

**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, **January 9, 2025** 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
William (Bill) Witcher	Assistant Secretary
Michael Barry	Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

Tricia Adams	District Manager
Kristen Trucco	District Counsel
Steve Boyd	District Engineer
James Curley	District Engineer
Alan Scheerer	Field Manager
Grace Montanez	Reunion West POA Manager
Garrett Huegel	Yellowstone Landscape
Pete Whitman	Yellowstone Landscape
Victor Vargas	Reunion Security
Residents	

The following is a summary of the discussions and actions taken at the January 9, 2025 Reunion West Community Development District Board of Supervisors meeting.

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

Roll Call

Ms. Adams called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m. and called the roll. Four Supervisors were present.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS**Public Comment Period**

Ms. Adams opened the public comment period. The following residents addressed the Board:

- Mr. Sean Sweeney of 7820 Whitemarsh Way, represented his parents, who questioned why their street was a No Parking Zone. One resident left at least five cars on the street, creating a problem for everyone else. An email was sent to Mr. John Kingsley of the HOA and Ms. Adams was informed that they could not do anything about it. *Mr. Staley stated that this matter would be discussed under the District Manager's Report and Mr. Vargas' report.*
- Resident (Pricilla) of Excitement Drive requested speed bumps a few years ago, on a straightaway on Excitement Drive, but was informed by Ms. Adams that it was not feasible. However, it had a radar sign, but people were not respecting the 25 miles-per-hour (mph) speed limit. In addition, she requested additional bushes on Excitement Drive, where people were parking on the grass and walking to the Excitement Drive shopping center, when they could not find parking. *Ms. Adams pointed out that this was a Reunion East CDD matter, but traffic calming and the recent pavement maintenance would be discussed later in the meeting. Mr. Greenstein requested that the resident speak to Mr. Scheerer, but there would be further discussion at the Reunion East CDD meeting.*
- Mr. David Kantor of 7810 Whitemarsh Way, lived on the street where half of a street was a No Parking Zone and was concerned that it would create an issue with guest parking. *Mr. Staley spoke with Mr. Kantor on Tuesday and had some background information to share with the Board.*

There being no further comments, Ms. Adams closed the public comment period.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS**Approval of the Minutes of the December
12, 2024 Board of Supervisors Meeting**

Ms. Adams presented the minutes of the December 12, 2024 Board of Supervisors meeting, which were reviewed by District Counsel and the District Manager and were included in the agenda package. Mr. Staley provided non-substantive changes on Pages 13 and 15, which were incorporated. Mr. Barry indicated that, "*Ms. Hobbs*" should be "*Ms. Harley*." Mr. Greenstein clarified on Page 3, where he stated, "*There were a few blue signs around the Bears Den area, on*

**Reunion West CDD
Regular Meeting****January 9, 2025
Page 3 of 15**

Whitewash Way, Tradition Boulevard and Golden Bear Drive,” this was in the past and was corrected. Ms. Adams would remove that portion of the statement and leave where he requested further detail on how Fausnight came up with \$18,400.

Mr. Staley clarified on Page 6 of 15, he said, *“If the CDD did not acknowledge that the OCSD had jurisdiction, was the CDD effectively saying it did not want any traffic enforcement?”* and requested On Page 12 of 15, under the Security Report, that his statement, *“On resident who posted on Facebook about security, owned a large house with 10 people living there,”* be deleted. Mr. Barry requested that the statement, on the top of Page 10, *“They would also clean cans once a month,”* be deleted.

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

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**District Engineer’s Debriefing on Road
Maintenance Project**

Mt. Curley provided a debriefing on the recent pavement maintenance and traffic calming project, which was included in the agenda package, as well as updates from their Tuesday walkthrough. Mr. Staley asked if it would be posted on the CDD website. Ms. Adams indicated that it would be included in the record of proceedings. Mr. Curley reported that All County Paving would be onsite on Monday, installing stop bars in pedestrian crossings that they missed, re-striping the speed humps with better reflective paint and fixing lines on Tradition Boulevard, from the traffic circle to the bridge. Their plan was to black it out and repaint over it. They were supposed to remove the tack on the brick pavers yesterday on Spine Road and Tradition Boulevard, but were delayed, as the solution that they were using, had a shipment delay. Mr. Staley pointed out that it was not just Reunion Grand. Mr. Curley confirmed that it was in multiple locations. On Friday, All County Paving would raise speed bumps on Excitement Drive to the proper height. Mr. Witcher recalled that Grand Traverse Parkway, heading towards the bridge, there was double yellow line and over the bridge, it had a double yellow line going down Grand Traverse Parkway, but there was supposed to be a double yellow line from the bridge to the intersection of Tradition Boulevard, but not beyond the bridge.

**Reunion West CDD
Regular Meeting****January 9, 2025
Page 4 of 15**

Mr. Staley pointed out that there was confusion over where warning signs should be and questioned whether this was what the Department of Transportation (DOT) required. Mr. Boyd reported that according to the municipal sign standards, there was no specific guidance on where to place a sign in front of a speed hump, for visibility reasons and the thought was to put it 100 feet in front of it. Mr. Witcher pointed out that in community, a sign was recommended at 100 and 200 feet from the speed bump, as long as it did not block another traffic sign. Mr. Boyd would review the signs on a case-by-case basis.

Mr. Staley felt that there needed to be consistency about where a sign was in proximity to the speed hump. Mr. Greenstein agreed that there needed to be consistency, but 100 feet made sense and should be the standard throughout Reunion. Mr. Witcher pointed out that a potential benefit from signs being 100 or 80 feet away, as it would slow traffic down earlier and reduce speeding. Mr. Staley asked if any of the speed humps needed to be lowered on Excitement Drive. Mr. Curley was not aware of any but would re-measure them to confirm that they were at the proper height of 3 inches. Mr. Greenstein noticed a difference, as some provided a jolt when going over them at 5 mph, which was not the Board's intent, as the intent was to slow traffic to 10 mph. Mr. Curley recalled that All County Paving set the height to 4 inches but could compact them down to 3 inches. Mr. Boyd would verify the height, before All County Paving was onsite. Mr. Staley requested that two speed humps between the I-4 bridge and Sinclair Road gate, be compacted down because they were too high, that one page of the documents provided by Mr. Curley, be updated, so it could be included in the minutes of this meeting and that he provide confirmation that all of the permits and approvals were received, but did not want reflective paint to be applied, until the height of the hump was checked. Mr. Staley indicated that was disappointed in the job that All County Paving did, but did not find the paving to be an issue. Mr. Witcher felt that they did a good job on the pavement and his issue was with the speed humps and the signs. Mr. Boyd pointed out that his biggest issue was with the striping, as it was inconsistent. Mr. Greenstein believed that the essential paving product was good but the crosswalks had to be cleaned up, the speed humps had different heights and there were signage issues. Mr. Staley recalled when he saw the yellow striping between the roundabout and the water park on December 19th, he could not believe what he was seeing and requested that Mr. Curley and Mr. Scheerer tell All County Paving to stop, questioned their supervision and requested that the CDD be compensated. Mr. Greenstein requested that All County Paving correct it. Mr. Boyd reported that

**Reunion West CDD
Regular Meeting****January 9, 2025
Page 5 of 15**

Ms. Adams was withholding payment until the pavement markings were corrected and all punch list items were completed. Ms. Trucco pointed out that there was language in the contract for withholding payment and it was in the District Engineer's discretion, if the contractor did not comply with the terms of the agreement.

Mr. Barry felt that the Board should have discussed what they wanted the speed to drop to, as someone was driving over the speed hump and the acceptable height. Mr. Witcher had an issue with the placement of the advanced warning signs. Mr. Staley felt that the speed humps were effective, but 5% of the drivers would not follow speed limits. Once the signs were installed, the noise level went down considerably; however, 50% of the community liked the speed humps, but 50% did not like them. Mr. Greenstein noted that everything that the Board did, was with the community safety in mind, but there would have to be some mechanism, in order to get compliance. Mr. Staley appreciated Mr. Boyd for stopping the striping on December 19th and taking control of the situation but wanted to find a way to communicate with the community, as there were over 150 Facebook messages and no other way to communicate with residents, other than sending an HOA email blast. Ms. Adams recalled that the Board directed communication to be sent in advance of the project, which was a good move, as residents contacted staff through email. Mr. Staley questioned how to communicate with residents that changes would be made to the striping and signage. Ms. Adams would send out a notice, with language from the document that the District Engineer prepared. Mr. Staley requested that it include the Action Plan. Mr. Greenstein agreed with having communication with residents, as it was hard to deal with residents who were venting on Facebook. Mr. Staley felt that the Board should not be driven by what was on Facebook or Twitter and felt that residents should have the opportunity to speak to Board Members. Mr. Greenstein recalled at one time, having a member's reception once a month with the Resort. Mr. Staley encouraged residents to come to their meetings or call him.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**Consideration of Revised Amenity Use
Policy**

Ms. Adams reported that the Reunion East and Reunion West CDDs owned, maintained and operated certain amenities, such as the playground and outdoor Fitness Center and from time to time, the Amenity Policies needed to be changed. The Board had the ability to change them at any duly noticed public meeting. There needed to be changes to the Amenity Use Policy, as a result of Reunion Resort no longer managing the Heritage Crossings Community Center (HCCC) and

**Reunion West CDD
Regular Meeting****January 9, 2025
Page 6 of 15**

staff recommending that the Board remove any reference to fees, as it made sense to move all of the fees to the Special Events Policy that the Reunion East CDD Board would be reviewing later. The suggested changes were to remove references to contacting the Reunion Resort office, as well as some minor formatting changes throughout the document. This was an administrative matter and there were no significant policy changes for the Board to consider.

On MOTION by Mr. Barry seconded by Mr. Staley with all in favor the Revised Amenity Use Policy was approved.

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

Ms. Trucco distributed an updated version of the Easement Agreement with the Reunion West Property Owner's Association, Inc. (POA), for the playground in the Reunion West Encore neighborhood. Per Board direction at the last meeting, the provisions in the agreement mirrored the provisions in a prior Easement Agreement with Kingwood for the Reunion East CDD. The previously presented version was a good form to use as it had a great deal of detail and included the insurance obligation; however, the Board preferred that the CDD maintain the fence in perpetuity and the playground for 20 years, but did not have an obligation to replace it after 20 years. However, she noticed that in the Kingwood version, the CDD was maintaining it in perpetuity and had the option of replacing it or make repairs, at the discretion of the CDD. Therefore, she suggested that this Easement Agreement state that this easement exists in perpetuity and the CDD can make repairs or alterations on the playground, as needed, but did not have an obligation to replace the playground. In addition, if the CDD wanted to terminate this agreement, written notice must be provided to the POA, which she felt was in the best interest of the CDD.

Mr. Greenstein felt that they needed to evaluate what was in the existing agreement for the Reunion East CDD and it should not be different, even though there were two different entities. There was Board consensus for Ms. Trucco to mirror the Kingwood Agreement for those terms. Mr. Staley asked if this needed to be brought back to the Board. Ms. Adams confirmed that the Board already approved the Easement Agreement in substantial form and it would be provided to the POA for execution.

Ms. Trucco reported that the Acknowledgement Regarding Traffic Control Jurisdiction, that was approved by the Board at the last meeting, was signed and sent to counsel at the Osceola

**Reunion West CDD
Regular Meeting****January 9, 2025
Page 7 of 15**

County Sheriff's Office. She was informed that the assistant attorney would work on it and would follow up. Mr. Staley asked if there was anything else in her cover letter that the Board needed to know about. Ms. Trucco stated that they were informed that both Boards approved it and asked how or if the CDDs should proceed with changing the color of the signage. Mr. Greenstein felt this would be the only practical consideration. Ms. Trucco would continue to update the Board. There was no update on the litigation, the hearing on the motion to dismiss was still at the end of the month and would have an update at the next meeting. She was reviewing the 2019 requisition, which was included in the agenda package and would be presented by Ms. Adams later in this meeting. There would be follow up on the completion documents to close out the Series 2019 bond at a future meeting.

B. Engineer

There being no comments, the next item followed.

C. Field Manager Updates

Mr. Scheerer reported that pressure washing throughout the property, was still occurring and thus far, it looked good. On the Reunion West side, ceiling tiles in the guardhouse, were being replaced this week. Sidewalk repairs were ongoing. Mulch was either being installed or was complete throughout Reunion East and West. There were some minor fence repairs in the Encore area. The deposit invoice for Playtopia was received and was approved. There would be a construction update at a future meeting, on how long it was going to take for them to get mobilized and permitted. Mr. Staley noted that the signage on the Grand Traverse Parkway and Valhalla Terrace, looked good and the lights were powerful, but they were still struggling with the lights at Legends Corner in Masters Landing. Mr. Scheerer noticed they were working when he entered the community early this morning. The 35-watt lamp made a difference, but if the Board wanted something brighter, he could install a higher watt bulb. Mr. Barry and Mr. Staley felt that it was bright enough. The only item on the Action Items List, was the Encore Reunion playground, which was just discussed. Mr. Staley questioned what they would do with the old radar signs, when the new ones were installed. Mr. Scheerer indicated that several were not functioning and recommended finding additional areas that needed additional traffic enforcement. He would have a report on the radar sign installed on Euston Drive. Ms. Adams pointed out even though they were

**Reunion West CDD
Regular Meeting****January 9, 2025
Page 8 of 15**

not useful for gathering information, it still provided a helpful reminder to drivers to pay attention to the speed limit.

Mr. Greenstein asked if data was not retrievable even at the sign. Mr. Scheerer noted that the one at the corner of Bears Den Lane and Grand Traverse Parkway, was working, but they could not retrieve the data; however, as long as it was displaying the flashing speed, they could continue to be used, as it was slowing people down. The new ones would be cloud based. Mr. Staley recommended placing one on Excitement Drive, as recommended by a resident earlier in the meeting. Mr. Scheerer recalled that there was already a radar sign at this location and the resident wanted a speed bump. He downloaded the information, which indicated that there was no speeding issue, but would download it again. Mr. Witcher requested that filters be applied, as he would like to see the data without low-speed vehicles, such as the 15-mph golf cart that was cruising around the property for the resort. Mr. Scheerer recalled when they set up the radar display signs, it was set at a minimum of 15 mph and a maximum of 45 mph but could raise it to 20 mph as a minimum and keep the maximum at 25 mph or not have a maximum. Mr. Witcher understood that a standard golf cart that was not street legal, could go up to 19 mph. Street legal starts at 25 mph for golf carts, but many could go to 30 to 35 mph. Mr. Scheerer pointed out if he raised the minimum, the radar sign would not activate until the minimum speed was reached. Mr. Witcher preferred to leave it alone for the time being, as he was unaware that a minimum was programmed into the sign.

D. District Manager's Report

Ms. Adams requested that the Board discuss the Parking Rules and the process that the Board adopted them, since Mr. Sean Sweeney of 7820 Whitemarsh Way, was waiting to discuss this matter, since the Public Comment Period. Originally, the Parking Rules were adopted in 2020; however, before the Parking Rules could be adopted, there must be a public hearing and a legal notice must be published. In addition, as a courtesy, an electronic mail message was sent by the Master Association to Reunion residents. The proposed public hearing information, such as a draft of the Parking Rules was included on the District's website. The Parking Rules were subsequently amended and restated in 2021 and then again in December 2023. Attached to the Parking Rules, were parking maps. Mr. Sweeney was provided with a copy on December 20th, but there was confusion on Whitemarsh Way. When the Parking Rules were implemented, signage should have been installed in accordance with the rules that the Board adopted and matched them. The District

**Reunion West CDD
Regular Meeting****January 9, 2025
Page 9 of 15**

Engineer suggested No Parking zones, based on their vicinity to intersections, curves or other line of sight issues. There were areas where parking was restricted to one side of the roadway, in order to allow for a free flow of traffic and if deemed necessary by the engineer, there were restrictions on both sides of the roadway. However, there was error on signage at Whitemarsh Way, which had since been corrected.

Mr. Staley clarified when the Parking Rules were amended on December 23rd, it was in response to a concern with people having difficulty coming out of the first turn on Muirfield Loop onto Whitemarsh Way, due to parked vehicles. Therefore, when the Parking Rules were amended on December 23rd, the No Parking was extended from the corner of Tradition Boulevard to 10 yards past the Muirfield Loop junction, so drivers were not faced with a vehicle opposite them. However, signage was not installed at the time, but during the Christmas holiday, the contractor installed the required signage too far down Whitemarsh, almost to the end of Whitemarsh, which was not the intention and was in error. As recent as yesterday, Mr. Scheerer removed and re-installed the signage, showing the end of the No Parking area, 10 yards past the junction of Muirfield Loop. The new signage was in line with what was approved in December of last year, but sometimes people parked a car in front of someone else's homes, which they could not do anything about and assumed that Mr. Sweeney had not seen the new signage. Ms. Adams pointed out in addition to providing the Parking Rules on December 23rd, they clarified that the jurisdiction for regulating the Parking Rules, was the CDD, but there may have been some confusion on Whitemarsh Way regarding residents believing that they controlled the parking in front of their residential property. These were public roads and the CDD owned and maintained the roadway and adopted these Parking Rules and therefore the CDD governed parking. However, if there was a traffic enforcement, law enforcement or public safety issue, residents were directed to contact the Osceola County Sheriff's Office for assistance.

Mr. Sean Sweeney of 7820 Whitemarsh Way, believed that the residents at 7818 Whitemarsh Way were causing the issue and felt that the Board was addressing the symptom rather than the cause, as the stop sign at Muirfield Loop, was never used. The map of The No Parking zone on the CDD website, showed that it ended at 7822 Whitemarsh Way, which was incorrect. In addition, residents never received notification and it took an entire year to change it. It needed to be reviewed and residents be able to say something about it, as it negatively impacted residents who needed to park in the street in front of their home. It was not fair to everyone. Mr. Staley

**Reunion West CDD
Regular Meeting****January 9, 2025
Page 10 of 15**

disagreed with Mr. Sweeney, as recalled there was No Parking for the first 15 years on Whitemarsh Way, for several years and the map on the CDD website, showed that the No Parking was extended 10 yards past the Muirfield junction. Mr. Scheerer installed a sign, indicating this, which was consistent with the Parking Rules approved by the Board in December. The issue with people not stopping at the stop sign, was a traffic enforcement issue, but if Security notices it during their roving patrol, they could educate the drivers. Changing the Parking Rules, to accommodate people not stopping at stop signs, was wrong, because even if people stopped at the stop sign, it was dangerous to have cars parked in the opposite direction, as vehicles were coming in both directions. The CDD Board needed to address a problem that was in the interest of public safety. However, Mr. Staley sympathized with Mr. Sweeney, for not being able to park outside of his home, but as Ms. Adams stated, residents did not have that right to govern parking on public roadways and he wished people used their driveways. He drove through the area and suggested that Mr. Sweeney park on the driveway behind his house, as it hardly had any cars parked on it. As far as the CDD Board, Mr. Staley felt that they did what they were required to do and acted in the best interest of the community. There was not much more that the CDD Board could do at this point in time.

Mr. David Kantor of 7810 Whitemarsh Way, clarified that cars were not parked when Mr. Staley was driving by, because many guests were short-term renters, who were at the Theme Parks for most of the day and the garage did not fill up with cars until the end of the day. When he purchased his home in 2018, the driveway in back of the property was too small to accommodate two cars, unless trees were removed to extend it. As a result, guests that stay in the main house, must park in front of his house. The two neighbors on either side of him, had units that were similar and there was not enough space. Mr. Staley understood, as there were only so many cars that could park in a 35-foot piece of property in front of a home and with the number of rental properties in their community, there were more cars than the property could accommodate and suggested that the Board could consider offering parallel parking at the Whitemarsh Mound, as part of a future capital project, which he discussed with Mr. Scheerer. Mr. Greenstein liked the idea of using this property for parking, similar to the mail kiosk parking and did not look at the alley or the width of driveways behind Whitemarsh Way, but if a surface was not permanent, such as pavers, it could be extended. Mr. Staley felt that was a valid point, as there was an issue in the community with too many cars, that was compounded by garages being used for arcades. The CDD did what was

**Reunion West CDD
Regular Meeting****January 9, 2025
Page 11 of 15**

right for public safety and would investigate the possibility of providing additional parking and requested that Mr. Sweeney and Mr. Kantor keep in touch with him.

Mr. Staley recalled that the Reunion East CDD Board made changes to their Parking Rules in August and at the time, he compared the Reunion East and Reunion West CDD policies, for consistency purposes. There were significant differences, such as Reunion East having a provision for parking at the playground being limited to 60 minutes and the mail kiosk parking be limited to 15 minutes, prohibit parking within 15 feet of a fire hydrant and having the ability to remove abandoned or broken-down vehicles within five days. Ms. Adams confirmed that Florida Law prohibited parking in front of a stop sign and fire hydrant irrespective of parking rules. She noted the Board had the ability to schedule a public hearing to amend and restate the Parking Rules. Mr. Staley preferred to take action to set a public hearing to amend the Parking Rules. Ms. Adams would provide proposed Parking Rules for the next agenda, in order for the Board to set the public hearing. Mr. Greenstein recalled at some of the mail kiosks, there were multiple parking spaces, two for the mail kiosk and two free spaces. Mr. Staley suggested discussing how many spaces were for the playground, mail kiosk and how many were free. Mr. Witcher felt that there needed to be similarity between the Reunion East and Reunion West CDD policies but recalled that the signs were changed to temporary parking, due to guests parking to use the playground and staying for more than 15 minutes. Mr. Staley recalled that there was no time period. *There was Board consensus for Ms. Adams to provide proposed Parking Rules at the next meeting.*

i. Action Items List

Ms. Adams presented the Action Items List, which was included in the agenda package. It included projects for Reunion East and Reunion West.

ii. Approval of Check Register

Ms. Adams presented the Check Register from December 1, 2024 through December 31, 2024 in the amount of \$2,462,931.65 for the General Fund and payroll, which was included in the agenda package, along with a detailed check run. As a result of tax revenues being received, there were some large transmittals to the Trustee for interest and principal payments and a transfer to the State Board of Administration (SBA) account.

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

iii. Balance Sheet and Income Statement

Ms. Adams presented the Unaudited Financial Statements through November 30, 2024, which was for the first two months of Fiscal Year 2025. It was for informational purposes and included the Combined Balance Sheet. Under revenue, CDD maintenance fees were starting to be received. Mr. Staley noted that in the maintenance section for Heritage Crossing for the shared expenses, not much was spent. Ms. Adams pointed out in discussions with the CDD accountant and with Mr. Scheerer, some invoices may not have been coded to Heritage Crossings. An audit was being performed for this fiscal year. Mr. Staley recalled that the Board discussed meeting with the Reunion East CDD about solutions on what to do with this building, as it cost \$130,000 to \$150,000 to maintain it. This would be brought back to the Board at a future meeting. Ms. Adams noted there were some pages for debt service payments, for any interest and principal payments that were made.

iv. Approval of Bond Requisition #10

Ms. Adams presented Bond Requisition #10 to Reunion West Development Partners in the amount of \$89,313, which was included in the agenda package. When a bond was issued, it generated funding for the eligible expenses related to the infrastructure of the community. As the property was turned over to the CDD, the CDD reimburses for those expenses out of the Construction Fund. This was the last requisition for Series 2019. Ms. Trucco was working on a couple of related issues that run in tandem with the bond requisition, one of which was for an audit, to ensure that any property related to this requisition, was properly conveyed to the District. Since this was the last requisition and the Series 2019 project was completed, there was a formal process in the Trust Indenture, for the District Engineer to declare the project complete and a completion certificate would go to the Trustee, directing the closing of the construction account. Bond Requisition #10 was reviewed by the District Engineer and the documentation for the eligible expenses, was attached. Ms. Trucco requested that the motion be subject to execution by District Counsel, confirmation by the District Engineer regarding conveyance of the improvements and direction to start the conveyance process. Mr. Staley recalled that the 2019 bond covered some streets in Encore, such as Eagle Trace by the main resort and Bears Den Lane. Mr. Boyd confirmed

**Reunion West CDD
Regular Meeting**

**January 9, 2025
Page 13 of 15**

that it covered Bears Den Lane. Ms. Trucco clarified that the requisition covered Reunion 17th and 18th fairway in Phase 3.

On MOTION by Mr. Barry seconded by Mr. Greenstein with all in favor Bond Requisition #10, subject to execution by District Counsel, confirmation by the District Engineer regarding conveyance of the improvements and authorization to start the conveyance process was approved.

v. Replacement and Maintenance Plan

Ms. Adams presented the R&M Plan, which was for informational purposes. The spreadsheet was updated each month with input from Mr. Scheerer. The items in process or deferred, were at the top of the list, followed by the Fiscal Year 2025 project list. They were coming to closure, but some items were still in process, such as one treadmill replacement at Seven Eagles. At next month's meeting, Mr. Scheerer would provide a proposal for The Terrace pool renovation/resurfacing and the lighting for this building. Next month, some of the recommended projects, based on field conditions or the Reserve Study, for items at the end of its useful life, as well as any potential Fiscal Year 2025 projects, would be discussed.

E. Security Report

Staff provided under separate cover, the December Security Report from Reunion Security and the Reunion West POA. No Board action was required and was for informational purposes. Mr. Victor Vargas of Reunion Security was present. Mr. Staley recalled at the last meeting, the parking problem in Muirfield Loop, was discussed, which had the worst parking situation, as one house accommodated 30 to 40 people, but only had one or two parking spaces. He met with Mr. John Kingsley, Mr. Vargas and the homeowner that was impacted by the abuse of the parking on this street. Everyone accepted that they were not going to be able to solve the problem of this particular house, as it would continue to have three to ten cars. However, in the short-term, there were some solutions, which was well received by the homeowner and were within the CDD's purview under the Parking Rules. If someone parked in front of his house and blocked their driveway, Mr. Vargas would immediately take action to remove the vehicle, by knocking on the door of the home that infringed the Parking Rules and placing a tow sticker on the vehicle. If no one was available to move the vehicle, Mr. Vargas would immediately contact the towing

**Reunion West CDD
Regular Meeting**

**January 9, 2025
Page 14 of 15**

company. This would also apply to situations, where people were parked in front of fire hydrants. Mr. Witcher assumed that the State of Florida had regulations about parking in front of fire hydrants, as it was a true safety issue and preferred that the vehicle be towed immediately. Mr. Staley did not think the Board needed to approve anything, as Mr. Vargas had the authority to enforce the parking rules. Mr. Barry felt that it made sense. Mr. Greenstein pointed out that blocking someone's driveway, a fire hydrant and sidewalks, were violations of State Law.

Mr. Staley recalled also discussing with Mr. Kingsley, the property management company, assisting with the implementation of the Parking Rules, which Mr. Kingsley supported, by once or twice a year, sending a communication to remind residents about the Parking Rules, that they would be implemented and enforced and including a one-page summary of the rules. There could also be a reference to the website, where there would be full details of the rules. Mr. Witcher requested that the preferred builders in Reunion be included, in order to provide this information to their subcontractors. Mr. Staley agreed and further requested that the four major property management companies educate their own people, as two vehicles from one of the companies, were parked all over the grass outside of a home. Ms. Trucco must review the rules about warnings. Mr. Staley recalled that it did not provide any timeframe. Ms. Adams confirmed that it just said vehicles were subject to immediate towing. Ms. Trucco indicated that there must be consistency on application of rule. Mr. Staley pointed out that they were allowing Mr. Vargas to be flexible based on the situation. Ms. Trucco advised if it was a violation of State law also, she understood Mr. Vargas would be acting fast and would include it in the rule. Ms. Adams indicated there must be discretion based on the egregiousness of the situation to act sooner rather than later. Mr. Staley requested that Mr. Vargas come back to the Board and discuss the problems that they were facing with the implementation. There was Board consensus for Mr. Vargas to knock on the door of the home that violated the Parking Rules and placing a tow sticker on the vehicle, but if no one could move the vehicle, he would immediately contact the towing company and for staff to send a communication to the four property management companies, reminding residents about the Parking Rules, enforcement and implementation and including a one-page summary of the rules. Mr. Staley reported that Mr. Kingsley also requested when Mr. Vargas stopped a house party or there was a major issue with a house party, to let him know who had the party, so that he could send a letter or warnings to the owner, as it was in violation of the HOA rules. Mr. Vargas would provide a report.

**Reunion West CDD
Regular Meeting**

**January 9, 2025
Page 15 of 15**

Mr. Barry asked if someone parked past the driveway and onto the sidewalk, blocking access to the sidewalk, would be receive a violation notice. Mr. Vargas confirmed that he would issue a violation notice. Mr. Staley requested that he use discretion, as parking on a sidewalk was less egregious than parking over the sidewalk and onto the road and would defer the discussion on the communication until the next meeting. Mr. Barry preferred having an electronic document, versus receiving handouts at the meeting, even if it was sent out the night before. Ms. Trucco would send out documents that she provided at this meeting and Ms. Adams would provide an electronic copy of the updated engineer’s paving report to Board Members when it was received. She would include the discussion regarding CDD communications and review of the CDD Parking Rules on the next agenda.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Other Business

There being no comments, the next item followed.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Supervisor’s Requests

There being no comments, the next item followed.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Next Meeting Date: February 13, 2025

Ms. Adams stated that the next meeting was scheduled for February 13, 2025 at 11:00 a.m. at this location.

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Adjournment

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

Signed by:

Tricia Adams

3F3E5FA5C67E43B...

Secretary/Assistant Secretary

Signed by:

Graham Staley

439F73A503AA4F2...

Chairman/Vice Chairman