

**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 8, 2026** at 10:30 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
Garrett Huegel	Yellowstone Landscape
Victor Vargas	Reunion Security
Grace Montanez	Reunion West POA
Shaienne Berry	Reunion West POA

*The following is a summary of the discussions and actions taken at the January 8, 2026 Reunion West Community Development District Board of Supervisors meeting.*

**FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Roll Call**

Ms. Adams called the meeting to order at 10:30 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.

**THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Approval of the Minutes of the November 13, 2025 and December 11, 2025 Board of Supervisors Meetings**

Ms. Adams presented the minutes of the November 13, 2025 Board of Supervisors meeting, a draft of which were reviewed by the District Manager and District Counsel and were included in the agenda package. Meeting corrections were provided from both the Reunion West and Reunion East CDD Boards. Mr. Greenstein clarified that Mr. Jack Gaskins was staff with the Special Districts Accountability Program.

On MOTION by Mr. Barry seconded by Mr. Greenstein with all in favor the Minutes of the November 13, 2025 Board of Supervisors Meeting were approved as amended.

Ms. Adams presented the minutes of the December 11, 2025 Board of Supervisors meeting, a draft of which were reviewed by the District Manager and District Counsel and were included in the agenda package. Mr. Staley recalled that Mr. Witcher stated that residents on the Reunion West side were paying 47% of those expenses, but it should be 43%.

On MOTION by Mr. Staley seconded by Mr. Witcher with all in favor the Minutes of the December 11, 2025 Board of Supervisors Meeting were approved as amended.

**FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Public Hearing to Amend and Restate Parking Rules**

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein seconded by Mr. Staley with all in favor the public hearing to amend and restate the Parking Rules was opened.

**B. Public Comment**

Ms. Adams reported that the proposed Parking Rules were reviewed at two separate meetings. The Board was making an effort to stay in tandem with the Parking Rules at Reunion East. The Reunion West CDD Board also wanted to capture language that restricts parking nearby speed bumps and a general liability statement was added by District Counsel. Other than that, there were no changes to the parking maps or any other changes to the Parking Rules. They were mainly

**Reunion West CDD  
Regular Meeting**

**January 8, 2026  
Page 3 of 15**

administrative updates. The CDD was required to take public comments at this time. There were no public comments.

On MOTION by Mr. Staley seconded by Mr. Greenstein with all in favor the public hearing to amend and restate the Parking Rules was closed.

**C. Consideration of Resolution 2026-01 Adopting Amended and Restated Parking Rules**

Ms. Adams presented Resolution 2026-01 Adopting Amended and Restated Parking Rules, which were included in the agenda package.

On MOTION by Mr. Witcher seconded by Mr. Greenstein with all in favor Resolution 2026-01 Adopting the Amended and Restated Parking Rules was adopted.

Mr. Staley pointed out that the Board did not change the rules often, but if either CDD makes a change he hoped that it could be coordinated so the rules could be aligned. Mr. Greenstein agreed, as long as it was on both agendas at the same time. Ms. Adams reported that the Reunion East CDD Board was scheduled to review their Parking Rules today and the only change that they were contemplating was to have time restricted parking near a playground. This would not affect Reunion West CDD, as there was already time restricted parking at their playground.

**FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Staff Reports**

**A. Attorney**

Ms. Trucco recalled discussion at last month's meeting regarding joint meetings. She spoke with the Reunion East CDD Board to see if there was a desire to hold more meetings before she did additional work on that topic and incurred fees for the CDDs. At this time, the Reunion East CDD Board was not interested in having joint meetings. Therefore, she would no longer research this topic. Mr. Staley asked if there was a unanimous decision. Mr. Greenstein pointed out that they voted on it when Ms. Hobbs was not present and a majority approved the motion. Mr. Staley questioned whether GMS wanted to know for their other CDDs if joint meetings were allowed, as he would like to know, if at some point in the future, this CDD Board decided to have joint meetings. Otherwise, they would have to get the lawyers to review it to see whether it was possible.

**Reunion West CDD  
Regular Meeting****January 8, 2026  
Page 4 of 15**

Mr. Witcher felt that something needed to be resolved as the Interlocal Agreement referred to joint meetings at any point in time and they represented citizens that were paying 43% of costs. Furthermore, the Interlocal Agreement stated that they were supposed to be involved in any decisions related to the expense of maintenance and operations.

Mr. Greenstein pointed out that it was a sensitive subject, whether the reasons were substantive or not, as the perception caused pushback on "*joint meeting*." However, he did not like using the word, "*joint*," until they knew the legal opinion and therefore, there was a need for information sharing. In addition, he did not recall there being a Reunion East vote on the concept of having a joint meeting; although, he did solicit input from the Supervisors. However, he did not give his own opinion, as he only talked about the benefits of having a combined meeting. Mr. Staley recalled that Mr. Greenstein favored the concept, but one Board Member did not. Mr. Greenstein noted that Ms. Hobbs was not present but felt that it was important that Mr. Jack Gaskins provide an opinion that they should not have combined meetings. Therefore, it was a good idea to come up with a definitive opinion as to how they should conduct concurrent meetings, so that information could be shared and decisions could be made more efficiently. As a result, they modified their procedures to address some of the issues that were being presented. Ms. Trucco reported that she spoke with Mr. Gaskins. He was not a lawyer, but he had a great deal of experience because they wanted to be in the right as much as possible and not take any risk at all, as there were severe penalties. Therefore, she would always err on the side of caution and advise that the Board stay as legal and ethical as they possibly could, but there was statute language that was sometimes ambiguous.

Ms. Trucco felt that they needed to look at how they were interpreting the language and precedent cases that have been decided and adjudicated before that have interpreted that same language to those particular facts, but it depends on the facts of each situation and how the language was being interpreted. Mr. Gaskins felt strongly that joint meetings were not permitted for Special Districts, of which the CDD was a Special District and she requested the statute that was the basis of that opinion, which he provided and Ms. Trucco reviewed. She did not see anything that expressly prohibited joint meetings, but it could be interpreted that way. This individual had a great deal of experience in Special Districts and she wanted to not take any risk, which was why she wanted to speak to the Board first to see if they wanted her to do an analysis into that specific statute to see if there was any case law. She looked through Attorney General Opinions and did

**Reunion West CDD  
Regular Meeting**

**January 8, 2026  
Page 5 of 15**

not see anything, but her firm had experience doing memorandums showing the gray area and areas of interpretation. The lawyers that Ms. Trucco spoke to were in agreement with her, but that was not to say that may be correct and deserved their attention. However, if the Board was interested in doing joint meetings, she was not comfortable saying there was no risk and recommended looking into it deeper and bringing back information to the Board. Mr. Witcher wanted to investigate this further and look into the Interlocal Agreement, as it referenced that it was perfectly acceptable to have joint meetings for the purpose of dealing with maintenance and operations of the two CDDs. Ms. Trucco recalled when this Interlocal Agreement was adopted joint meetings were perfectly legal, but now there were interpretations by the Attorney General or a judge that provided the correct interpretation and would look into that. Mr. Staley proposed asking Ms. Trucco to perform a thorough professional review into the legality of holding any form of joint or concurrent meetings between the two CDDs.

On MOTION by Mr. Staley seconded by Mr. Witcher with all in favor authorizing District Counsel to perform a thorough professional review into the legality of holding any joint or concurrent meetings between the two CDDs was approved.

Mr. Greenstein pointed out that he had been through these kinds of issues many times in his career and there were certain procedures that must be respected, but some of the points that came up in discussion about the meeting were practical every day operational matters, but not statutory matters. At the last meeting, they stated if it was an east only item it should be voted on by the Reunion East CDD Board, but if it was a west only item it should be voted on only by the Reunion West CDD Board because it would not be on the agenda of the other Board if it was strictly unique to that Board. However, because they were all one community and there was an Interlocal Agreement, they needed to ensure that there was effective communication on the same day so that the Boards could make proper decisions and everyone would feel like their input was being heard. Furthermore, Mr. Greenstein was sure about what the outcome was going to be and they just needed it to be in writing. If they needed to have legal review, that was fine but they needed to be as pragmatic as they could be, as there were Districts in Florida that only operate with concurrent or joint meetings. Therefore, they needed to adjudicate this quickly and move on.

*Ms. Harley joined the meeting.*

**Reunion West CDD  
Regular Meeting****January 8, 2026  
Page 6 of 15**

Ms. Trucco felt that Mr. Gaskins was qualified and had a great deal of experience. She appreciated his insight, as they needed to ensure that they were compliant with the laws. Mr. Greenstein indicated that if he had to testify in court regarding this issue, he would say that he did not personally research where Mr. Gaskins was employed. Ms. Adams confirmed that Mr. Gaskins was associated with the Special District resources and contacts for the State of Florida. Ms. Trucco offered to look into it but pointed out that Mr. Gaskins felt strongly that this was the correct interpretation of the law and believed that he had some experience with the State, respected his opinion and would provide the Board with an answer. Ms. Harley asked if the Reunion East CDD Board questioned the legality of joint meetings or an individual. Ms. Trucco recalled that an individual brought up the issue.

Mr. Staley asked if GMS had Special Districts that also have joint meetings or if this was the only Special District. Ms. Trucco pointed out that all CDDs were Special Districts. Mr. Staley voiced concern as an elected official that they were responsible to the taxpayers, as they entrusted the Board with their money and to be spending money through the 57%/43% cost sharing split, without having much visibility to that split, applied to both Boards. It was more of an issue for Reunion West because most of the assets were on the east side, which was why the Reunion East CDD had more contracts to review for the buildings and pool. Therefore, to discharge their responsibility to the taxpayers, they must be well versed and understanding of what was being done. They never approve any overspend or unbudgeted items either on the operating side or the capital maintenance side and if the Reunion West CDD Board decided to spend \$1 million on a project, the Reunion East CDD Board would have no say and vice versa. In that case, Mr. Greenstein was right in that they have to find a way of working together, by having joint or concurrent meetings or some other vehicle. In his opinion, Mr. Staley felt that having joint meetings was a brilliant way of getting around all of that, as they had an opportunity to express their views and Mr. Greenstein has been an invaluable asset to the west because he knows what was occurring in the east. However, Mr. Greenstein's term was up at the end of November and he could no longer run, as he was not a resident of Reunion West. Therefore, they needed a way to work together so they could find a more practical way of discharging their responsibilities in both CDDs.

Mr. Greenstein was confident that they would get to where they needed to be and believed that this community, as large as it was, takes the input of 10 Supervisors to finalize an issue and it

**Reunion West CDD  
Regular Meeting****January 8, 2026  
Page 7 of 15**

was not just a Reunion East or West item. Years ago, the idea of consolidating meetings came up again and again in the last two years, but they would straighten this out. Mr. Staley noted that it would get straightened out step by step and felt that Mr. Witcher made some good comments on the Interlocal Agreement. It mentioned that joint operation and maintenance would be through one interconnected community, but each CDD would be responsible separately for costs. Some contracts had to be executed jointly, but Mr. Staley never signed a contract alongside Mr. Greenstein's signature; however, the agreement provides for all of this and that there must be approval by both Districts. They could get there a different way, but they must find a way as there would be an instance where something would come up and they would wonder why they were approving it. They were not approving it but simply having to pay for it. Therefore, they should be ahead of the curve. Ms. Trucco offered to revisit the Interlocal Agreement, if the Boards wanted to. Mr. Greenstein pointed out that the document was 16 years old when the Boards were developer controlled.

Ms. Adams explained that the purpose was to function as one community, which was important when they talked about the access between the communities and how residents enter the community and what access credentials could be used at each respective gate. Mr. Staley noted that Reunion Village and Encore Reunion West were only ideas in those days, which makes it even more important that they discharge their responsibilities as elected officials. Mr. Barry was happy that the Interlocal Agreement was circulated, as it brought to mind whether it was appropriate to have one and whether one side versus the other was getting value out of that. Mr. Staley felt if they took a poll of people that used Seven Eagles, the vast majority of people would be from the east side as he could not see anyone from Encore going over to Seven Eagles. Mr. Staley pointed out that the operating costs that they pay on a lot in the west was \$1,000 per year. It would make a huge difference if they did not have to pay towards the operation and maintenance expenses of the east side assets, but it would not change anyone's lifestyle. However, there may be issues with the capital costs. Therefore, it was worth keeping it in the back of their minds as they review this document in the future. His focus was on making it workable because if the east Board wanted a \$1 million project that the west did not think was an appropriate project, there was no way of preventing what was happening today. They needed to find a way to have input without any conflict.

**Reunion West CDD  
Regular Meeting****January 8, 2026  
Page 8 of 15**

Mr. Greenstein recalled that they existed as a resort community since 2003, which was over 20 years. This was his third term on the Board and they rarely had anything that was so contentious that it was an east versus west thing. The reason why they had the agreement, besides the fiduciary and administrative things, was because everybody in the west could use any of the amenities in the east. Mr. Staley agreed, as they have only been an independent taxpayer-controlled Board since 2020. Prior to that, those positions were filled by two Kingwood representatives and an HOA Member. Mr. Greenstein recalled that he was on the Master Association and had to resign when Encore came in because Encore wanted representation on the Master Association Board. Mr. Staley felt that Mr. Greenstein's point was valid and that this was a good discussion. Mr. Staley preferred to have an answer from Ms. Trucco within four to six weeks. Ms. Trucco offered to aim for four to six weeks and would have an associate of her firm, who made less per hour, to start doing the research. Mr. Greenstein preferred to have a concurrent but separate meeting and felt that it should not take that much research to get an opinion from in-house counsel as to how they can conduct concurrent meetings because GMS supports Districts that only operate that way. To answer Mr. Barry's question, Mr. Staley preferred to get an answer from District Counsel and then try to organize as many joint concurrent meetings as possible. During those meetings, they would discuss the Interlocal Agreement as it was out of date.

Mr. Barry questioned whether property owners would want this or was it better for them to not have this. If so, Mr. Staley did not feel that was a good use of their time and residents, particularly those in the Encore community would feel the same. In addition, he spoke to the Reunion East CDD Board about why they had to pay for Seven Eagles, as well as playgrounds and pools that they would not use, since they were paying the same assessment. Ms. Harley felt that was a valid question but believed that the Board was totally ignorant to the number of guests that stay at Encore to use those Reunion East amenities because that was what they promoted to short term guests. Mr. Staley pointed out that Mr. Barry raised a good point on what their taxpayers want in this cost sharing arrangement and whether they would want access to those facilities. Ms. Harley was sad that they were in this position when at the end of the day, it was all one resort and cared about what the east, the village and Encore looked like because it was part of the west. Mr. Greenstein wanted uniformity, because it was the most efficient, economical way of getting some amenities in place before the club was established and The Grand was built. Hopefully, property owners would see that the actual unit cost of contributing to assets that were in another District

**Reunion West CDD  
Regular Meeting****January 8, 2026  
Page 9 of 15**

was minuscule in comparison to the benefit. Mr. Staley questioned whether they were doing the right thing for all of their constituents.

Ms. Harley pointed out that it was more than the financial aspect, it was the community aspect, regardless of which side elected them to the position, which was why they should be involved together so they were all equally informed in order to answer people when they were asked questions. Mr. Staley agreed and requested that this item be included on the agenda for the next meeting in order to discuss it more in-depth, but questioned whether the Reunion East Board would proceed with having concurrent or joint meetings if Mr. Gaskins stated that they could have them. Mr. Greenstein would promote it and make it clear for the Board what the benefits were, as he believed that they were going to come out of this review with guidance on how to legally proceed. Mr. Barry preferred to discuss this item more in March, as he was not going to be available in February. Ms. Trucco reported that she reached out to eminent domain counsel and they provided an update on all of the parcels that were subject to the eminent domain proceedings, which she forwarded to the Board. It was a slightly more complicated situation due to the repeated changes made by the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) and eminent domain counsel could bring counter offers to the Board for review for each parcel. Mr. Witcher asked if it was standard practice to file suit, as it seemed odd to him that the CDD was filing lawsuits without talking to someone and negotiating a price. Ms. Trucco recalled that the State provided initial notice and the Board approved the engagement of Gray Robinson, who were excellent in her opinion. They went through this process and the State filed suit. At the Reunion East CDD Board, eminent domain counsel would introduce himself to the Reunion East CDD Board. At the request of Mr. Staley, Ms. Trucco would provide screenshots of each parcel.

Mr. Greenstein recalled that the list was more extensive than what they were initially shown, which was why he liked Mr. Witcher's question on why a lawsuit was filed when the CDD was a subunit of county government. Instead of a lawsuit, there should be an administrative procedure to acquire it with mediation or third-party review in order to ensure that they were getting fair value for the property. Ms. Trucco explained that a CDD could not file suit and therefore the State brings the suit against property that it wants to acquire. Furthermore, as part of the Statute, the State must pay all of the CDD attorney's fees and costs. To answer Mr. Witcher's question, Ms. Trucco pointed out that there was nothing to suggest that this has not gone through a regular course of action. Mr. Greenstein indicated that laws were written without regard to the

**Reunion West CDD  
Regular Meeting****January 8, 2026  
Page 10 of 15**

entities that may be impacted by it and when it comes to a governmental entity, there should be a provision that allowed them to avoid that process but it involves acquiring through eminent domain, private property, which becomes a legal battle. Ms. Trucco would ask if there was a meeting that the Board could call into to ask for specific information. Mr. Staley preferred to include this item on the agenda and hear from eminent domain counsel at the February meeting and at the same time get information about the parcels. Regarding the pending litigation, Ms. Trucco reported that the litigators requested a Shade Session the week of January 26<sup>th</sup>, with the best days being January 26<sup>th</sup> and January 27<sup>th</sup>. Discussion ensued and there was Board consensus to hold the Shade Session on January 27<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Barry requested that Mr. Daniel Baker, be in attendance, in case they had any clarifying questions. Before Christmas, he sent some comments on his reaction to the meeting and suggested when they made their reply, they state their rationale for the request. Ms. Trucco forwarded those comments to the litigators.

On MOTION by Mr. Barry seconded by Mr. Greenstein with all in favor scheduling a Shade Session for January 27, 2026 to discuss the pending litigation was approved.

**B. Engineer**

Mr. Curley reported that it was the new year and new stormwater rules have come into effect. It would not affect the CDD this year and would go into effect next year. As an entity, they had to prepare a schedule and have the inspection checklist ready for when that time comes. They would look at the different stormwater facilities and when they would be inspected, which would be reported to the South Florida Water Management District.

**C. Field Manager Updates**

Mr. Scheerer reported that right before the holidays, the flex stakes at the entry gate were fixed. However, seven were damaged and would be replaced next week, as he acquired 12 additional stakes that were placed into The Stables. Irrigation inspection and repairs were ongoing. They had some minor gate repairs at the Sinclair gate. Some no parking signs were reinstalled, as Encore had some issues with drivers over the holidays. They planned to relocate the speed hump sign on Grand Traverse Parkway next week. He would install the no pets on the playground sign as quickly as he could and was waiting on the overall striping proposal from Fausnight. There

**Reunion West CDD  
Regular Meeting****January 8, 2026  
Page 11 of 15**

would be a great deal of legwork from them to do all the linear footage and come up with those costs, but he was in communication with them and met with them right before the holiday. On Monday, he spoke with the manager to see where they were and they hoped to have that soon so that it could be presented at the February meeting. Mr. Staley asked if this was for striping the curbs on all of the tables. Mr. Scheerer replied affirmatively as there were some no parking zones that were being created on the east side, as well as Phases 4 and 5 in Reunion Village, even though the signs were not going in there until construction was completed which would be tied to the 2027 budget. He just received an email from security that the exit gate at Sinclair was not parallel. It has been called into service.

Regarding the Action Items List, the Reunion Village Davenport Bridge gates were ready. There was internet and everything was good to go. They were waiting on Guardian Access to come out, initiate the gates, have security and staff go through all of the testing and ensure that the readers were functioning. At that time, they would discuss when they would be put into service with all of the construction taking place. Other than that, things were moving along. They were currently doing maintenance work at the various entities. Mr. Witcher noticed that weed barrier material that was exposed at the playground on Grand Traverse Parkway and Valhalla Terrace, which could become a trip hazard. Mr. Scheerer would get with Yellowstone. They were currently installing mulch throughout the community and would have them refill the mulch at this location. Mr. Staley pointed out that they did not have any damage during the holidays. Mr. Scheerer agreed that things went smoothly and there were no major issues. Mr. Staley reported that someone ran into the no parking sign outside of Bears Den. Signs were put up quickly, but they used galvanized posts. Mr. Scheerer explained that they used galvanized because they did not have any of the 3-inch black posts, which was his decision, so people knew during the holidays that it was a no parking zone. Fausnight was working on providing extra 3-inch black powder coated poles that they would keep in stock at The Stables. Mr. Greenstein agreed, as they had to follow safety first. Mr. Staley asked if they were reimbursed by the person that hit the no parking sign. Mr. Scheerer would forward the invoice once he received it. Ms. Adams was holding the invoice until she received the resident's contact information from Reunion Security. Ms. Adams announced that Ms. Grace Montanez, the Property Manager for Reunion West Property Owners Association was present but had no information to report to the Board.

**Reunion West CDD  
Regular Meeting****January 8, 2026  
Page 12 of 15**

Ms. Adams reported that during the COVID pandemic, the Governor authorized that Florida governments could meet virtually and during that time the CDD had Zoom meetings, but once they went back to in-person meetings, staff was asked to continue offering Zoom services as a convenience for residents. They were not required to offer it, but Board Members felt if it was more convenient for residents to attend via Zoom, they wanted to offer it when possible. She tried different kinds of audio and video to see what worked well for Zoom attendees. There were now two speaker/microphones spread throughout the room. According to Zoom attendees last month, the audio quality was fine. At the request of the Board, she solicited a proposal for enhanced audio and video support. The proposal was distributed to Board members. In order to allow for enhanced audio at the Board meetings, for each Board Member to have their own handheld microphones and a microphone for members of the public to speak into, the cost would be approximately \$900 to \$1,000 per meeting. However, if both CDDs wanted to participate, that cost could be split.

Ms. Harley questioned whether it would bring in more attendance. Mr. Barry liked this idea. Mr. Greenstein preferred purchasing basic equipment for \$200 to \$500 and a PA system. Mr. Staley believed that the \$900 to \$1,000 per meeting would be to pay someone from The Grand to set up the equipment at each meeting. Ms. Adams pointed out that once they had six microphones, they needed a mixing board and other equipment, which they did not have. Mr. Staley pointed out that they were spending residents' money and \$6,000 per year seemed like a great deal of money. Ms. Adams recalled that because of the comments about audio during the recent Reunion East CDD meeting, one of the attendees emailed her after the meeting to indicate that the audio was good. Mr. Staley suggested placing a chair next to the microphone when a member of the public was speaking. Mr. Greenstein pointed out that they moved the seats which may mitigate the problem as the seating was closer to the microphone, but if it becomes a problem they will look at it again. Mr. Greenstein recommended investing in a system that had six microphones, speakers and a mixing board. This item was tabled.

**Reunion West CDD  
Regular Meeting**

**January 8, 2026  
Page 13 of 15**

**D. District Manager's Report**

**i. Action Items**

The Action Items List was included in the agenda package for Reunion East and West CDDs. It included items that were being tracked and was provided to Board Members a week in advance of the meeting.

**ii. Approval of Check Register**

Ms. Adams presented the Check Register from December 1, 2025 through December 31, 2025 in the amount of \$2,682,231.

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein seconded by Ms. Harley 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, 2025, which were included in the agenda package. Mr. Staley asked if they phased the landscape expense into a 12-month period. Ms. Adams indicated that landscape was tricky because it accounted for the installation of mulch and other items that occur once a year, but they could look at that. Mr. Staley pointed out that he did not want to see a variance of \$67,000. Ms. Adams explained basic landscape services were billed on a 1:12 basis, but the other special services were billed only when they occurred and when approved by the Operations Manager. However, they could separate out the billables for mulch, quarterly annuals, tree trimming, etc. and include them as a separate line item in future budget years. All of the debt service payments that were due in November were completed.

**iv. Replacement and Maintenance Plan**

Ms. Adams presented the R&M Plan, which was included in the agenda package.

**v. Consideration of Revised Fiscal Year 2026 Meeting Schedule**

Ms. Adams recalled that there was prior discussion about the meeting schedule and included in the agenda package was a schedule for the remainder of the calendar year with meetings on the second Thursday of the month through September at 10:30 a.m.

On MOTION by Mr. Witcher seconded by Mr. Greenstein with all in favor the revised Fiscal Year 2026 meeting schedule was approved.

**vi. E-Mail Subscribers**

Ms. Adams presented the number of active email subscribers for the CDD's email, which were included in the agenda package. As of the end of December, there were 160 active subscribers for Reunion West and 125 active subscribers for Reunion East. An update was sent regarding the updated parking policies, amenity center closure and a traffic advisory. Mr. Staley pointed out that he did not want to know who was clicking or not clicking but wanted to know how many people were registered. Ms. Adams would report on the number of subscribers in future reports.

**vii. Security Report**

Ms. Adams reported that the November Security Reports from Reunion Security and the Reunion West POA were provided to the Board under separate cover. No Board action was required and was for informational purposes. Mr. Victor Vargas of Reunion Security was present to answer any questions. He reported that last month was quiet. Mr. Staley read on Facebook that young kids were causing issues in Patriots Landing. Mr. Vargas indicated that they were keeping an eye on them. This was when there was no school. Ms. Harley heard yesterday that Rolling Loud, the largest hip hop festival in the world, was going to take place in Orlando at Camping World from May 8<sup>th</sup> to 10<sup>th</sup>.

**SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS****Other Business**

There being no comments, the next item followed.

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

Ms. Harley noted that she and Mr. Barry would not be attending the February meeting. Ms. Adams pointed out if there were no time sensitive items, the Chair had the discretion to defer agenda items to the next meeting and cancel the February meeting. Mr. Staley did not want to cancel the February meeting, as the Board would be reviewing Ms. Trucco's findings.

**Reunion West CDD  
Regular Meeting**

**January 8, 2026  
Page 15 of 15**

**EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Next Meeting Date: February 12, 2026**

The next meeting was scheduled for February 12, 2026 at 10:30 a.m. at this location.

**NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Adjournment**

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

Signed by:  
*Tricia Adams*  
3F3E5FA5C67E43B...

Secretary/Assistant Secretary

Signed by:  
*Graham Staley*  
439F73A503AA4F2...

Chairman/Vice Chairman