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 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 Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

Tricia Adams District Manager
Kristen Trucco District Counsel
James Curley District Engineer
Alan Scheerer Field Manager

Aura Zelada Reunion West POA, Artemis Lifestyles

Zory Ramos Reunion Security

Residents

The following is a summary of the discussions and actions taken at the July 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.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS Public Comment Period

There being no comments, the next item followed.

July 11, 2024 Page 2 of 14

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS

Approval of the Minutes of the June 6, 2024 Board of Supervisors Meeting

Ms. Adams presented the minutes of the June 6, 2024 Board of Supervisors meetings, which were included in the agenda package and reviewed by District Management staff and District Counsel.

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein seconded by Mr. Witcher with all in favor the Minutes of the June 6, 2024 Board of Supervisors Meeting were approved as presented.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Review and Acceptance of Fiscal Year 2023 Audit Report

Ms. Adams stated as a Florida Special District, the CDD was required to undergo an annual independent audit. The audit for the year ending September 30, 2023, was included in the agenda package, which was prepared by Grau & Associates. It was a clean audit, as there were no findings or recommendations, the financials were in compliance with the Auditor General for the State of Florida and there no conditions that would constitute a financial emergency, nor anything to bring to the Board's attention. Mr. Staley noted a typo in the table on Page 48, as "20343" should be "2034." Ms. Adams noted the correction. Mr. Staley questioned Note 10 on Page 49, which stated, "The parties are currently negotiating a resolution at this time, but litigation by the District could ensue if such attempts are unsuccessful." Ms. Adams explained that it was the (FY) Year 2023 audit, for the period that ended September 30, 2023 and that statement was accurate for that time period. Mr. Staley asked if subsequent events needed to be reported, after the end of the fiscal year. Ms. Trucco pointed out that it was not needed in this type of report. Ms. Adams stated that before the audit was finalized, it was reviewed by District Counsel. Mr. Staley congratulated staff for not having any material weaknesses.

On MOTION by Mr. Staley seconded by Ms. Harley with all in favor the Fiscal Year 2023 Audit Report was accepted.

July 11, 2024 Page 3 of 14

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Staff Reports

A. Attorney

i. Memorandum Regarding Recently Enacted Legislation

Ms. Adams recalled at the last meeting, Ms. Trucco presented a Memorandum with a Legislative update, regarding recently enacted Legislation. During that discussion, District Counsel mentioned that it would be memorialized in next month's agenda, so it was printed and available for the public. Ms. Trucco explained that this was their formal memorandum, that was sent out to all CDD Boards, discussing the new House Bill 7013 (HB) and the effect of it. The most important section relating to CDDs, was in the second paragraph, which required all Special Districts, including the CDD, by October 1st of this year, to prepare and publish a report showing goals and objectives for each program that the CDD was undertaking. Then by December 1st of each year thereafter, starting with December 1, 2025, the CDD was required to report whether or not they met those goals and objectives and the standard for measuring whether or not they met those goals and objectives and publish it on the CDD website by December 1st. Her office was working with GMS on the goals and objectives for the CDD. The Statute did not specify how specific they needed to be, but Ms. Trucco recommended having general goals and objectives, for the Board to modify. Ms. Adams reported that GMS was preparing a document for the Board's review, which would be presented to the Board during the budget adoption in August. The goals and objectives that staff was recommending, would be compliant with Florida Statutes and be quantitative information that could be used for reporting in December of 2025. However, in calendar year 2025, if the Board wanted to develop goals and objectives with more specificity, they could do that in the future, but this year, staff was recommending the approval of standard goals and objectives at a minimum. Mr. Staley asked if they could be useful goals and objectives. Ms. Trucco stated it was up to the Board, to tailor them as much as they wanted. Mr. Staley would wait to see what GMS provided. Ms. Trucco recalled that the other HB provision related to CDDs which was approved by the Legislature, was the repeal of Section 190.047, which related to the process for CDDs to incorporate into their own cities, and now it was no longer required for CDDs to hold a referendum vote at the General Election on the question of whether or not to incorporate. However, this was not relevant to this CDD at this time.

ii. Review of Draft License and Maintenance Agreement with Reunion West Property Owner's Association, Inc. - ADDED

Ms. Trucco recalled that a prior version of the License and Maintenance Agreement with Reunion West Property Owner's Association, Inc., was previously provided to the Board and the Board delegated authority to the Chairman to execute it. However, it was being provided to the Board today for final review and to incorporate comments before it was executed. The purpose of this agreement was to memorialize the permission of the Reunion West POA, to have certain equipment on tracts that the CDD owned. Some of the equipment was already there, but this agreement would memorialize the terms of that arrangement, as their goal was to have everything in writing with all of their contractors and other entities, in order to have clarity on the terms of the permission. The locations of the POA's equipment were specified in the agreement, for Gates 1 through 5, such as access control panels. This was a form of agreement that they generally used for all of their CDDs and included indemnification from the contractor, in order to indemnify or reimburse the CDD for any damages on CDD property due to their use of the CDD property. The POA would also hold the CDD harmless, by paying for the CDD's legal defense, if the CDD was sued as a result of something that they or their contractors did to CDD property under the agreement. The standard indemnification language was included in the fifth paragraph. In Paragraph 6, there were maintenance obligations on behalf of the licensee, the POA, who was responsible for operating, maintaining and installing everything related to the equipment, that the POA would be responsible for under this agreement. It also included their standard termination clause, allowing for each party to terminate with 30 days' notice with or without cause, and that the POA would remove the equipment, an insurance requirement provision in Paragraph 8, as well as the standard sovereign immunity and public records acknowledgments, in Paragraph 11.

On MOTION by Mr. Barry seconded by Mr. Greenstein with all in favor the approval of the Draft License and Maintenance Agreement with Reunion West Property Owner's Association, Inc. in substantial final form, subject to final execution by staff and delegating authority to the Chairman for execution was approved.

July 11, 2024 Page 5 of 14

iii. Ratification of Third Agreement and Extension to Security Services
Provider Agreement with Reunion West Property Owner's
Association, Inc. - ADDED

Ms. Trucco presented the Third Amendment to the Security Services Provider Agreement with the Reunion West Property Owner's Association, Inc., which was previously discussed with the Board, finalized and executed and was provided for ratification. All terms were accepted by the POA.

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein seconded by Mr. Witcher with all in favor the Third Agreement and Extension to Security Services Provider Agreement with Reunion West Property Owner's Association, Inc. was ratified.

Ms. Trucco reported that staff was finalizing the lawsuit related to Kingwood Orlando Reunion Resort (Kingwood), regarding the ownership of and rights to certain tracts of land. Mr. Staley pointed out that Board Members received a text this morning from a member of the community, who received an email from Mr. Anthony Carll of Kingwood, stating his intent to attend this meeting, but that District Counsel advised his counsel, not to do so, because it would be disruptive. Mr. Staley called Ms. Jan Carpenter, who confirmed that staff did not do this and as a result, Mr. Staley indicated to the member of the community, that they were free to inform Mr. Carll, that he was welcome to attend the CDD meeting, because it was a public meeting. Ms. Trucco was happy that Mr. Staley brought up this matter, because it was always a good reminder, for anyone listening, that these were public meetings and the Board was not permitted under Florida Law, to restrict anyone from attending one of these meetings. Mr. Witcher questioned the timeframe to filing the lawsuit, as he had to leave town on August 8th and did not want to miss the shade meeting. Ms. Trucco indicated that a private meeting or sometimes referred to as a shade session could be held under the law, with the CDD's attorney and Board Members. The public would not be permitted to attend and it must not be held until after a lawsuit was filed, either by or against the CDD. At this point in time, it had not been filed, but once this occurred, which she anticipated by the next meeting, she could come back to the Board and request a motion to hold a shade session. Ms. Harley questioned, if an entity remained in ownership over those parcels of land, in three, five or ten years, whether they would have the right to develop them. Ms. Trucco explained that a property owner, could do whatever they wanted with that property, as long as it

was legal. Mr. Greenstein suggested that there could be conditions on the property, such as zoning ordinances.

Ms. Harley understood that any form of litigation was going to be extremely costly and did not understand why they did not have conversations with Kingwood, to discuss their intentions. Ms. Trucco agreed, but this issue went back to the bocce ball court issue, where there was extensive conversation with counsel on that matter and now, as with any dispute, there was a time clock clicking to pursue clarification in a court, which was why counsel recommended filing a court action as quickly as possible. Mr. Staley felt that this was an important fact, as they could have discussions and negotiations for two years, but if the clock expired, they would not be in the position to do anything legally. Ms. Trucco pointed out that her firm rarely recommended CDDs they work with pursuing litigation, but in this instance, there were reasons why they recommended pursuing court action as quickly as possible.

Mr. Greenstein asked if action was taken by any entity to change the title on any properties in Reunion East. Ms. Trucco indicated that she was still reviewing this matter, but her understanding was only the Reunion West CDD was subject to the 2024 deed which was referred to in the resolution that the Board reviewed last month. Mr. Greenstein felt that it was important for the Board to understand that there were processes to follow, as Kingwood was running a business and the CDD was a governmental entity, with fiduciary responsibilities, as well as operation and maintenance (O&M) responsibilities on their assets. Kingwood decided to take a particular action for whatever reason but the Board did not know exactly what that line of thinking was and the proper response was to file suit to get clarity. Mr. Staley noted Kingwood was a profitmaking entity versus the District, which was non-profit. However, if a court decided that the CDD owned these tracts of land, the Board expected corrective action, but if they decide that the CDD did not own them, then the Board must question the implications. Ms. Trucco offered to share more information with Ms. Harley and recommended that the Board hold a shade meeting to discuss if desired but only after the complaint was filed. Mr. Staley did not want to wait until August to have a motion to move forward. Ms. Trucco pointed out that once the lawsuit was filed, Kingwood would have a certain number of days to file an answer. However, the Board could continue this meeting to a date and time certain or hold a special meeting.

Mr. Staley preferred to have a shade session before the next Board meeting, prior to Mr. Witcher leaving for vacation. Mr. Barry wanted it to be contingent on the filing of the complaint.

At the request of a resident and approval of the Chairman, Ms. Adams opened the public comment period. Mr. Paul McKinnon of 1356 Centre Court Ridge Drive asked why the Board did not speak to the community regarding this matter. Mr. Staley agreed with this comment and said he was about to recommend that as soon as the lawsuit was filed, the Board authorize District Counsel to send an e-blast to the community that was informative and just listed the facts. He also recommended scheduling a shade session as soon as possible. There being no other public comments, Ms. Adams closed the public comment period. Mr. Greenstein questioned what happened to the transcript of the Court Reporter after the shade session. Ms. Trucco explained at the end of litigation, the transcript would become a public record. Ms. Trucco recommended discussing guidelines on how to handle shade sessions, at the next meeting. Mr. Staley preferred having a shade session as quickly as possible, after the court filing. Mr. Barry asked if he could attend the shade session via Zoom. Ms. Trucco advised for a Shade Session there needed to be a physical quorum. Mr. Barry preferred to schedule the Shade Session, contingent on the filing of a lawsuit. Ms. Adams requested that the meeting agenda continues while District Counsel reviewed the pertinent Statutes regarding minimum timeframes for notice requirements.

B. Engineer

i. Presentation of Annual Engineer's Report

Ms. Adams reported as part of the Master Trust Indenture for the Series 2015, 2016, 2017, 2019 and 2022 bond issues, the District was required to provide an Annual Engineer's Report to the Trustee each year, which was included in the agenda package, reflecting that the District's assets were being maintained and there were adequate funds and insurance to maintain the infrastructure.

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

ii. Review of Revised Speed Table Locations - ADDED

Ms. Adams presented revised maps of the speed table locations, which were included in the agenda package, based on Board input at the last meeting. Mr. Curley questioned whether the first speed table on Tradition Boulevard was in the correct location. Mr. Staley confirmed that the map was correct but preferred that the first speed table on Grand Traverse Parkway, after making the left turn, be closer to the entrance into Bears Den. Mr. Curley would move it. Mr. Staley noted that the two speed tables on Grand Traverse Parkway near his house, were in a better location than the Board discussed, as it was further away from the bend and recommended that the remainder of Grand Traverse Parkway not have speed tables, because there were curves everywhere which would slow down traffic. The Board agreed. Mr. Greenstein requested that the locations be marked, before the speed tables were constructed, so Board Members could evaluate them. Mr. Scheerer would install utility flags or stakes. Mr. Staley recalled for Ms. Harley's benefit, that instead of having speed tables close to golf cart crossings in three places, there would be additional signage. Ms. Adams pointed out that no Board action was required, as the Board approved the scope at the last meeting and authorized staff to prepare the agreement for milling and resurfacing and installing speed tables and stop bars.

C. Field Manager Updates

i. Review of Playground Costs

Mr. Scheerer presented an estimate of costs for the Grand Traverse playground, which was included in the agenda package, based on a proposal from PlayTopia dated October, 29, 2021. The playground cost was \$62,545.67, the shade structure was \$25,435.52 and the fence was \$15,000, for a total estimated cost of \$102,981.19. The cost of the shade structure that was recommended by the contractor that installed the fitness equipment, for two 30 x 30 shades, was \$53,233.40, which was not approved by the Board. Mr. Scheerer indicated the shade structure needed to be permitted. Mr. Staley wanted to do this, but given the amount of upcoming capital expenditures, it must be tabled for now. Ms. Adams would include it on the capital improvement list for FY 2026 or 2027. Mr. Staley pointed out in next year's Replacement and Maintenance (R&M) Fund, \$140,000 was allocated for the Encore playground and in three years, the cost had increased by 40% compared to the Grand Traverse playground. Mr. Scheerer reported that the current cost was \$127,400 and their goal was to bring a proposal back for next fiscal year. Mr. Scheerer confirmed that it included all of the fencing, shade structure, swing sets and same style play structure. Mr.

Staley requested that Mr. Scheerer speak to PlayTopia to see if the cost could be reduced. Mr. Scheerer pointed out that he was obtaining more than one quote and would bring back a comparison to the Board after October 1st. Ms. Adams indicated there would be a placeholder in the R&M line item for FY 2025.

Mr. Scheerer reported that sidewalk panels in Encore were replaced. They tried to do all of them in bulk and he was constantly monitoring them. Three golf cart crossing signs were installed on Grand Traverse Parkway and one more remained to be installed on Muirfield Loop. They did not feel comfortable installing the decorative post and signs, because of all the construction vehicles. They had the equipment and would install it as soon as the construction traffic dies down. A speed limit sign was installed on Grand Traverse Parkway. Mr. Barry voiced concern about the golf cart crossing at Muirfield Loop, as golf carts drove fast. Mr. Scheerer would look at it. Old Lake Wilson Road was widened and a turn signal was installed at the entrance of Encore Reunion West. Modifications were made to the island tips.

D. District Manager's Report

i. Action Items List

Mr. Scheerer presented the Action Items List for Reunion East and West, which was included in the agenda package. Mr. Staley asked him to look at the area by the golf cart tunnel off of Tradition Boulevard after they reduced the size of the Whitemarsh Mound. He was engaging with the golf team, to add some planters, as it was not CDD property. Mr. Barry recalled discussing the sidewalks on vacant lots, at the last meeting and budgeting \$22 per linear foot and asked if this was a good number for the basis of decision making. Mr. Scheerer noted that he looked at the locations requested by both the Reunion East CDD and Reunion West CDD Boards, to get an accurate number, but at this time, \$22 per linear foot would be used as a placeholder and he hoped to have a more definitive number by the next meeting. Mr. Barry also recalled that they would be going back to Mr. Carll, at some point in time, to discuss what they were proposing and questioned whether there was anything else to clarify, other than informing people and obtaining permits. Ms. Adams believed that there were some legal concerns, which Ms. Trucco could speak to, but they were tentatively putting a placeholder on the FY 2025 R&M project list. However, there was the time sensitivity getting back to Mr. Carll, related to the annual preferred builders meeting in November. Mr. Carll discussed having an agreement for builders to replace the sidewalk during residential home construction. Staff was tracking this item on Actions Items.

Ms. Trucco pointed out that her biggest concern was that some of the roadways in Reunion West were included in the Kingwood deed. Mr. Barry questioned whether a permit is required by Osceola County. Ms. Adams indicated that Mr. Curley would report at next month's meeting, whether a permit was required for sidewalk installation on unimproved lots. Originally, Mr. Barry and Ms. Hobbs, from the Reunion East CDD Board, met with Mr. Carll and reported that Mr. Carll was in favor of the concept, but no financial contribution was to be expected. The other question was whether the Master Association was going to enforce the recorded declaration's timeline on building residential homes on lots owned by individual property owners, which Mr. Carll confirmed would not be enforced. Mr. Greenstein pointed out that the only real decision, was whether the CDD would be responsible for subsequent damage after sidewalk installation. Mr. Staley did not believe that it would be an issue to have the builders replace sidewalks damaged during home construction because the homeowner currently has to pay for building the sidewalk when they build the home.

ii. Approval of Check Register

Ms. Adams presented the Check Register from June 1, 2024 through June 30, 2024, in the amount of \$284,880.09, which was included in the agenda package, along with a detailed register.

On MOTION by Mr. Witcher seconded by Ms. Harley 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, 2024, which was included in the agenda package and was for informational purposes. No Board action was required.

• Staff Reports – Attorney (*Item 5A*)

Regarding the shade session, Ms. Trucco recommended that the Board make a motion to schedule a special meeting, after the complaint was filed, as they were not comfortable continuing this meeting to a date and time certain without advertising notice of it. Mr. Staley asked if the litigation was filed tomorrow, whether the shade meeting could be scheduled 10 days from tomorrow. Ms. Trucco replied affirmatively if directed at a regular meeting to schedule the shade

meeting, but the safest route, since the Statute did not specify the type of notice to provide, was to advertise in a newspaper. Mr. Staley recalled that they did not have to publish something in the newspaper to have the shade session and could state it in the record. Ms. Adams pointed they historically did advertise Shade Sessions. Ms. Trucco explained by the time they had the Special Meeting, they would have clarity on how much flexibility there was for the notice that needed to be provided for the shade session and recommended that the Board schedule a special meeting for July 25th, which was 10 days from Monday, contingent on a lawsuit being filed. Mr. Staley questioned whether there was a quorum for July 24th, to have a special meeting and take action to schedule the shade session. Ms. Harley, Mr. Witcher and Mr. Staley confirmed their availability.

Mr. Witcher MOVED to schedule a Special Meeting for July 24, 2024, in order to schedule a Shade Session for August 8th, 2024, subject to the lawsuit with Kingwood, being filed by July 24th and Mr. Greenstein seconded the motion.

Ms. Adams questioned the time of the special meeting. Mr. Barry asked if there was a strong sense of urgency or if they could wait until August 8th. Mr. Witcher confirmed that he would be able to attend on August 8th, as his flight left that night. Mr. Greenstein asked if the District Manager and District Counsel were available at 9:00 a.m. on July 24th for a special meeting. Ms. Adams and Ms. Trucco confirmed that they were available.

On VOICE VOTE with all in favor amending the prior motion to schedule a Special Meeting for July 24, 2024 at 9:00 a.m. at this location, in order to schedule a Shade Session, subject to the lawsuit with Kingwood being filed by July 24th, was approved.

iv. Replacement and Maintenance Plan

Ms. Adams presented the R&M Plan, which was included in the agenda package. It included the proposed Project List for FY 2025, which was comprised of items discussed by the Board, included within,the Reserve Study or items noted by the Field Manager during property inspections.

*Mr. Witcher left the meeting at this time.

Ms. Adams reported that she met with Mr. Scheerer in June, to review the Reserve Study. Mr. Scheerer provided input on the equipment allowances that were included. Some projects that

were scheduled as part of the current fiscal year, would not be completed or the timing of when the expense would be paid was uncertain. For example, there was fitness equipment that the Reunion East CDD would be considering today, but the earliest installation date was October. Therefore, this project may be started this fiscal year but it may not be completed until next fiscal year. It was likely that the milling, resurfacing, traffic calming and striping, including additional stop bars, would likely occur in FY 2025, after October 1st. There was also a legal ownership clarification issue regarding the access gate at Reunion Village. Mr. Staley recalled that the paving was \$300,000 for Reunion West and \$900,000 for Reunion East, but \$1.5 million was allocated. Ms. Adams noted that the \$1.5 million, may be reduced, as it was an estimate based on the unit cost and would be fine-tuned prior to the budget adoption. There were other stop bars and road maintenance needs outside of the proposed scope. Ms. Adams reported that other items in the R&M Plan, were based on the Reserve Study, site conditions and Mr. Scheerer's inspections. There were some placeholders in the R&M Plan, for the refurbishment of the HVAC, for wall coverings, carpeting and lighting systems. There is a cost for upgrading the radar display signs to remote access. The Board decided to remove the fitness shade structure on Grand Traverse Parkway. The amount for the Encore Reunion West playground, could be fined tuned to a lower amount. Ms. Adams indicated that there were placeholders for new pool furniture for The Terraces and pool heater replacement. In Phases 4 and 5 of Reunion Village, the Board adopted Parking Rules, but because the area was not yet populated with residential homeowners, installing No Parking signs was tabled, but depending on sales, this project could occur in 2025. The sidewalk replacement was \$75,000; however, since \$50,000 was budgeted for the current year and there was \$200,000 actually spent on sidewalk replacements, staff was comfortable reducing the amount to \$75,000 for the upcoming year. The sidewalk installation on vacant lots had a placeholder amount based on rough numbers presented by the Reunion West CDD Board. The Reunion East CDD Board was still reviewing the number of sidewalk panels. Mr. Staley was unsure of the Reunion East CDD Board's plan for The Stables but asked if the roof needed to be replaced. Mr. Scheerer reported that the roof was included in the Reserve Study and was scheduled to be replaced in FY 2025. Mr. Greenstein requested that The Stables roof replacement be placed on hold. Ms. Adams would defer it to FY 2026. Ms. Adams indicated that the R&M Plan did not include a contingency.

Mr. Staley distributed a General Fund and R&M Fund Plan that he prepared. The CDD did not have the same reserves that existed on the east side, because of the history of the community.

The Total West and East CDD R&M proposal of \$2.4 million, was included in this analysis. If the West CDD had a 5% assessment increase in FY 2026 and another 5% increase in 2029, based on the level of R&M expenditure for 2025, the General Fund balance at the end of 2029 would be down to approximately \$250,000 and the R&M Fund balance would be down to a couple of hundred thousand dollars. Mr. Staley recommended that the Board discuss the projects that were discussed today, in the next year and share that with the Reunion East CDD Board, but at the same time, monitor reserves, because if they had an unexpected \$1 million project, the reserves would be under pressure. There was no reason to panic at this point, but they needed to know the capital projects in the next four to five years, such as the road work. Ms. Adams agreed, as milling and resurfacing was the most expensive component in the Reserve Study. The Board already approved a scope and plan that Steve Boyd prepared for the priority paving areas. The next milling and resurfacing project would be about five years after the current project was completed. Mr. Staley pointed out according to line number 14, \$600,000 to \$700,000 per year was expended in R&M in the previous three years, and \$2.4 million was budgeted for 2025, due to the road resurfacing. Estimates of \$700,000, \$600,000, \$600,000 and \$600,000 had been included for the next four years (2026 to 2029). In addition, there was 4% inflation assumption for operating costs. Ms. Adams indicated that any Surplus Funds that built up in the General Fund, were recognized for FY 2025 to balance the budget, but in FY 2026, there would be no Carry Forward Surplus and there must be an assessment increase. Mr. Staley said he would discuss this with Ms. Adams before the next meeting

v. Presentation of Series 2015 Arbitrage Rebate Calculation Report

Ms. Adams presented the Arbitrage Rebate Calculation Report prepared by Grau & Associates for the Series 2015 bonds, which was included in the agenda package. There was no arbitrage issue.

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein seconded by Mr. Barry with all in favor the Arbitrage Rebate Calculation Report was accepted.

E. Security Report

Ms. Adams provided under separate cover, the June Security Reports from Reunion Security and the Reunion West POA. Ms. Zory Ramos was present on behalf of Mr. Vargas. Mr.

July 11, 2024 Page 14 of 14

Staley asked if the community was past the problems with the RFID tags and security gate passes, as the latest software caused issues. Mr. Barry reported that his card worked last night, but not today. Ms. Zory Ramos said the software problems had not yet been resolved.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Other Business

There being no comments, the next item followed.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Supervisor's Requests

There being no comments, the next item followed.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Next Meeting Date – August 8, 2024

Ms. Adams reported that the meeting was scheduled for July 24, 2024 at 9:00 a.m. and the public hearing on the budget was scheduled for August 8, 2024 at 11:00 a.m.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Adjournment

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

Signed by:

Secretary/Assistant Secretary

-Signed by:

Chairman/Vice Chairman