Ms. Adams recommended that Ms. Harley contact the Supervisor of Elections office for guidance on this matter.

Mr. Greenstein hoped that anyone applying for these seats, had interest and knowledge of the current Board Members. Ms. Adams pointed out that the nature of the announcement did not have any specificity to the incumbent elected Board Members. It would only state that the Reunion West CDD had two seats on the Board that would be included with the General Election process for November 2024, list the qualifying period and that information could be obtained from the Osceola County Elections office. Mr. Barry preferred to include information on whether Mr. Staley and Ms. Harley were running for re-election, so a resident could make an informed decision on whether or not to run against them. Mr. Greenstein agreed. Ms. Trucco pointed out that there would be a Sunshine Law issue and preferred that Mr. Staley and Ms. Harley declare whether they were running again at a public meeting, versus including it in a public notice. Mr. Staley agreed and declared his intention to re-run for his seat. Ms. Harley declared her intention to run. Mr. Staley preferred that the announcement be basic, including the open seats and the qualification period. Ms. Adams asked if Board Members wanted the announcement to state that Mr. Staley and Ms. Harley announced their intention at a duly noticed public meeting, to run for Seats 2 and 1, respectively. Mr. Staley was in favor for transparency purposes. Ms. Trucco requested the proposed language be sent to her for final approval. There was Board consensus to direct District management staff to prepare an announcement as stated above.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**Consideration of Resolution 2024-05
Approving Entering into a Contract with
All County Paving Inc. to Provide Paving
and Related Services**

Ms. Adams presented Resolution 2024-05 Approving Entering into a Contract with All County Paving Inc. (All County), to provide paving and related services, which was included in the agenda package, due to wear and tear issues on the District's roadways, as the District set aside some funding for the current fiscal year, in order to engage in milling and resurfacing. There was also the potential of including some traffic calming devices. Mr. Curley worked hard to secure a proposal for the Board of Supervisors. There was a public bid through a public procurement process, but because they did not receive any bids, staff had the flexibility to look at different options for entering into an agreement. District Counsel provided guidance for the District

**Reunion West CDD
Regular Meeting****May 9, 2024
Page 7 of 16**

Engineer and the District management team regarding options and ultimately, the Board can consider a resolution. Mr. Curly pointed out that there was repeated documentation, as it was bid out in sections. The unit cost was the same, but the quantities changed within each section. There was a cost of \$7,500 for mobilization and \$3,800 for message boards. There would be a Maintenance of Traffic (MOT), to keep everything organized within the community. Ms. Adams explained that the MOT program, consisted of communication, before the start of the project, people stationed at the project site, flagging and directing traffic, opening and closing roads and signs to caution people that construction was imminent. In comparison to prior bids, the MOT was much larger, but the mill and resurface, were at the estimated cost, which was \$5 per linear feet for the mill and \$13 for the resurface, as well as pavement markings for an additional \$1 per linear foot.

Mr. Greenstein asked if Fausnight Stripe & Line (Fausnight) would do the markings. Mr. Scheerer stated it would be completed as needed. Mr. Scheerer felt that that the amounts were reasonable. Ms. Trucco advised that the District's Rules of Procedure, allow the CDD to take whatever steps were reasonably necessary, to procure the services or a contract, since no bids were received and, in this instance, the District was not required under the current rules to piggyback, but the contractor was honoring the prices, based on another government contract. Mr. Witcher asked if the proposal covered everything that was in the Inspection Report. Ms. Adams confirmed that it covered everything that was identified as a priority repair and this was the first five years of what had been identified in the Pavement Management Plan as critical. Mr. Staley asked if they needed to make a decision on the speed tables at this time, as there were three on Traditions Boulevard and two on Grand Traverse Parkway. Ms. Adams felt that there should be an explicit discussion about the speed tables. Traffic calming devices were a controversial issue, as some residents within the community would be opposed to speed bumps. They were not required, but the Board had the discretion to include traffic calming in the final scope.

Mr. Staley proposed having further discussion about speed tables at a later date, when they had pictures and specific locations. Ms. Curley would bring back additional information at the next meeting for Board discussion. Mr. Staley felt that it should be brought back to the Board, as it was a controversial subject and wanted to see what the Reunion East CDD Board would do, so there was consistency. Mr. Witcher preferred to have speed tables. Ms. Harley agreed with having speed tables, especially on Grand Traverse Parkway. Mr. Staley indicated that the area that needed speed

**Reunion West CDD
Regular Meeting****May 9, 2024
Page 8 of 16**

tables was at the water park, as it was a cut through to the resort. Mr. Barry questioned the timing for starting this process. Ms. Adams confirmed that it was several months out. Ms. Harley asked if All County Paving was willing to hold their prices. Mr. Curley would confirm and stated that it included the following segments of roadway: 1) Outbound Lane of Tradition Boulevard, Sections 1, 2 and 3; 2) Grand Traverse Parkway – Section 4; 3) Desert Mountain Court; 4) 1.06W – Golf cart crossing on Grand Traverse Parkway and 5) 1.07W. The purpose of the location for the speed tables was to protect the golf cart crossings and slow people down at other locations. Ms. Adams clarified that speed tables were recommended at golf cart crossings or straightaways where people build up speed. The traffic calming locations were prepared with the assistance of the security team, based on speeding complaints. Mr. Staley understood the logic, but voiced concern about driving over five speed tables on Grand Traverse Parkway.

Ms. Trucco asked if there was the ability to move the speed tables. Ms. Adams stated the Board could eliminate one or all speed bumps including the ones at golf cart crossings. Mr. Barry questioned why speed tables were needed at the golf cart crossings. Mr. Staley believed that the logic was to slow people down before the golf cart crossings. Ms. Adams pointed out that it was not required nor was a recommendation from the District Engineer, but there was feedback from Board Members that this was an area of concern. Mr. Scheerer indicated that the golf cart crossing at Bears Den, was where traffic built up speed relatively quickly, but questioned where the three speed tables were. Mr. Witcher stated one was before the bridge, one was the other side of the bridge, going from Holes 1 to 2 and the third one was from Holes 6 to 7. Mr. Barry noted the third one was before the Eagles Estate sign. Mr. Scheerer pointed out that the speed tables could be manipulated any way the Board desired, as these were only recommendations. Ms. Adams asked if the Board wanted to see an exhibit with the locations recommended by the District Engineer where traffic was building up speed. Mr. Witcher preferred to see one before the next meeting, so that he had an opportunity to speak to residents about it. Mr. Barry pointed out that there was no law for people to stop at golf cart crossings. Mr. Staley indicated that there may be different signage or road markings that could be used for the golf cart crossings that draw attention in order to get people to stop, versus a speed table. Mr. Scheerer noted that there were not stop signs at any of the golf cart crossings.

Mr. Greenstein wanted to know the value that they were getting for the road resurfacing, due to the size of the contract and how it compared to the budget. Mr. Witcher recalled that there

**Reunion West CDD
Regular Meeting****May 9, 2024
Page 9 of 16**

was a placeholder in the budget and the amount of the contract was lower than the placeholder amount. Mr. Staley noted that \$400,000 was for both CDDs. Ms. Adams explained that the amount for the Reunion West CDD would be lower than the proposed amount of \$235,838.39, if the number of speed tables was reduced. However, the work based on the bid scope for the Reunion East, was \$903,086.71, including the speed tables. Funding was available in the Repair and Maintenance (R&M) Fund, but it would be more than what the Board had specified for this fiscal year; however, funding is available if this is a priority for the Board. Ms. Adams pointed out that the direction of staff was to prepare and exhibit on the exact speed table locations and bring that back to the Board at the next meeting. Mr. Staley asked Mr. Curley to provide the value of the source contract, as it was relevant for comparison purposes. Ms. Trucco pointed out that the District could use any vendor and did not have to piggyback on any contracts, due to a loophole in the District's Rules of Procedure. Ms. Adams indicated that Mr. Curley received feedback from prospective bidders about why they chose not to bid on this project, which was due to the challenges with accessing this location and the time spent in traffic going to and from where the materials were being fabricated. Mr. Curley pointed out that All County Paving provided amounts that were close to the engineering estimates for the milling and yardage of asphalt. The MOT was larger, because All County Paving wanted to ensure that everyone in the community was happy and was not a huge disruption. They would use many flaggers and signage and ensure that everything was organized well for construction.

There was Board consensus to defer this item and for Mr. Curley to provide an exhibit at the next meeting on the precise locations for the speed tables for long stretches of ROWs, using the amount recommended by the District Engineer.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**Staff Reports****A. Attorney**

Ms. Trucco received the Traffic Enforcement Agreement, provided some comments and returned it back to the Osceola County Sheriff's Office. As soon as they approved it, she would provide a draft to the Board. Mr. Barry indicated that he spoke Mr. Anthony Carll, the Chairman of the HOA and was under the impression that Mr. Carll would attend a CDD meeting to discuss this matter, as there were some points of view to consider. Ms. Trucco welcomed any comments from residents and if they could not attend in person, they could email their comments to Ms. Adams to be read during the Public Comments Period. Mr. Staley requested that Mr. Barry provide

**Reunion West CDD
Regular Meeting****May 9, 2024
Page 10 of 16**

Mr. Carll's comments to Ms. Adams. Mr. Barry felt that it was valuable for Mr. Carll to provide his comments versus him and for Supervisors to get Mr. Carll's views. Mr. Staley asked if someone could contact Mr. Carll to hear his comments. Ms. Trucco indicated that she could not contact Mr. Carll, as there were Florida Bar Ethics Rules that govern lawyers and requested that staff reach out to Mr. Carll. Ms. Adams would continue to monitor this discussion and at the time that the agreement would be presented at a duly noticed public meeting for the Board of Supervisors, would ensure that Mr. Carll was aware of it and had an opportunity to attend and make comments during the Public Comment Period or provide his comments in writing, if he was unable to attend. Mr. Staley recommended that Mr. Carll for his views now, as it would influence Mr. Barry's comments and requested that Ms. Adams contact Mr. Carll to share his views with her or come to the next meeting.

Mr. Witcher understood that Mr. Staley was trying to shorten the process, but at the same time, he was perplexed that Mr. Carll had issues with it, because all the Board was trying to do was to get the Sheriff's Department to be onsite periodically for traffic enforcement, like any other Osceola County roadway. Ms. Harley believed that Mr. Carll's concern was once the Sheriff's Department was in the community and enforcing the law, they would enforce every single law. Ms. Trucco recalled that the Board's position had always been that the Osceola County Sheriff's Office always had traffic control jurisdiction on CDD roadways and this was the first CDD that the Sheriff's Office requested an agreement to confirm that they have jurisdiction on these roadways for liability purposes and defense lawyers trying to throw out tickets. Therefore, the Board directed staff to proceed with getting an agreement in place; however, it has not been signed and encouraged the public to submit comments. Mr. Barry questioned what they were trying to solve. Ms. Harley pointed out one of their biggest issues was trying to control speeding and having speed bumps, would alleviate most of the issues. Ms. Trucco indicated that the CDD did not have police powers, such as issuing tickets, but did have the authority to adopt parking and towing rules. Mr. Greenstein believed that the purpose of the agreement was so that residents were not informed by the Sheriff's Department that they would not respond to violations of law and criminal activity, not for traffic enforcement. Mr. Staley understood that the agreement was in order for the Sheriff's Office to perform their responsibilities for traffic enforcement as it was not being performed because their assumption was that it was a private community. The question was how to get Mr. Carll's feedback because it was important and was in favor of having the agreement finalized, have

**Reunion West CDD
Regular Meeting**

**May 9, 2024
Page 11 of 16**

public discussion, make sure that Mr. Carll reviewed it in advance and approach him or staff with his comments. Ms. Trucco would provide a draft to the Board when she received the agreement from the county.

Ms. Trucco was also working on the extension of the Security Services Provider Agreement with the Reunion West POA, which was provided to their counsel for execution and there were the same revisions that were discussed and the Chairman was delegated authority to sign off on that final version, but there were a few extensions. Hopefully, the CDD Board would be happy with that final version. Ms. Aura Zelada at the Reunion West POA, was appreciative of the extension, as everything stayed the same, with some minor tweaks, which would be considered by the POA Board tomorrow, as well as final approval of the under updated parking rules and the License Agreement regarding the kiosks. Ms. Trucco would keep the Board updated. The Inventory Review Project was proceeding and requested a motion to allow staff to research that project on some related issues.

Mr. Greenstein MOVED to authorize staff to provide additional research on the Inventory Review Project and Mr. Witcher seconded the motion.

Mr. Witcher was in favor of proceeding quickly, as this issue was ongoing for quite some time and they needed to find a way to shift gears, in order to have a faster approach on this particular topic, as he felt that Kingwood took advantage of the CDD. Ms. Trucco indicated that this was their highest priority.

On VOICE VOTE with all in favor authorizing staff to provide additional research on the Inventory Review Project was approved.

B. Engineer

Mr. Curley did not have any business to report on, other than the proposal review.

C. Field Manager Updates

Mr. Scheerer met with Ms. Aura Zelada regarding the playground design and there was agreement that the design would be similar to the Grand Traverse playground. A proposal was provided by a vendor in the amount of \$127,000. Their vendor offered to install it for \$100,000.

**Reunion West CDD
Regular Meeting****May 9, 2024
Page 12 of 16**

but did not include the fence. They would continue to obtain information and include it in the budget for 2025. Mr. Witcher pointed out that the Grand Traverse playground was used all the time. Mr. Staley questioned the total cost of the Grand Traverse playground. Mr. Scheerer believed that it was \$85,000 but would confirm. Now the county was requiring permits for playgrounds and shade structures. He met with Mr. Barry regarding the No Parking signs that were modified and were still in the adopted policy for parking enforcement. The Whitemarsh Mound was leveled and pallets of sod were delivered. Mr. Scheerer was grateful for Mr. Carll doing the work within the timely fashion, as it looked good and there was no damage to utilities. The sod should be installed this week and he would speak with him about a watering schedule. Mr. Scheerer met with Fausnight, yesterday, regarding the Reunion Village sign in Reunion East and installed stakes at the entrance to the Sinclair gate, in order to make repairs. Regarding the Action Items List, the inventory of the vacant lots was completed. Mr. Staley asked if staff was satisfied about the parking and safety of the POA playground, as it was on a corner lot. Mr. Scheerer confirmed that there was designated street parking on a POA tract of properties. There may need to be an agreement similar to the one in Reunion East when the dog park was constructed. Mr. Staley asked if people could park at the Encore Club. Ms. Adams indicated that the CDD could not give permission. Ms. Zelada stated that the expectation was that people would be walking from the lot. Mr. Staley requested a bench at the Valhalla playground as people were sitting on the floor. Mr. Scheerer would provide one. An updated R&M List was provided to the Board. Most of the sidewalk work was completed. Staff would continue to monitor them, as most of the damage was caused by tree roots.

Ms. Adams recalled at last month's meeting, Mr. Barry was delegated to interface with a representative of Kingwood Orlando Reunion Resort (KORR), the HOA Master association and the Preferred Builder Program, to get feedback regarding the potential of the CDD undertaking the installation of sidewalks adjacent to empty lots. Mr. Barry reported that he and Ms. Hobbs met with Mr. Carll to discuss this matter. In general, Mr. Carll, was in favor of the concept of what the CDD was trying to accomplish, with the CDD paying for the sidewalks, but the builders and owners pay for damages to the sidewalks and for the construction of new sidewalks. Mr. Carll also saw no issues from the east side but was concerned about the number of lots in Reunion West and the conveyance issue. However, for the good of the community, Mr. Carll supported the general concept and requested that Reunion West continue planning and then go back to him. On his part, there was an agreement with the builders, which was reviewed every November and in the next

**Reunion West CDD
Regular Meeting****May 9, 2024
Page 13 of 16**

one, Mr. Carll would include language stating that builders and owners pay for damages to the sidewalks and for the construction of new sidewalks. Ms. Adams asked if there was discussion related to the position of the Master HOA regarding enforcement of their declarations requiring residential properties to be constructed within a certain timeframe. Mr. Barry stated it was briefly discussed, but the impression was there would be no enforcement of the declarations and the next step was to proceed to discuss where to install the sidewalks in Reunion West.

Ms. Trucco felt this was good progress, especially with the agreement with the Builders Association and requested a copy of the agreement. Mr. Staley agreed Mr. Barry on identifying where they wanted to build the sidewalks, as time was of the essence, since they only had five months to decide, so they could present it to Mr. Carll in order to negotiate with the builders. Ms. Adams recommended that Mr. Barry and Ms. Hobbs continue working on this matter and bring back an exhibit next month to identify strategic locations of sidewalks in Reunion East and West and include in the agenda package. Mr. Witcher felt there needed to be better understanding of the maintenance issue before proceeding with the sidewalks. Ms. Trucco agreed with the maintenance issue and having the exhibit of the sidewalk locations for Board review. Mr. Greenstein pointed out that the conveyance had to do with sidewalks behind residential lots, not from the street to the sidewalk, but they could not do anything until there was clarity. Mr. Staley appreciated the work of Mr. Barry and Ms. Hobbs, as it was a huge move forward for the community and felt that they did a great job. Ms. Harley wanted to find out which lots were due to be developed soon. Ms. Adams would include the sidewalk project as a placeholder in the proposed Fiscal Year 2025 project R&M List. There was Board consensus for Mr. Barry and Ms. Hobbs to bring back an exhibit next month to identify strategic locations of sidewalks in Reunion East and West and include in the agenda package, if it was a week prior to the meeting.

D. District Manager's Report**i. Action Items List**

Ms. Adams presented the Action Items List, which was included in the agenda package. Most items were addressed by Mr. Scheerer, District Counsel and the District Engineer. It was provided for informational purposes and no Board action was required. Mr. Greenstein pointed out that now that the Whitemarsh Mound was leveled and re-sodded, whether anything could be done to enhance it, such as including landscaping. Mr. Scheerer pointed out that it was a gas line easement. Ms. Trucco suggested pulling the Easement Agreement to review the terms. Ms. Adams

**Reunion West CDD
Regular Meeting**

**May 9, 2024
Page 14 of 16**

explained that anything installed in an easement was considered an encroachment, but permission could possibly be granted for an easement variance after further review. Ms. Trucco recommended confirming whether a separate Easement Agreement was recorded or on a plat, before the easement holder was contacted. Mr. Staley mentioned to Mr. Scheerer earlier, that leveling the mound revealed a huge drop off down to the golf cart path, which Mr. Scheerer was going to look at to see if a fence could be installed.

ii. Approval of Check Register

Ms. Adams presented the Check Register from April 1, 2024 through April 30, 2024 in the amount of \$416,309.67, which was included in the agenda package.

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

iii. Balance Sheet and Income Statement

Ms. Adams presented the Unaudited Financial Statements through March 31, 2024, which was included in the agenda package and were for informational purposes. No Board action was required.

iv. Replacement and Maintenance Plan

Ms. Adams presented the Replacement and Maintenance Plan, which was included in the agenda package, that the Board approved as part of the Fiscal Year 2024 budget. It was a project list that was reviewed by field management staff each month and updated in accordance with the projects that have been completed or are still in process. The only anticipated to be before the Board before the end of the fiscal year, was an Equipment List that Mr. Scheerer was working on for Reunion East, for older cardio equipment and older weighted equipment at Seven Eagles to be traded in and to acquire new equipment. Mr. Staley requested that Ms. Adams include a projected expense column when the Proposed Budget for next year was presented, to determine the amount of carryforward surplus.

v. Presentation of Number of Registered Voters: 555

**Reunion West CDD
Regular Meeting****May 9, 2024
Page 15 of 16**

Ms. Adams stated that the District was required annually to present each year on the record, the number of registered voters to the Board. A letter was provided by the Osceola County Supervisor of Elections, confirming as of April 15, 2023, the Reunion West CDD had 555 registered voters Supervisor of Elections. No Board action was required. Mr. Witcher pointed out that the number of registered voters was down from last year. Ms. Adams recalled that on May 11, 2023, the recorded number of registered voters was 567, so there was a difference of 12.

E. Security Report

Ms. Adams provided under separate cover, the April Security Reports; one from Reunion Security on behalf of the Master Association and the other from the Reunion West POA. No Board action was required and it was for informational purposes. The Reunion Security Director, Mr. Victor Vargas was present to answer questions.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**Other Business**

Ms. Adams recalled at the beginning of the meeting; the Chairman requested that the item that a resident discussed about additional amenities be discussed under this item. Mr. Staley stated Mr. Randall Zapata contacted him weeks ago about whether the CDD, as a benefit to the community, take on existing assets in the community, such as the Encore Clubhouse, Encore water park, golf course and Reunion Resort water park. Mr. Staley informed the resident that they would need willing sellers for those assets, as they were fundamental to the Encore and Kingwood business models, but requested that the Board think about it, as they needed a willing seller. However, if there was one, there would be a competitive competition for those assets and the CDD did not have the skills or expertise or the financial resources. Mr. Staley would discuss this item at the next meeting under Other Business, to see if other Board Members had any thoughts. It was a good idea, because it would add value to the community and get those assets under the control of the community, as opposed to a third party; however, Encore or Kingwood would most likely not be willing sellers of any of those assets.

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**Supervisor's Requests**

There being no comments, the next item followed.

ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Next Meeting Date – June 13, 2024

Ms. Adams stated that the next meeting was scheduled for June 13, 2024 at 11:00 a.m.; however, she requested a quorum check, as this was the presentation of the Proposed Budget, which must be adopted by June 15th. Ms. Harley asked if she could attend by phone. Ms. Adams explained she could attend via phone and participate, but it did not count towards the quorum. Mr. Barry had a conflict but would try to attend. Ms. Trucco pointed out if a different date was selected, it must be advertised as soon as possible. Ms. Harley would not return until June 17th. Ms. Adams recommended moving the meeting to June 6th, as there were 60 days between June 6th and the August Public Hearing date. Discussion ensued and there was Board consensus to move the meeting to June 6th at 1:00 p.m.

On MOTION by Ms. Hobbs seconded by Mr. Staley with all in favor moving the June 13, 2024 meeting to June 6, 2024 at 1:00 p.m. at this location.

A Resident asked if the sidewalk apron was CDD property. Ms. Adams explained that the CDD did not install sidewalk aprons. The Resident questioned who owned the landscaping between the sidewalk and the road. Ms. Adams confirmed that the property was owned by the District, but there were maintenance assignments in the declarations to the abutting residential property owner. The Resident asked if residents were permitted to do anything to that piece of property. Ms. Adams pointed out that the HOA enforced the declarations. Ms. Harley clarified that someone built a circle around a tree. Ms. Harley confirmed that it was discussed with Mr. Kingsley.

TWELFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Adjournment

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

DocuSigned by:
Tricia Adams
3F3E5FA5G67E43B...
Secretary/Assistant Secretary

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