# 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, **December 12, 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 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 December 12, 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 with the exception of Ms. Harley who was not present at roll call.

December 12, 2024 Page 2 of 15

#### SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS

#### **Public Comment Period**

There being no comments, the next item followed.

#### THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS Organizational Matters

Ms. Adams welcomed back Mr. Graham Staley and Ms. Harley, who started new terms effective November 19, 2024, which would expire in November of 2028.

Ms. Harley joined the meeting.

#### A. Administration of Oaths of Office to Newly Elected Board Members

Ms. Adams, a Notary of the State of Florida and duly authorized, administered the Oath of Office to Ms. Harley. She noted the Oath of Office had been administered to Mr. Staley prior to the Board Meeting.

#### B. Election of Officers

# C. Consideration of Resolution 2025-02 Electing Officers

Ms. Adams reported that after an appointment or an election, the Board was required to reorganize its officers. Resolution 2025-02 was included in the agenda package and currently Mr. Graham Staley served as Chairman, Ms. Sharon Harley served as Vice Chair, the remaining Board Members served as Assistant Secretaries, Mr. George Flint served as Secretary, Ms. Tricia Adams served as Assistant Secretary, Ms. Jill Burns served as Treasurer, Ms. Katie Costa and Mr. Darrin Mossing, Sr. served as Assistant Treasurers, for check signing purposes. Mr. Witcher was in favor of retaining the same officers.

On MOTION by Mr. Witcher seconded by Mr. Barry with all in favor retaining the same slate of officers as evidenced by the adoption of Resolution 2025-02 was approved.

Mr. Staley appreciated the Board allowing him to continue serving as Chairman and thanked Ms. Aura Zelada for her service to the Reunion West POA. She was retiring and Ms. Grace Montanez was replacing her.

December 12, 2024 Page 3 of 15

#### FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

**Approval of the Minutes of the November 14, 2024 Board of Supervisors Meeting** 

Ms. Adams presented the minutes of the November 14, 2024 Board of Supervisors meeting, which were reviewed by District Counsel and the District Manager and were included in the agenda package. Mr. Greenstein, Mr. Staley and Mr. Barry provided corrections, which would be incorporated.

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.

#### FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

# Consideration of Proposal for Street Signs from Fausnight Stripe & Line, Inc.

Ms. Adams presented a proposal from Fausnight Stripe & Line, Inc. (Fausnight), in the amount of \$18,400, to replace the blue signs with green ones, which was included in the agenda package for informational purposes. It would not be approved until clarification was provided by the Osceola County Sheriff's Department (OCSD), on whether they would enforce traffic, irrespective of the sign color. Mr. Scheerer pointed out that Fausnight was asked to provide a proposal, as they installed most of the signs in the community, which was \$18,400, to remove, manufacture and install signs on every street corner in the Encore Reunion West neighborhood and both sides of Old Lake Wilson Road. Ms. Harley questioned whether green signs were in most of Reunion. Mr. Greenstein confirmed that green was standard and OCSD was refusing to enforce traffic even where signs were green. He questioned how Fausnight came up with \$18,400. Mr. Scheerer would obtain further detail.

#### SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Consideration of Proposal for Radar Feedback Signs with Universal Signs & Accessories

Mr. Scheerer provide a proposal from Universal Sign Accessories for 10 radar display signs in the amount of \$34,912.20, which was included in the agenda package, at the Board's request. They would be cloud-based, similar to what was purchased for the Reunion West CDD Encore neighborhood and Bluetooth controlled. \$67,531 was allocated in the budget for signage replacement and radar display signs. The signs would be split based on the cost share Interlocal agreement between the Reunion West and Reunion East CDDs. This item was also on the agenda

for Board consideration at the Reunion East CDD meeting. Mr. Staley asked if five or six signs would be installed in Reunion West. Mr. Scheerer confirmed that four signs would be placed in Reunion West, two on Tradition Boulevard and two on Grand Traverse Parkway and the remaining six would be placed in Reunion East, two on Reunion Boulevard, two on Excitement Drive and one on Euston Drive. Ms. Adams noted that the signs were portable and if there were concerns about a particular location, it could be relocated. Mr. Scheerer explained that they would be mounted on streetlights with a strap, which could be removed and affixed to a different pole in a different location. Mr. Staley questioned whether there was a service contract. Mr. Scheerer confirmed that there was a one-year warranty on the product. The current Bluetooth ones were purchased eight years ago and were still in good condition. Ms. Trucco indicated that she would prepare a contract. Mr. Staley was in favor of approving this expenditure. Mr. Barry agreed, as it was a cost-effective way to help with the safety of the roads.

On MOTION by Mr. Straley seconded by Mr. Greenstein with all in favor the proposal with Universal Signs & Accessories for 10 radar display signs in the amount of \$34,912.20 was approved.

#### SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Consideration of Data Sharing and Usage Agreement with Osceola County Property Appraiser

Ms. Adams presented a Data Sharing and Usage Agreement between the District and the Osceola County Property Appraiser, which was included in the agenda package, exempting certain records from public records disclosure. It was an annual agreement that would be in effect from January 1, 2025 through December 31, 2025 and staff recommended approval.

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein seconded by Mr. Witcher with all in favor the Osceola County Property Appraiser Data Sharing and Usage Agreement was approved.

## EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Acknowledgement Regarding Traffic Control Jurisdiction of Osceola County Sheriff's Office

Ms. Trucco recalled that the Board directed her, at the last meeting, to prepare a one-page letter or Acknowledgement and Consent of the District for the Osceola County Sheriff's

Department (OCSD), to acknowledge that OCSD had jurisdiction for traffic enforcement on District roadways. This was due to counsel for OCSD expressing concern, including, about tickets being challenged when officers wrote tickets and performed traffic enforcement on roads within the CDD's boundary as there could be an issue of probable cause if they did not have jurisdiction, resulting in personal liability of the officers. The Board previously discussed this service being provided for decades without an agreement being in place, as understanding was residents were paying taxes. Ms. Trucco was trying to confirm with OCSD if it was their position that such service would not be provided unless an agreement, under Chapter 316, was in place and noted this dealt with providing standard traffic enforcement services and not enhanced services but at this time there was not a response on that point. Ms. Trucco voiced concern about liability, if for example the CDD was informed by certain individuals that OCSD was not going to provide traffic enforcement services or if OCSD confirmed that they would not provide these services without an agreement being entered into by the CDD and there was an accident, she voiced concerned of a potential argument being made by an injured party, that their damages could have been reduced, if the CDD had entered into an agreement, as there would have been traffic enforcement services. In an effort to limit the CDD's liability exposure, this acknowledgement would confirm in writing, in the interim, that OCSD had jurisdiction to provide traffic enforcement services on District roadways. It also made it clear that OCSD had no obligation to maintain, repair or restore the District's roadways. In addition, Ms. Trucco would include language in message that the Board could change the color of the signs.

Mr. Witcher assumed that the officers coming onto their property would follow the rules and regulations established for roadways and questioned the difference between standard and enhanced traffic enforcement services. Ms. Adams explained that there were times when a law enforcement officer needed to be hired on an hourly basis, which was considered to be enhanced traffic enforcement, as it was extraordinary to their regular position, versus routine patrol for any public roadway within Osceola County, which was considered to be standard traffic enforcement. Ms. Trucco clarified that the acknowledgement referenced the District roadways and not all roadways within the CDD boundary. Mr. Greenstein was in favor of approving the acknowledgement, as it stated the District's position and showed their commitment. The only issue remaining was with the color of the signs. Mr. Staley agreed. Mr. Barry agreed with the Board approving the acknowledgement but not entering into an agreement. Ms. Trucco was concerned

about the District's liability exposure and felt it was in the best interest of the CDD to respond in at least some way. Mr. Staley asked if the CDD did not acknowledge that OCSD had jurisdiction, whether the CDD was saying that they did not want any traffic enforcement. Ms. Trucco explained that a concern is an argument could be made that the CDD was put on notice that OCSD wanted an agreement to be signed and the CDD did not do so, so this at least acknowledged that OCSD had jurisdiction. Ms. Harley pointed out that the Board was not expecting them to come into the community all the time and only when requested. Mr. Greenstein pointed out that the Sherriff's Office would decide how to utilize their workforce and prioritize need. Ms. Trucco recommended sending this to OCSD to see what their response was. Mr. Greenstein would recommend the same at the Reunion East CDD meeting and if the Board had any concerns, he would bring it back to the Board.

Mr. Greenstein MOVED to approve the Acknowledgement and Consent of the District for the Osceola County Sheriff's Office to provide traffic enforcement powers and Ms. Harley seconded the motion.

Mr. Barry wanted to ensure what they were putting in writing was true today. Mr. Greenstein pointed out that it was good until amended. Ms. Trucco confirmed that the Board was acknowledging what was true today and the District's position that OCSD had jurisdiction to come into the community and provide traffic enforcement services. Ms. Harley suggested posting a sign. Mr. Staley pointed out if OCSD did not reply or chose not to sign the acknowledgement, the CDD would send it again, to demonstrate that they were trying to be responsible. Mr. Greenstein pointed out that it showed the community the CDD's position, as there was nothing in writing. Mr. Staley commended staff on the preparation of this acknowledgement.

On VOICE VOTE with all in favor the Acknowledgement and Consent of the District for the Osceola County Sheriff's Office to provide traffic enforcement powers was approved.

Ms. Trucco reported when she was researching this issue, a plat was uncovered which stated, "The aforementioned street shall be subject to the jurisdiction of Osceola County in establishing speed limits and traffic control devices deemed necessary and appropriate by Osceola

December 12, 2024 Page 7 of 15

County." Therefore, she would include in her email to the county, that pursuant to this plat note, the CDD streets were subject to the county establishing the speed limits of traffic control devices and to contact her if they had any objection. Mr. Staley requested that Ms. Trucco just transmit the acknowledgement and not include this in her email to the OSCO. Ms. Trucco agreed to omit that per the direction.

#### **NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

#### **Staff Reports**

#### A. Attorney

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

Ms. Adams reported that Ms. Trucco and her team were finalizing the form of the Easement Agreement with the Reunion West Property Owner's Association, Inc. (POA), for a playground in the Reunion West Encore neighborhood. Ms. Trucco indicated that the Board already reviewed a prior version and desired to discuss the proposed final version in Agenda, that acknowledged that the CDD had permission from the POA to install and construct a playground on POA's property. After construction of the playground was completed, the CDD would provide written notice to the POA, that the CDD was not responsible for maintaining, operating or installing any other improvements on the property, including landscaping improvements. There was also the responsibility to insure the playground which belonged to the POA and not the CDD; however, the CDD at some point in the future by modification of this agreement, could elect to maintain the playground and the landscaping and include it on the CDD's insurance but the CDD did not have an obligation to do so. All the CDD was doing was paying for and installing the playground and after notice was provided to the POA that it was installed, it would be POA's responsibility to maintain and insure it in the future. Neither of the parties could materially alter the playground without one another's consent and if the POA's development plans change and they wanted to move that playground, the CDD had to agree on the new location and the POA would be responsible for paying the CDD to move it. There were also provisions for damages and indemnifying the CDD, if a POA contractor broke something for example. The CDD could put the POA on notice that they would be responsible for making repairs within 20 days and if they failed to do so, then the CDD could make the repair and bill the POA. Lastly, there was an acknowledgement that the playground must remain open to the public.

Ms. Zelada said that the CDD was going to pay for the playground, install and maintain it and it would be open to everyone. Mr. Staley recalled that the CDD would not maintain the landscaping or the fence. Ms. Trucco would make the changes. Mr. Scheerer confirmed that the fence would be included because it was part of the tract, but the landscaping would be maintained by the POA. Mr. Staley felt that the CDD should maintain it for safety reasons. Mr. Scheerer recommended that it be similar to the Easement Agreement with Kingwood, to construct the playground by Euston Drive, as the CDD was maintaining the equipment and insuring it. In this case, the insurance, maintenance of all the improvements, would be the responsibility of the CDD and the landscaping would be the responsibility of the POA. Ms. Harley agreed with Mr. Scheerer and further recommended the CDD maintain the fence. Ms. Trucco per direction would include in the agreement that the CDD would maintain the fence in perpetuity and maintain the playground for 20 years, but the CDD did not have an obligation to replace it after 20 years. Mr. Staley requested to check with staff to confirm consistency with Kingwood Easement. Ms. Zelada recommended having the agreement signed by the POA Board before construction begins.

#### B. Engineer

Mr. Curley reported that the paving would be completed today. They were supposed to complete it yesterday, but it rained. The speed tables and re-striping would be completed from December 17<sup>th</sup> to December 23<sup>rd</sup>. He was in the process of preparing a debriefing, indicating what went right or wrong with this project and what they wanted to see in the future, with other road maintenance projects. Mr. Witcher questioned whether the road must be re-milled again when they installed the speed table, so that it adhered properly. Mr. Curley was informed that they would be re-milling it or they would apply a liquid adhesive. Mr. Staley recalled that the tables would be 12 feet wide. Mr. Curley confirmed that the tables were full width. Instead of it having a hump, it would gradually go up and down, as a reminder for drivers to slow down. There would be signage on each side of the table. Mr. Staley voiced concern that a 12-foot speed table would block driveways. Mr. Curley was meeting with All County Paving on Monday, December 16<sup>th</sup>, to review the speed table locations. Ms. Harley questioned whether it would cause disruptions, as she was concerned about the dates that the work was taking place. Mr. Curley pointed out that there would be a much smaller crew than what was currently onsite and it would take no more than two days to install 12 speed tables. Mr. Greenstein agreed that they needed to factor in the length of the

speed table on residential roads. Mr. Staley suggested that Mr. Curley contact him, as Chairman of this Board and Mr. Greenstein, Chairman of the Reunion East CDD Board, if there were issues. Mr. Witcher questioned whether there would be re-striping and stop bars in the entire community, even roads that were not going to be re-paved. Mr. Curley pointed out that they would be in specific areas, which were included in the bid documents. Mr. Staley questioned whether the raised pavement markers (RPMs) would be replaced. Mr. Curley confirmed that they would not be re-installed, with the exception of the hydrant RPMs.

## C. Field Manager Updates

Mr. Scheerer reported that some minor sidewalk repairs were completed, mostly in Encore Reunion West. There were also some ongoing irrigation repairs. In the Encore Reunion West portion of Old Lake Wilson Road, there were some heavy landscaping installations, which caused damage to the black aluminum fence. It was supposed to be repaired, but due to Hurricane Milton, the appointment was missed and it was now being repaired. The pressure washing was delayed because of the pavement work. All County Paving requested that the curbs not receive the 3% chlorine wash. The lights on the monuments were improved, by replacing the 15-watt bulbs with 35-watt bulbs. Mr. Staley noted that the light on Desert Mountain Court was not working, but the one at Castle Pines Court, was working; however, he did not know if the one at Legends Corner was working. Mr. Scheerer would look at it. Mr. Staley requested that Mr. Scheerer look at the markings that were installed on Whitemarsh Way. Mr. Greenstein questioned who was responsible for cleaning brick pavers in the crosswalk, as pavers Reunion East in crosswalks, had oil on them. Mr. Scheerer would review all of the concrete curb and gutters, crosswalks and brick pavers with Mr. Curley, after all of the work was completed and if there was oil, they would ask All County Paving to remove it.

Ms. Harley questioned who had jurisdiction over trash cans left on the roadside, in areas that the CDD controlled and if they could inform owners to remove them. Ms. Adams felt that this was a legal question. Mr. Greenstein pointed out that drivers did not know how to operate the trucks, as last week, one truck was 25% of the way into the roadway, versus halfway into the street and halfway on the driveway apron. Yesterday's trash pickup was okay, but they would have to see about Wednesday. At an HOA meeting that Mr. Barry attended several months ago, Mr. Anthony Carll of Kingwood mentioned that at the beginning of next year they would have a service

that follows the trash trucks, takes trash cans and pull them up to the house, which should resolve the issue. Ms. Trucco could potentially send a letter but did not know how effective it would be. Board will monitor.

# D. District Manager's Report

#### i. Action Items List

Mr. Scheerer reported that once the Easement Agreement was finalized and approved, a timeline would be provided, hopefully at the next meeting, regarding the permitting and start of the playground project. Ms. Adams reported that this week, a representative for the Old Lake Wilson Road Improvement Project, informed her that they were now at 30% of the design phase. The project would be expedited, compared to what was presented to the Board previously, because the County was taking over a portion of the improvements, in order to proceed with the Moving I-4 Forward Project. They anticipated bringing a presentation to this Board in the second quarter of 2025, as there were some anticipated impact to Reunion. In their earlier presentation, Osceola County discussed needing right-of-way acquisition from the District and at that time, the District was interested in improving one of the exits from the Reunion West Encore neighborhood, which was currently an exit only and making it an entrance exit. This was still being discussed.

#### ii. Approval of Check Register

Ms. Adams presented the Check Register from November 1, 2024 through November 30, 2024 in the amount of \$388,840.57, which was included in the agenda package and included items from the General Fund, as well as the Repair & Maintenance (R&M) Fund, along with a detailed Check Run summary.

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

#### iii. Balance Sheet and Income Statement

Ms. Adams presented the Unaudited Financial Statements through October 31, 2024, which was for the first month of Fiscal Year 2025. It was for informational purposes and included the Combined Balance Sheet, showing the unassigned balance in the General Fund, in order to operate the District, until tax revenues were received. The Fiscal Year 2025 Adopted Budget and

actual spending. No Board action was required. Mr. Staley noted that halfway down Page 63, there was a section for the Heritage Crossing Community Center (HCCC). Ms. Adams explained that there were two issues: the Reunion East CDD Board, made the decision to parse out the HCCC direct expenses for operating the facility, in order to understand the costs and impact to the overall budget. At the same time that the CDD took over management of HCCC, custodial services were bid out and there was a new provider selected.

## iv. Replacement and Maintenance Plan

Ms. Adams presented the R&M Plan, which was for informational purposes. The spreadsheet was updated each month by her and Mr. Scheerer. The items in process or deferred, were at the top of the list, followed by the Fiscal Year 2025 project list. The item to be presented in December, was included on today's agenda and two proposals would be provided to the Reunion East CDD Board in February. Mr. Staley pointed out that the sidewalk that was budgeted at \$300,000, was deferred and would be explained when the Long-Range Plan was discussed. The radar signs would also be included. Ms. Adams clarified that the radar display line item, was for signage replacement and the radar display signs.

## v. Year End Review of CDD Accomplishments

Ms. Adams reported that a suggestion was made at last month's Reunion East CDD meeting to provide residents with a review of CDD accomplishments and plans for 2025, as the Board was frustrated with the ability to openly communicate with residents outside of the meeting due the Sunshine Law. A draft letter to residents was included in the agenda package, for Board Member review, feedback and comments. Mr. Witcher felt that this was a good letter to send to all residents, as well as non-residents. Mr. Greenstein pointed out that it was excellent for a first draft and was a long-time coming and provided the following edits:

- 1. Change "upgraded playground nearby Liberty Bluff" to "upgraded playground in Liberty Bluff."
- 2. Change "The entrance gatehouse at Sinclair Road, Spine Road and Reunion Boulevard were replaced," to "The entrance gatehouse roofs at Sinclair Road, Spine Road and Reunion Boulevard were replaced and there were other renovations."

- 3. Change "The Seven Eagles fountain near Gathering Drive was refurbished," to "The Seven Eagles fountain near Gathering Drive was completely refurbished to include a new filtration and lighting system."
- 4. In the sentence, "A resident only access control system and gates are scheduled to be installed on Spine Road between Reunion Village and Tradition Boulevard," include in parenthesis "(Davenport Creek Bridge)."

Mr. Staley was frustrated that no one contacted Board Members so that they could understand their concerns and requested in the last sentence changing "Board members and staff stand ready," to "Board members and staff, whose contact details are available on the websites, stand ready to be of service to residents and look forward to a productive New Year." Ms. Adams would incorporate these changes, revise the letter and distribute it to the Associations.

#### E. Security Report

Ms. Adams provided under separate cover, the November Security Report from Reunion Security and the Reunion West POA. No Board action was required. Mr. Victor Vargas of Reunion Security noted that everything was going well this month. Today they were busy with tournaments this weekend. In the community, there were six houses that they were monitoring. On Muirfield Loop, they had some challenges but it was under control. There parking was an issue, as the homeowners had five to six vehicles and the only parking spaces, were across from the home but they did not move the vehicles or their trash cans, which made it hard for the adjoining homeowners to park there. Security worked with the guests to find parking but here were times, especially during the holidays, where parking was out of control with this specific home. This past weekend, when the Orlando Fest was held, people gathered in front of the house at a specific time but when security intervened it turned aggressive. The security team did a great job controlling it. They tagged vehicles and communicated with the guests but sometimes homeowners wanted them to tow vehicles; however, there was a process that they had to follow. This specific homeowner got aggressive and upset, not only with the guests, but also with staff. That was one of the challenges that they had, which he spoke with Ms. Adams and Mr. Staley about.

Ms. Harley pointed out that the homeowner did not park their own vehicles on their driveway. His mother's camper van was parked permanently in the road for the last two years and she had photographs of him placing nails underneath a guest's tires. Mr. Staley noted that trash cans were also left out 24/7 and offered to meet face-to-face with the homeowner and Mr. Vargas.

December 12, 2024 Page 13 of 15

Ms. Trucco requested that Mr. Staley, if he chose to have such discussions, not speak on behalf of the CDD or in his capacity as Chairman but rather in a resident-to-resident capacity. Mr. Greenstein felt that it would be helpful to have a representative of the Master Association involved, as there were some POA issues. Mr. Staley would invite them. Mr. Witcher questioned whether Mr. Vargas received all of the fleet replacements. Mr. Vargas confirmed that they had all of their vehicles and new uniforms. Mr. Witcher liked the logos on them. Mr. Vargas reported on January 1<sup>st</sup>, they would be adding more patrols per shift.

#### TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

#### **Other Business**

## A. Discussion of Long-Range Plan

Ms. Adams reported now that Fiscal Year 2024 concluded, Mr. Staley prepared some yearend numbers and a draft of a Long-Range Plan which was included in the agenda package. Mr. Staley presented the Long-Range Plan, which was for informational purposes, as it would be revisited several times before next year's budget was approved. The first section was suggested financial goals, which had not changed since a prior version was provided to the Board in September. The purpose was to break even in the General Fund, in order to have \$500,000 in the General Fund at the end of each year, to fund the expenses of the first quarter of the new fiscal year and build up to a \$1 million reserve in the R&M Fund by the end of 2030. They could do this in two ways; by raising assessments and lowering expenses and transferring funds to the R&M Fund or by managing R&M expenditures more carefully and reducing costs in order to build up reserves. When the 2025 budget was prepared, it was discovered that the District spent on custodial services for the HCCC; however, \$75,000 was budgeted and an additional \$75,000 was included for 2025, for a total of \$150,000. Furthermore, if \$150,000 was the right number, with Reunion East CDD sharing 57% versus their 47% share, the total cost of running the HCCC, was over \$300,000, which needed to be refined. Ms. Adams advised the total cost for custodial services was \$11,500 per month, inclusive of HCCC. Mr. Staley questioned where the \$75,000 allocated in the budget came from. Ms. Adams explained that it was aggregated between landscaping, utilities, maintenance and any expenses related to operating the HCCC. Mr. Staley requested a synopsis of what HCCC was costing the District, as there was \$75,000 budgeted for a facility that was not being used. Mr. Greenstein agreed that budget formulation was important and recommended scheduling a workshop to have further discussion. Mr. Staley suggested scheduling one after the new year.

Major assumptions that Mr. Staley included in the Long-Range Plan, included legal expenses of \$125,000 for 2025 and 2026, under his assumptions, but it could be lower, once the litigation matters were addressed. The combined R&M Budget for 2025 was \$2.5 million, which included the paving work. In order to help reserves, they needed to reduce expenditures. Fortunately, the District saved \$300,000 on the sidewalk project and there may be savings on signage. By pushing some expenditures into next year's budget, there could be savings of \$600,000 in 2025. R&M spending in 2026 would be \$750,000 with \$500,000 per year in the remaining years. The Reserve Study would provide actual numbers and the plan was to discuss this further at the February Board meeting. In addition, if they were going to build up reserves, breaking even in the General Fund and having \$1 million at the end of every year, they must increase assessments next year. Mr. Staley preferred to split the increase next year into two pieces, 12.5% in 2026 and another 12.5% in 2027 and spreading it over a couple of years, versus hitting people with a big assessment in the first year. In the next two pages, Mr. Staley showed how the numbers were built up. The first line was the gross assessment, which was \$1.9 million for this year. Increasing it 12.5% in 2026, would increase it to \$2.1 million and another 12.5%, would increase it to \$2.4 million, which would allow them to break even on the General Fund, which was reflected in Line 18. The General Fund balance at the end of 2030, as reflected in Line 22, was \$577,000. An analysis of the R&M Fund was on the last page, which would be filled in, when the Reserve Study was received in February. Ms. Adams had the Reserve Study, which assumed a 3% inflationary index. It did not include any new capital projects approved by the Board, but she had an extended spreadsheet, which she would provide to Mr. Staley. The remainder of the R&M Fund was discussed by Mr. Staley. Line 39 showed what would occur if they gradually built-up reserves from \$437,000 at the end of 2025, to their target of \$1 million by the end of 2030. The Board Members appreciated all of Mr. Staley's hard work.

#### **ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS** Supervisor's Requests

There being no comments, the next item followed.

## TWELFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Next Meeting Date: January 9, 2025

Ms. Adams announced that the next meeting was scheduled for January 9, 2025 at 11:00 a.m. at this location.

December 12, 2024 Page 15 of 15

THIRTEENTH 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:

Graham Staley

439F73A503AA4F2...

Chairman/Vice Chairman