# 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, **November 14, 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

Mark Greenstein 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 Manager

Grace Montanez Reunion West POA
Garrett Huegel Yellowstone Landscape

Victor Vargas Reunion Security

Residents

The following is a summary of the discussions and actions taken at the November 14, 2024 Reunion West Community Development District Board of Supervisors meeting.

#### FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS Roll Call

Ms. Adams called the meeting to order at 11:05 a.m. and called the roll. A quorum was present.

## SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS Public Comment Period

There being no comments, the next item followed.

Reunion West CDD Regular Meeting November 14, 2024 Page 2 of 12

#### THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS

# Approval of the Minutes of the September 12, 2024 Board of Supervisors Meeting

Ms. Adams presented the minutes of the September 12, 2024 Board of Supervisors meeting, which were reviewed by staff. Mr. Staley noted on Page 2, at the bottom of the page, the \$2.5 million General Fund Reserve and \$3.5 million R&M Reserve, was for Reunion East. On Page 3, under the Fifth Order of Business, the word, "Their" should be "Creative North," but questioned whether they completed work in Reunion West. Mr. Scheerer stated that they did work for Encore. Mr. Greenstein questioned whether there was a gross assessment of \$1,000 per resident for this year, but only \$340 to \$350, would cover the General Fund and the remainder for debt service. Mr. Staley indicated that the assessment was 30% to 35% and the \$1,000, was the assessment for the operating expense. The total assessment was three times that amount; two-thirds for debt service and one-third for operating expenses. Ms. Adams would correct the minutes. On Page 5, under Item C, where he requested that FCC be included in the RFP process, he wanted Weber Environmental to be included as well, as they did work for the POA. On Page 11, Mr. Staley recalled that he wanted to show the parking maps to the Reunion West CDD Board Members, after this meeting and not the Reunion East CDD Board Members.

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein seconded by Mr. Barry with all in favor the Minutes of the September 12, 2024 Board of Supervisors Meeting were approved as amended.

# FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

# **Consideration of Playground Installation Proposals**

#### **A.** Creative Recreation Products

# B. Playtopia

Ms. Adams recalled that several months ago, the Board Members directed District management staff to include funding for a potential amenity at the Reunion West Encore neighborhood, as part of the Repair and Maintenance (R&M) projects. There was discussion with the Property Owners Association (POA) in Reunion West, regarding the type of amenity that they would like to see and ultimately they requested that the Reunion West CDD Board consider a playground. The Field Operations Manager, Mr. Scheerer, met with the Reunion West POA Manager, Ms. Aura Zelada, to identify available parcels in Encore Reunion West that could potentially be used for a playground and a tract owned by the POA, was selected. Proposals were

obtained from Creative Recreation Products and Playtopia. The setup was modelled after the Valhalla and Grand Traverse playgrounds, which had a separate swing set, large canopy to cover the structure and would have the same slides, same features and be suitable for the same age group. The fencing would be slightly larger, because of the larger footprint and the shade structure would be slightly larger, 40x40, than the Valhalla and Grand Traverse playgrounds, as there was a request to cover as much of the playground structure as possible. Creative Recreation Projects provided a price of \$127,400.97, versus Playtopia, which provided a price of \$113,027.52 and installed the Valhalla and Grand Traverse playgrounds. According to Ms. Zelada, the POA approved of the plan and had no preference on which company was used.

Mr. Barry did not have a preference, as long as it was the same structure as the Valhalla and Grand Traverse playgrounds, which held up well. Mr. Scheerer pointed out that the only difference would be with the colors, the fence and shade structure. Playtopia included \$850 for permitting, versus Creative Recreation Projects, which included \$2,000 for building permit fees, as the playground and the shade structure must be permitted. Mr. Staley questioned what Mr. Scheerer recommended. Mr. Scheerer preferred Playtopia, as they installed the Valhalla and Grand Traverse playgrounds, understood the process and were the lowest bidder. Mr. Staley felt comfortable with Playtopia, as they had good experience, the playground held up well and were the least expensive. Mr. Scheerer did not have a timeframe for installation, as there needed to be an agreement with the POA, which was later in the agenda for Board consideration.

On MOTION by Mr. Staley seconded by Mr. Greenstein with all in favor the proposal with Playtopia for the installation of a playground in the amount of \$113,027.52 was approved.

Mr. Barry requested that the structure have light colors, as darker colors tended to get hot. Mr. Scheerer would coordinate with Ms. Zelada on the color scheme.

#### FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Consideration of Easement Agreement for Playground with Reunion West Property Owner's Association, Inc.

Ms. Adams presented an Easement Agreement with Reunion West Property Owner's Association, Inc., for the playground, which was prepared by Ms. Trucco and was included in the

agenda package. There was a similar arrangement with the Reunion East CDD for a dog park that was constructed on Reunion Resort property. Ms. Trucco explained that since the CDD would be expending public funds to construct the playground, the public must be able to access it. There was language that the POA could never restrict the public from accessing the playground and even if the POA sold this parcel in the future, the easement would run with the land. There was also a damage provision for if the POA or one of its contractors for example caused damage that there was a requirement to reimburse the CDD or pay for the repair, if they damaged the playground, as well as standard indemnity language for if the CDD was held liable or sued, as a result of actions or inaction taken by the POA. The POA would reimburse the CDD for losses that the CDD incurred and pay for legal defense, if the CDD was sued due to a negligent POA contractor for example. In addition, there was also sovereign immunity language and public records requirements, as well as an affidavit to satisfy a new statutory requirement regarding human trafficking, whereby nongovernmental entities contracting with the CDD would be required to sign, generally saying that they would not engage in any human trafficking. Ms. Trucco recommended that the Board approve this form of agreement, subject to finalization by District Counsel, as she would work with the POA counsel to include any revisions.

On MOTION Mr. Barry seconded by Mr. Greenstein with all in favor approval of the Easement Agreement with Reunion West Property Owner's Association, Inc. for the playground, in substantial final form, subject to final approval by District Counsel was approved.

Mr. Staley requested two benches and one trash can at this playground and one additional bench at the Valhalla playground. Mr. Scheerer cautioned that due to supply issues, it would take time to receive it. Mr. Staley questioned whether Yellowstone would mow the grass. Ms. Trucco stated that the CDD would maintain the playground and the fence, but not the entire tract. Mr. Staley requested that this be clarified in the agreement.

## SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Consideration of Resolution 2025-01 Amending the Fiscal year 2024 Budget

Ms. Adams presented Resolution 2025-01 Amending the Fiscal year 2024 Budget, which was provided to the Board under separate cover, along with the amended budget. This was a procedural administrative matter, in order to be in compliance with Florida Statutes. When the

Board adopted the Fiscal Year 2024 budget, there was a resolution that included a provision for a budget amendment. The Board's hands were not constrained by the adopted budget, as the Board had the ability to approve projects or expenses above and beyond the budgeted line items. Florida Statutes require this process within 60 days of the end of the fiscal year, as it memorializes actions taken by the Board throughout the fiscal year. Attached as an exhibit to the resolution, was the amended budget for Fiscal Year 2024, which along with the resolution, would be provided to the auditor, with other financial records. The amended budget reflected line items that exceeded the adopted budget. In cases where expenditures were less, there were reductions in the budget in order to balance the budget.

Mr. Staley pointed out that the first and third columns reflected Fiscal Year 2024 and the first one should be the original adopted budget. Ms. Adams would make this change. Mr. Staley understood that the budget was increased where they overspent and left as is, if they underspent and if they spent \$247,550 for Administrative Expenses, why the amended budget did not have the same amount. Ms. Adams confirmed that the accountant made some decisions in order to balance the budget. It was a Florida statutory requirement for Special Districts, to be compliant with not only Chapter 190, but Chapter 218, to amend the budget when expenses were more than what was in the adopted budget.

On MOTION by Mr. Staley seconded by Mr. Greenstein with all in favor Resolution 2025-01, Amending the Budget for Fiscal Year 2024 was adopted.

# **SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

#### **Staff Reports**

#### A. Attorney

Ms. Trucco reported that since the last meeting, she prepared the amendment extensions for Applied Aquatics, Yellowstone and Creative North, which the Board previously approved. There were no changes to the litigation status since the last update that they provided. Mr. Staley questioned the date of the hearing for the next phase and if it was a virtual or in-person. Ms. Trucco confirmed that a hearing was scheduled for the end of January, which was the next step, but did not know if it was virtual or in-person and could confirm this. Regarding the Traffic Enforcement Agreement with the Osceola County Sheriff's Office (OCSO), Ms. Trucco recalled that there was a draft, which was presented to the Board several months ago. She followed up with OCSO, as the

Board wanted clarification on whether OCSO was taking the position was that it was not required to provide these services without an agreement, due to there being a gate, as residents expressed they were paying taxes and understood that traffic enforcement was included. She was informed that someone at OCSO informed the Reunion West POA representative that their deputies would not provide traffic enforcement warnings or citations for traffic related incidents until the agreement was signed, as Reunion was a gated community. There was also a follow up email regarding deputy working detail was questioned about not stopping kids who were driving golf carts and arguing that they were public roads. Ms. Trucco reached out to counsel at the OCSO to discuss this matter. They requested a copy of this email chain, which she provided and reiterated the Board's concern that these were public roadways and this service was always provided for more than two decades and questioned what changed. She was told that the main issue was confirming jurisdiction. However, they offered to review the Traffic Enforcement Agreement and get back to her, but at this time, had not done so and Ms. Trucco questioned what the direction of the Board was on this matter.

Ms. Trucco proposed that the Board sign a one-page acknowledgement from the CDD, stating that the OCSO had jurisdiction. Mr. Staley felt if they did not provide OCSO with jurisdiction acknowledgment, the District was saying that they did not want OCSO on CDD property. Ms. Trucco wanted confirmation from OCSO of their position. If OCSO confirmed that their position was to not provide these services without the CDD signing the agreement, Ms. Trucco recommended that the Board sign the agreement, as she had liability concerns regarding exposure for the District being sued, for example for not taking steps to prevent a car accident. Mr. Staley recalled that Mr. Witcher's concern was with golf carts. Ms. Trucco informed counsel at the OCSO that the POA and CDD were permitted to enter into a separate agreement for off duty sheriffs, separate from this agreement, as such was to provide beyond what was required. Mr. Greenstein recalled that this discussion started, because someone started a rumor that OCSO would enter the community for a civil or criminal offense, but not traffic enforcement. The Board enhanced traffic enforcement within the community, but Mr. Greenstein questioned the downside, by not signing the agreement and how to bring it to closure, as in his opinion, it was a waste of time and preferred to have a one-page document showing residents the Board's position. Ms. Adams pointed out that many law enforcement organizations in Central Florida, now required a Traffic Enforcement Agreement, but there were no exchange of fees or compensation, as the agreement simply clarified what was already in the Florida Statutes. Law enforcement agencies were using it for training purposes, internally, due to turnover with the traffic enforcement patrols. It did not change anything, as OCSO had jurisdiction to enforce traffic laws inside and outside of the CDD, whether or not there was an agreement. The the CDD did not have police powers.

Mr. Greenstein questioned whether OCSO provided an agreement to be signed by the Board. Ms. Trucco confirmed that they provided one in, but comments were provided back to them and since then, there was no response on that. Regarding the compensation, Ms. Trucco recalled a section in the statute allowing for the Sheriff's Office to charge a fee for their services, but most CDDs did not enter into this type of agreement, as these were public roads and they must provide these services. Therefore, Ms. Trucco recommended having a one-page statement, reiterating that the OCSO had jurisdiction over all CDD roadways for traffic control enforcement services and if it was not sufficient, she would bring this matter back to the Board at the next meeting for further discussion. Mr. Barry questioned if there was a problem, as they were increasing the safety of the roads, with flashing speed limit signs and the installation of speed bumps. Ms. Trucco recalled that staff received comments from residents and a Reunion West POA Manager, requesting traffic enforcement assistance and OCSO indicating that they would not come in and enforce traffic without an agreement. Mr. Staley was in favor of signing the one-page statement, as he wanted to resolve this matter and was concerned that by not signing it, the CDD was refusing traffic enforcement. In addition, he wanted there to be one policy and procedure between Reunion East and Reunion West. Mr. Greenstein agreed, as the CDD was not required to manage traffic enforcement, although they had taken many steps, as far as the speed tables and radar signs and Security contacted OCSO, if law enforcement was necessary. Mr. Staley requested that Ms. Trucco prepare the one-page statement between now and the next meeting and provide to both Boards at the December meeting.

Ms. Adams asked Mr. Staley if he wanted to open for audience comments, as there were attendees on Zoom, who wished to speak. Mr. Staley agreed, as this was an important topic and the Board was struggling to find the right solution. Resident Lorraine Foley of 7847 Palmilla Court felt that OCSO should have the right to come into the community, as kids were driving golf carts and if there was an accident, the CDD would be liable. Ms. Aura Zelada, Reunion West POA Manager, recalled that she requested off-duty officers from OCSO in October and was informed that the community had blue street signs, indicating that it was a private community, but if they

were green, OCSO could come into the community. It was imperative that OCSO be onsite, providing verbal warnings, as safety was important to her. There being no further comments, Ms. Adams closed the floor to public comments. Mr. Staley questioned the history of the blue versus green signs. Mr. Scheerer explained that blue signs refer to a private gated community with private roads and most signs in the Encore Reunion section were blue. Ms. Trucco confirmed that was part of the Traffic Enforcement Agreement. Mr. Greenstein believed that the blue signs, were directly tied to the Encore Reunion Project. There was a gate in Bears Den and the roads were private and at one time, the signs at the intersection of Tradition Boulevard and Whitewash Way and Tradition Boulevard and Golden Bear Drive, were blue, but were changed to green. Mr. Staley was in favor of changing their signs from blue to green. Mr. Scheerer would inventory all of the signs and obtain a price to change them. Ms. Trucco voiced concern with spending the money to change the signs, as the county would likely come out to inspect all signs if the Board approved the agreement and because the issue appears to relate to the gate. Ms. Zelada was in favor of changing out the signs, no matter how long the negotiation with OCSO takes.

Mr. Staley requested clarification on the ownership of Sandy Ridge Drive, before the I-4 bridge. Mr. Scheerer stated that a portion was owned by the Reunion East CDD, but the majority were condos owned by the POA. Ms. Adams opened the floor to public comments, as an additional member of the public wished to speak. Resident Josna Samaraju, owner Unit 127 in Spectrum Building 19, noted that it was difficult to hear the Board, due to the audio and requested that the Board and staff upgrade the system. Ms. Adams would look into upgrading the current system into and reconfigure the Board tables. After further discussion, there was Board consensus for Ms. Trucco to prepare a one-page jurisdiction statement, indicating that the OCSO had jurisdiction for traffic enforcement of areas that had green signs and providing to the Reunion West and Reunion East CDD Boards at the next meeting and for Mr. Scheerer to inventory all of the signs and provide a proposal to change all signs from blue to green.

# B. Engineer

Ms. Adams recalled that the milling and resurfacing project was commencing and Mr. Curley was working with the contractor, All County Paving to coordinate it. Mr. Curley reported that All County was starting the milling on Monday and was working with the Project Manager, to mark out the areas, based on where they were starting and stopping. Mr. Curley would be onsite,

when they start the paving on Tuesday, to monitor the work and then planned to be onsite, one to two times a week, to take pictures and follow up. All County would have eight flagmen to provide traffic control and keep traffic flowing as smoothly as possible during the paving. Mr. Staley asked if a notice would be sent through an email blast to the community. Ms. Adams indicated that some associations sent it out, but not the Master Association, as it was scheduled to be sent to all associations today and would follow up with the Master Association and the email distribution. There would also be door and mailed notices. Mr. Staley questioned whether Mr. Anthony Carll of Kingwood was fully briefed on what was occurring. Mr. Scheerer was meeting with him next week.

# C. Field Manager Updates

Mr. Scheerer reported that the Board approved the only Reunion West action item, which was the playground and would coordinate the work with the contractor and keep the Board apprised of the step-by-step process. There was currently some concrete work on Tradition Boulevard, where there was a low spot. They were going to dig up the concrete, to find out what the problem was, by the irrigation pump on Bears Den. There was also some grinding in Encore Reunion West. A black aluminum fence panel come down, but he was not sure if it was related to the hurricane or Bougainvillea that was growing in the area. The plant material was removed, in order to make the repairs to the fence. He received an email that there was minor damage to the porte-cochere going under the guard house at Encore Reunion West, which was cleaned and repaired. There were some ongoing gate repairs. Most of the mulch was scheduled to be installed, starting the week of Thanksgiving, which was going to be a lengthy process, in order to get the entire community mulched. Then they would start pressure washing throughout the community. Once the concrete work was completed, they would replace a couple of monument lights that were out. Mr. Staley requested that they look like the lights in Eagle Estates, as their current lights were dull. Lights at Desert Mountain and Castle Pines, were not working. Mr. Scheerer had a list of lights to be installed and would have the lights changed out to brighter ones. Mr. Barry noted that the plantings around the monuments look good, but there were weeds. Mr. Scheerer pointed out that the landscape company should be detailing the monuments every three weeks, but there was a lull in services, due to the hurricane, as the contractor was focusing more on cleanup.

Mr. Scheerer reported that the District had minimal damage with the hurricane, but had many sign repairs, some of which were already made and some of which they were still making. Flex stakes were reinstalled at the Sinclair Road gate and as far as he knows, they were all up. This would continue to be monitored. Even though it was a Reunion East project, the Seven Eagles fountain was completely renovated. He met with Mr. Greenstein, several weeks ago, who suggested replacing the center tier of fountain, which was completed yesterday. It was grouted and sealed today and were hoping to fill it with water later on this afternoon or tomorrow. With the filtration of the water and the color changing lights, the fountain looked like night and day and would benefit anyone going into Linear Park. It was money well spent, in his opinion. Mr. Staley questioned whether additional No Parking signs and markings were installed on Whitemarsh Way and Muirfield Loop. Mr. Scheerer confirmed that it was not completed and notices must be sent to residents.

# D. District Manager's Report

#### i. Action Items List

This item was discussed.

## ii. Approval of Check Register

Ms. Adams presented the Check Registers from September 1, 2024 through September 30, 2024, in the amount of \$67,690.13 and from October 1, 2024 through October 31, 2024, in the amount of \$251,342.09, which were included in the agenda package, along with a detailed check run.

On MOTION by Mr. Staley seconded by Mr. Barry with all in favor the September and October Check Registers was approved.

#### iii. Balance Sheet and Income Statement

Ms. Adams presented the Unaudited Financial Statements and combined Balance Sheet through September 30, 2024, which were for informational purposes. The Board reviewed these documents, when they reviewed the Amended Budget. The Unassigned Balance would be utilized, until tax revenues were received, at the end of November or early December. No Board action was required.

## iv. Replacement and Maintenance Plan

Ms. Adams presented the R&M Plan, which was included in the agenda package. At the December meeting, Mr. Scheerer would be providing proposals to the Reunion East CDD Board for radar display signs. Mr. Staley recalled that the Board would review the Capital Plan for the next five years, at the February meeting, would be updating the Long-Range Plan, as part of the final closeout for the 2024 Fiscal Year and appreciated Mr. Scheerer for his hard work.

## E. Security Report

Ms. Adams provided under separate cover, the October Security Reports from Reunion Security and the Reunion West POA. No Board action was required and it was for informational purposes. Mr. Victor Vargas of Reunion Security reported that on January 1<sup>st</sup>, they would be adding an extra patrol in the community. Mr. Staley pointed out that parking and traffic violations at Reunion Resort, dropped, as prior reports were 70 pages long and it was now eight pages long and questioned what happened. Mr. Vargas confirmed that the number of violations dropped. Mr. Staley estimated that violations dropped by 90%. Ms. Adams noted that Reunion West Encore had security activity in the month of October. Ms. Zelada confirmed that there was a great deal of security activity from October 18<sup>th</sup> through October 28<sup>th</sup>, with over 600 incidents, including at least 20 incidents each night with loud parties. The Noise Ordinance established by Osceola County, was no more than 45 decibels and the noise was at 75 to 80 decibels. There were at least four sheriffs on the property at night, trying to bring the parties down, but many guests were not cooperative. It was a rough 10 days for her.

#### EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

**Other Business** 

There being no comments, the next item followed.

#### NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

**Supervisor's Requests** 

There being no comments, the next item followed.

# TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Next Meeting Date: December 12, 2024

Ms. Adams announced that the next meeting was scheduled for December 12, 2024 at 11:00 a.m. at this location.

**Reunion West CDD Regular Meeting** 

November 14, 2024 Page 12 of 12

# **ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

Adjournment

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

Secretary/Assistant Secretary

—signed by: Graliam Staley

Chairman/Vice Chairman