

MINUTES OF MEETING
REUNION EAST
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

The Regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Reunion East Community Development District was held Thursday, July 11, 2019 at 1:00 p.m. at the Heritage Crossing Community Center, 7715 Heritage Crossing Way, Reunion, Florida.

Present and constituting a quorum were:

Mark Greenstein	Chairman
Don Harding	Vice Chairman
John Dryburgh	Assistant Secretary by phone
Steven Goldstein	Assistant Secretary
Trudy Hobbs	Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

George Flint	District Manager
Andrew d'Adesky	District Counsel
Steve Boyd	Boyd Civil Engineering
Alan Scheerer	Field Manager
Rob Stultz	Yellowstone
John Cruz	CWS Security
Richard Nasser	Kingwood Resort

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

Roll Call

Mr. Flint called the meeting to order and called the roll and a quorum was present.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS

Public Comment Period

Mr. Flint: Any members of the public have comment for the Reunion East Board?
Hearing none, we will move to the next item.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS

Approval of the Minutes of the June 13, 2019 Meeting

Mr. Flint: Are there any additions, corrections or deletions?

Mr. Harding: I have a couple of comments on who said what. On page 13, it says "Mr. Harding: There seem to be some short-term rentals on my street," I think that was Mr. Dryburgh,

not me. Then on page 15 on the middle of the page it says, "All of these houses on this park are rental homes. The only permanent homeowners there are Kim and Bob." I don't know those people.

Mr. Goldstein: That was me.

Mr. Harding: Those were the only things I could see.

Mr. Flint: Okay. Any other comments?

Mr. Greenstein: On page 1 we have to properly identified Rick Feather, somehow it became Steve Feller. Even though on the West minutes he was correctly identified, but he didn't survive the East minutes.

Mr. Flint: Interesting.

Mr. Greenstein: Starting on page 4 and going through that Sixth Order of Business, we just have to change it to be Mr. Feather.

Mr. Flint: Right.

Mr. Greenstein: On page 17 the comment I made, "Being on the Reunion West Board I have mentioned from time to time about doing more than just the grass there." We are talking about the median on St. Cloud Rd. I said, "I think at some point down the road that entrance." It stays, "will," it should be "could" become the main entrance because of traffic and road construction.

Mr. Flint: Okay.

Mr. Greenstein: I don't anyone to think that I'm shifting the entrance to that side.

Mr. Flint: Okay. Anything else?

Mr. Dryburgh: On page 17 after Yellowstone Rep, "Kevin told me that none of the ones on the golf course currently work." That was me, not Mr. Harding.

On MOTION by Mr. Harding seconded by Mr. Greenstein with all in favor, the Minutes of June 13, 2019 Meeting, were approved, as amended.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Consideration of Request for Closure of Spine Road Bridge Access for Reunion Village

Mr. Flint: The issue of the Reunion Village and Spine Road Bridge Access, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Greenstein: At the last meeting we deferred action on that item to give the Board the opportunity to receive more information about the issue. As a result, I had a meeting yesterday with Richard Nasser of Kingwood and Fred Zohouri who's another principal in Kingwood and Kevin Bacon the GM asking them for their input on the issue. As a result, there have been discussions and there will continue to be discussions with Encore about the Reunion Village Project and Encore's specific request to close off access to the bridge. Do you have anything else to add, Richard?

Mr. Nasser: Not really, other than we are meeting next week and hopefully we will have something in the next couple of weeks.

Mr. Greenstein: And from discussions that I had with Encore with John Chiste. He's on the West Board so I can speak with him about it since it's an East Board matter. They are open and looking forward to meeting with Kingwood to take another look at that Reunion Village Project. So, it's more than just the bridge, it's the project itself. That's probably why we don't see Mr. Feather here, asking for where's the action on his request. Because they didn't withdraw it, but there's nothing for us to take action on.

Mr. Harding: I would just like to make some comments. I wrote a little epistle that I handed out to fellow Supervisors and I also had some input from David Burman who gave me some written input saying my personal opinion is that there are already many examples of Reunion Parcels being detached from the core, but are part of the community none the less. Adding another free pass throughway into Reunion just adds to our problem of public access to the community. I'm okay with it becoming an emergency exit, which is what Mr. Feather is proposing as an emergency exit and not a regular through type road. And that's what his proposal is. The other issue I have too, is the fact that it is not part of our Reunion Master Association. The other part is security won't have any control over that area either. So, those are some reasons that I've outlined in my little epistle. I think we are okay with it being an emergency gate and having it being landscaped like a park like they had proposed. That's what I would recommend to approving as far as the Board is concerned.

Mr. Goldstein: I have one comment to make and its discussions that I've had with people that I know on a regular basis. Nobody has a problem with that being an emergency exit. It doesn't affect us at all. It won't create traffic. It will give them what they are asking for and it gives us a park which is kind of nice there. They could still walk through that area from their side

if they want access to Reunion too. There's nothing stopping them from riding a bicycle through the grass or walking over. But I have to agree and I think everybody else I talked to said the same thing, they don't want another hole in the sieve. And our security has already admitted they can't stop people from coming through our gates. We have an open road from over there, they are going to have the same problem. They can't stop them from coming through there. They are public roads, so unless somebody can assure us that there's a way to stop that from happening. I don't think anybody can do that, then I would have to agree with Don. I'm totally against it and that's the only reason why.

Ms. Hobbs: I think I still have a number of questions. I know you're right about that being an access. If that ends up being a private road, on their end then that would change things. Because there wouldn't be a drive through. It would only be people from that community that could come through there. It would also be an Encore's interest in that case if we opened the side road to have the security gate there because it would mean that we wouldn't have access to that road anyway since it's private. But that community could come through, so we wouldn't see a huge number. It wouldn't be a drive through as far as general public is concerned, but it would be accessed to that community which is on the CDD. After hearing from them, my suspicion was that they were probably going to make that a private road which is why they already said they were going to put a security gate at the other end.

Mr. d'Adesky: Just to be clear, the issue when it was brought before us last meeting was the first time we'd seen it. Certainly, we have heard nothing on how they plan to finance the roads. And to be clear as I explained to Supervisor Harding, one of the reasons why the roads have to be public is the way their financed. So, if their financed with tax exempt bonds, they need to be open to the public in the sense that you can't ultimately force them to deviate from a manned gate.

Ms. Hobbs: Correct.

Mr. d'Adesky: Now if it's a private community, yes. It does change the analysis, but like you said, they'd want a gate on their end to prevent the public from coming in through our roads into their development. Now there might be something to be said from the interconnectedness of the community holistically or the access to the amenities on our side, but that's for Supervisors I think to think over. And what's the value of interconnectivity within Reunion.

Mr. Harding: I guess my issue is if Encore is proposing that it be an emergency exit and some of us Board Members believe it should be an emergency exit, then let's do it that way. I mean I don't understand why.

Mr. Dryburgh: I would agree with you, Don. I agree. I walked that territory twice and I had very mixed emotions about it being closed, but I agree. After looking at it and thinking it's really in their best interest. I don't see where it makes it all that much easier for people to get into Reunion. So, if we are eliminating a traffic issue, that's probably the priority.

Mr. Harding: So, why can't we just approve that?

Mr. d'Adesky: There's nothing to approve.

Mr. Greenstein: Look at me.

Mr. Harding: Huh?

Mr. Greenstein: You can look at me when you say that.

Mr. Harding: I'm not looking at you.

Mr. Greenstein: No, no. I'm asking you to because I know the facts. The facts are as follows: May of 18 the developer the declarant in that declaration, Adler, met with principals of Encore and came up with they believed to be their agreement concerning development rights and other issues concerning development of that property. We now have a successor, owner, the declarant who has rights under that agreement to revisit some things that were agreed to. And if everyone had spent the time, I believe, to read the declaration itself, they would see that it has specific intent for access between that parcel and Reunion East. It left it up to Encore to determine where the guard house would be. It talked about the guard house being turned over to the Master Association for operation, even though it's built by the CDD. The document itself is flawed. The document itself is not ready for permitting. It talks about storm water management being a responsibility of the HOA when it's not, it's a CDD. But the real issue is this, the successor owner operator of the resort and Encore which I confirmed right before this meeting by talking to John Chiste, agrees that it is in their mutual interest to sit down the meeting next week and reevaluate how they develop Reunion Village. So, there's no need, there's no gun to our head. We just received this request last month. If you look at the plan, the plan was developed, the plat was put on paper in November of 18. When we inquired in months past, Encore was not ready to do anything with that parcel. They were focusing on other projects. Now, because of successes they are having elsewhere within Reunion, there you have move this

to the front burner. They do recognize that some decisions that were made in that document probably could be improved upon. And I'm not sitting here acting as mediator or anything else. You can read the minutes from the last meeting so you can see where I stand on from a tax paying, property owner assessment stand point that they should have access to the rest of the CDD amenities without having to go through the front gate. But the point is, this is not the time to have a vote or an action. We can get Encore to withdraw that request if I ask for it, I'm sure we would have gotten it. I didn't think we needed it. I didn't think we were going to be sitting here discussing this issue when the only action to take is to defer it to the next meeting. We will then be educated or we will learn along the way as to what the results of Encore's meeting with Kingwood and we will march on from there. There may be no action for us to take other than approve a bond issuance.

Mr. Harding: That's fine.

Mr. Greenstein: Well, that's where it's going.

Mr. d'Adesky: I would recommend having staff, George and I can reach out to Rick Feather and when they are ready to come back with those plans. Because like you said, there's no plans in front of us right now to approve. We have what they had month, that's not saying that's what they want us to approve this month even if we had it in front of us.

Mr. Goldstein: Maybe 2 months.

Mr. Greenstein: There are problems with it.

Mr. d'Adesky: It might not be next month; it may be 2 months from now where they come back. I don't know their timeline.

Mr. Goldstein: We can put it on as an action item?

d'Adesky: Yeah.

Mr. Greenstein: It will be on next month's agenda and hopefully we will be able to adjudicate it and we will see what they come up with.

Mr. Flint: Okay, sounds good.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Consideration of Resolution 2019-04 Setting a Public Hearing for the Purpose of Towing Rules and Policies

Mr. Flint: I think item 5 is going to be an easy discussion because we were waiting on a map. I haven't seen map. John, were you working on that?

Mr. Cruz: So, what I think I want to clarify is what is the goal here? I mean, I do want to eliminate parking on the roads, but after looking at it there's really a couple options. Do we eliminate parking on both sides? One side? That comes with its set of problems. With the size of the homes that we have being built now, there's no way that folks are going to be able to park all their vehicles on their driveways. Especially on the West side. Like if you look at Grand Traverse, that's the trend that they have going on over there. When you have these homes being built to sleep 30 people, you are looking at 10 vehicles.

Mr. Goldstein: John, what you are asking us is no parking on the streets or can we park on one side basically is your options. Am I right?

Mr. d'Adesky: He's looking for some direction.

Mr. Goldstein: I think that's what we kind of started that way. Initially on one side because as you said, what do you do if you have a party at your house? I just had 4 families from Reunion over for dinner. A barbeque one Sunday. They can't park in my driveway. I mean we don't have enough of those spare spots on the sides for people to park. We all don't live by the water park, so we can't use it. So, I think you've got to leave parking on one side of the road. Does that solve our safety issue with the fire trucks and stuff?

Mr. Flint: Well, the problem with leaving and Steve has brought this up before, the roads are not wide enough. Correct me if I'm wrong, but I think the majority of these roads are not designed for any on-street parking. So, by designating one side for parking or one side for not parking, you're defacto saying you can park on the other side which is a problem.

Mr. Cruz: The tricky issue is the 24ft wide roads aren't wide enough for on-street parking. Some places their on-street parking was anticipated. In practice if a car parks on one side of the road and there's not somebody else parked on the other side, you can get by and a fire truck can still get by. But when you go to the next step of saying parking is allowed, I think that's when you are opening the door to a potential problem because it's not really designed for parking.

Mr. Goldstein: How many of our streets is no parking streets right now? Does the law say they are no parking streets?

Mr. Cruz: The law doesn't say they aren't.

Mr. d'Adesky: Practically they are not. It's practical by the dimensions that are required for emergency exits. They are not set up as capable of parking. So, once again if the police came

through and there was no emergency access, they could remove the vehicle or fine that vehicle. Once again, that's only going to come with an emergency situation and God forbid that comes up. Now they've actually impeded emergency responders from responding. This is more preventative.

Ms. Hobbs: If memory serves me, the issue with road was raised again. I know it's been talked about a lot. It was on the Board before I was even on it. Someone came forward and said there was a problem because there were cars parked on both sides and then ordinary vehicles, one of the residents, could not get down between those two cars with his vehicle. So, although emergency vehicles are a consideration, I think that's the initial reason we started to look at this. It was more to do with just general access from ordinary vehicle trying to get down the road. But I'm curious because you are saying that we kind of can't say well you can park on one side but not the other. We are now suggesting that you are allowed to park on the street.

Mr. Flint: Right, that's the problem.

Mr. d'Adesky: It's implication. I mean we obviously wouldn't be posting a sign that says yes you can post on the other side, but by the fact that there's not tow a way signs.

Ms. Hobbs: But we also have no way or power or whatever you want to say that you can park on the street.

Mr. d'Adesky: Yes, we do. We can tow them which is what we are trying to do.

Mr. Hobbs: So, we can tow everyone. Okay, I get it. So, we can say no, you're not allowed to park.

Mr. d'Adesky: And that's why John is asking. He's asking before the massive backlash you're going to get. When you are barbequing and you are getting towed because.

Mr. Flint: Previously when we talked about this, we talked about the fact that the CDD doesn't have police powers. We can't give tickets. But there has been a statutory amendment that allows CDDs to implement towing policies. So, that's the only tool we have.

Mr. d'Adesky: You all make the policy decision. I think it's kind of hard for staff to be fair to make those policy calls because that's a lot.

Ms. Hobbs: We can make a policy decision that says we are going to tow any car parked in the street?

Mr. Flint: Yes.

Mr. d'Adesky: Or you can say no overnight parking or whatever you want to do.

Ms. Hobbs: Okay.

Mr. d'Adesky: If that's what you wanted to do, say no overnight parking. If you're parked between the hours of, I don't set an hour, 10pm and 6am anywhere on the street, we are going to tow you. You can do that too. It's up to you to make those calls.

Ms. Hobbs: Okay, thank you.

Mr. d'Adesky: He will make the map. I think he needs you guys to make a little bit of a call.

Mr. Flint: I thought we had some specific neighborhoods where this was worse than others.

Ms. Hobbs: Yes.

Mr. Flint: And I thought we talked about maybe doing a pilot project where we only did it for that neighborhood vs doing the entire Reunion.

Mr. Goldstein: Well, mainly it's your little side streets are the ones that don't have any, yeah.

Mr. Greenstein: The whole thing started when I was parked on Corolla Court when Jeff Pile and Terry came to me and described the situation. That they couldn't believe was possible happening. Where because of two larger vehicles parked on either side of the street, they couldn't get through with their medium sized SUV without folding the mirrors in. That kind of thing. So, the key words that I've heard that I think are key to how we go forward is overnight parking. Is something that prohibiting on-street overnight parking is something that has to be presented to the community to get their input. Because we are all going to have parties, we all are going to have during the day types of situations, but to control the during the day situation that becomes the emergency access you can't get through. People have to know that they can't park side by side to prevent a vehicle from coming through. So, the real impact I think we can adjust somehow security. We can get the population to recognize that it doesn't make common sense to park that way. Because if you can't get a normal vehicle through, forget about a firetruck. Long term, I really believe and I don't know which part of the grander plan, but it's talked when Adler was still here to build the parking garage along Lake Wilson Rd. as an extension to the Grande. If there was an offsite parking facility then I guess the Resort could possibly offer a shuttle service to people. And promote the idea of if you have a large group, you park in a central spot, but you've got the shuttle to take to you to the residents where you are going to be. There're all

kinds of different things that can possibly happen, but the key thing is we've got to get it out there. As a draft, as a proposal, not that we are doing it. We want input from the community because everyone is going to have a different spin on how we should manage it. Someone actually made a comment at a builder's meeting the other day where they are proposing alternate side of the street parking. I thought I was back in New York where I had to remember was it Tuesday or Thursday and I got to move my car. So, everybody has an angle on this, but we are all in agreement that we need to do something about it. And I think the starting point is to come up with an initial proposal which this is close that prohibits the overnight parking.

Mr. Harding: Some streets are obvious. On Radiant St. where it's kind of obvious where some of the houses don't even face the street so, it would make sense to have parking on the one side of the street and not the other side. All the way down the street because there's not any houses facing that way anyway. So, that would be an easy thing to do there. No parking on that side.

Mr. Goldstein: I think you really ought to just pick a couple of streets like the Radiant, Gathering Ct., Corolla Ct. I would put no parking on side of the street and see how it works.

Mr. Harding: Just the main.

Mr. d'Adesky: Granted, we still have to go through the formal process. That's the point. Because of what this is and what the repercussions are, we still have to go through a formal process.

Mr. Goldstein: I'd say like 3 areas. Like Mark said, let's not do the whole thing or figure out the 3 streets that are going to be the ones that benefit the most.

Mr. Dryburgh: Well, Steve, with that idea in mind, I think Mark's idea still informing the public and getting their approval might make sense. So, just that they are aware of the fact they're going to be restrictions.

Mr. Goldstein: Oh yeah, I have no problem with that at all.

Mr. d'Adesky: So, in that sense, you would want to delay doing anything here and then maybe put something out. I don't know if you can do it through the HOA.

Mr. Greenstein: Do we have to have a hearing on this?

Mr. d'Adesky: Yes.

Mr. Greenstein: So, do we just want to come up with a draft policy or draft procedure and close it?

Mr. d'Adesky: I guess today you could set the public hearing for you know, 60 to 90 days from now. In the meantime, designate try to circulate as much information as possible and pick those roads.

Mr. Greenstein: I'm thinking more along the lines of not signs but striping.

Mr. d'Adesky: There's specific signs you have to use for towing.

Mr. Greenstein: Okay, well hopefully we get to minimize where we place the signs, so we don't have a sign every 20ft that has no parking on it. On one hand we are trying to minimize signage and on the other hand now we are going to literally place with signs that say no parking.

Mr. Goldstein: And what kind of poles we are going to use? Not cheap ones.

Mr. Cruz: One other idea and you probably wouldn't want to go this way is how you say yellow painted curbs as fire lanes. So, if you have any areas that you didn't want them to park, you could paint them yellow. You wouldn't have to have a sign there. Although, I know you don't want yellow curbs in front of your houses probably. Just a thought.

Mr. Goldstein: Very good. We are going to get plenty of input once this thing is hoisted up the flag pole for comment. So, as a policy, do we agree that we think we want to move in the direction of beyond the demonstration project? We want to move in the direction of no overnight street parking? Which was the intent when the community was first established. They thought when they were building 4 and 5-bedroom homes, that having the 4 parking spaces, 2 in the garage and 2 on the driveway was going to solve everybody's problem. Until people started building bigger houses and we had that depression.

Mr. Goldstein: Well, what are you going to do if you make no on-street parking. Where can they park their cars if they can't park in their driveway?

Mr. d'Adesky: He was saying overnight. Depends on how you define that and this is 10pm to 8am, I don't know.

Ms. Hobbs: I was just going to ask that question.

Mr. d'Adesky: You can change the definition.

Mr. Dryburgh: I'd be worried more about the fact that you can't get firetrucks down. Don't you still have to have one side open?

Mr. d'Adesky: No, no overnight means no overnight on either side.

Mr. Dryburgh: I've got that. What about at 8 o'clock in the morning when there's a fire and they can't get a firetruck down because they guy is parked.

Mr. Greenstein: That's what I was saying. That's a security issue. That's an emergency access issue and the rules would have to be in effect during the day on that.

Mr. Flint: Well, it's already covered under go ahead you site the statute, Andrew. I don't want to play attorney.

Mr. Dryburgh: No, you were doing a good job, George.

Mr. Flint: Statute 316 addresses the issue of emergency vehicle.

Mr. d'Adesky: I didn't even know that. You've got that number for me. Emergency folks would site you for that, but once again, we don't want to get to that point. This is preventative to avoid getting to that point. And also, to avoid the basic access issues which I think brought this up in the first place.

Mr. Greenstein: Truthfully, I think it's I don't want to say this, someone else say it. People are going to have to find places to park. And while we are going to start this off with the demonstration project to assess impact in areas that are choke points that we already know are problems, but we have to have a long-term plan. That's why I raised the issue of the parking garage.

Mr. Goldstein: Can people park at the waterpark parking lot?

Mr. Greenstein: Well, this is what we have to look at as a community overall. There may be overnight parking locations that can be used. The park can be used, but then there will be an issue when the person doesn't move their car in the morning and that kind of stuff.

Mr. Goldstein: Yeah.

Mr. Greenstein: But it happens everywhere. Now, in Celebration they almost had a riot. 1,000 people or something show up to the meeting when they tried to propose no parking on the streets in Celebration. I don't even think, was it one side only or no parking at all?

Mr. Goldstein: At all. It was no parking at all.

Mr. Greenstein: I'm not saying I'm taking the negotiation stance on this by saying no parking on the streets and then we back down to the one side only and that's the middle ground that we have to work the crowd to get them to that point. You know, we are being open and honest about it.

Mr. Harding: Which side do you pick?

Mr. Greenstein: Exactly. So, it's going to be an interesting voyage, but I think we have to go on it and start determining which streets we are going to use as a demonstration project.

Mr. d'Adesky: I agree. I think we have to be totally transparent and kind of open it up. I think it's going to be discussed this. I definitely think that you know, we can make some edits here. Bring it back to the next meeting, set the date for 60 to 90 days out so we have lots of time to talk about this. I think 2 things; I guess the first is, I think you said changing the overnight hours instead of 10 to 11 or midnight?

Mr. Goldstein: I think midnight.

Mr. Greenstein: Midnight to.

Mr. Flint: 6am?

Mr. d'Adesky: I go to bed at 6 so.

Mr. Greenstein: Yeah, but we all get wild about twice a year, so.

Mr. d'Adesky: We will say 6am, okay. Okay, midnight to 6am. Then you know, you've mentioned a couple of streets.

Mr. Greenstein: Corolla.

Mr. Harding: Radiant, Excitement.

Mr. Dryburgh: Gathering.

Mr. Harding: Yeah, Gathering.

Mr. d'Adesky: I just want to make sure those are included.

Mr. Harding: On either side of the street?

Mr. Flint: Well, it doesn't say that, but common sense would dictate.

Mr. Scheerer: Well, there is no parking signs off on the West side of Reunion Blvd. for the homes that are in Patriots Landing. There's just a handful in between.

Mr. d'Adesky: I think the point is to correct the problem areas first.

Mr. Goldstein: And maybe the other problem in Excitement is the 2 roundabouts. There are not many cars on my street ever because they are all rentals. They are small rentals. The roundabouts on Excitement are really bad. There shouldn't be any parking anywhere on those roundabouts.

Resident: So, is this issue getting calls by guests or residents?

Mr. Harding: Both.

Mr. Greenstein: A car is a car. It makes no difference. There's no distinguishing.

Mr. Goldstein: I think that for the communication with guests coming in you can provide that information. There's no street parking without any legal backup. You could provide that

information. When they check in, you provide that by your property managers or whatever to inform them that there is no street parking. You don't need to back it up legally. Just ask. Just inform them. Then security has active patrols to make sure that we correct problems as we see them, like we used to do in the past. This has been an issue from day 1.

Mr. Cruz: There's a big elephant in the room that we aren't touching. That elephant is that when they are bringing their guests in, the guests check in then they are bringing in their overnight people. So, Corolla Ct. there was a house there for 37 people, but only 9 was registered to be there. So, when guests check in from the other operators, Jeeves, Reunion Vacation, Orlando Magical Homes, that's other criteria to add on top of the parking situation.

Mr. Greenstein: Well, the rules are going to apply to everyone. We know you could have a 4-bedroom/5-bedroom permanent resident has a party and invite a nice load of people and have cars all over the place. So, we know we are trying to make sure there's enough off-street parking based upon the number of bedrooms which is in county code and was a Master Association rule before the county even codified it. But that's kind of like the minimum level of security that we can achieve or efficiency we can achieve by keeping cars off the street. When you invite people to a party that equation, that formula, that approach is meaningless. That's why you have to have the prohibition against overnight parking, and you have to have the ability to make sure that emergency vehicles are not impeded. But hopefully we will come up with a longer-term solution. And I think Steve, you brought up the waterpark.

Mr. Goldstein: Well, I know people, they'd actually bring buses back and forth from the waterpark didn't they?

Mr. Greenstein: We've had people with really large campers that are more like tour buses that needed to have a place to park and would get permission to park in some mutual territory and keeps it out. It couldn't even make the turns into the residential streets half the time.

Mr. Goldstein: But it's something the Resort could do to help alleviate some of the traffic. If we could legally tell people they could park there but I know.

Mr. Harding: Legally an emergency vehicle can plow through barriers.

Mr. d'Adesky: Yeah, if your car is in the way they can ram you out of the way if they need to. And they are going to by the way if it's a serious incident like a fire or something like that. If it's active, they are going to ram your car out of the way.

Mr. Harding: Without any kind of liability. I think everybody ought to be aware of that and maybe entice them to have some kind of policy one way or the other.

Ms. Hobbs: Quick question. So, are we are saying that the roads are too narrow and there will be one side parking and an emergency vehicle is trying to get down then that emergency vehicle would not be able to get through?

Mr. Goldstein: I think the emergency vehicle still can get by when one car is parked.

Ms. Hobbs: Just one, okay. I was wondering if we are telling them they can park on that side of the road and the emergency vehicle smashes into them, are we liable?

Mr. d'Adesky: No, no, no. The CDD wouldn't be but I think what Steve was explaining was like the difference between defacto and deserve. So, like yes by law and regulation the width is just enough for an emergency vehicle to go down, but practically the fact is they are going to up on the curve. They are going to get around, but that's you know going to involve some ramming if there's two cars on it.

Ms. Hobbs: That's why I was asking if we say one side and not the other what the ramifications might happen.

Mr. Cruz: And on the other hand, it would be a good policy is as soon as you see two cars parked on opposite sides, you immediately start towing.

Mr. d'Adesky: And also working for that it has to be once again like any rule that's passed, it's got to be uniform, it's got to be straight forward, it's got to be applied in a consistent basis. It's really difficult. Yes, so just label one side.

Mr. Harding: I mean people are going to be mad because of why did they pick that side vs. my side or whatever, but.

Mr. Greenstein: We aren't going to win friends with this. We know that, but this is for the good of the community, it's for their own good as well. The other thing is, this is bringing out behaviors which people think are acceptable. Parking on grass, even when they are in their driveway, you know they've got their car situated where they are blocking the sidewalk. People have to walk up and down and go around cars. So, this is going to point out a bunch of things which hopefully will get people to be more aware of what they are doing and how it's impacting the community and others. Give them an opportunity to tell us a better way of approaching this and do it as a demonstration project so we are not implementing across the Board immediately. But again, I think we are going to need some high level, long term solution to.

Mr. Harding: Why don't we have John just go through on all of our streets and identify what would be the preferred area. What would be the preferred side to have no parking? Like some streets are very obvious, but I don't know maybe.

Mr. d'Adesky: I think it might be prudent just to if we are limiting it to these streets, just start with these streets, focus on that and then expand the scope.

Ms. Hobbs: I have a suggestion to even narrow that down to just Excitement.

Mr. Goldstein: I said the roundabouts, not Excitement. There needs to be some marking.

Mr. Dryburgh: Well, perhaps it might make sense on those streets for, John people to actually go around and start slapping stickers on windows on these cars that are parked on driveways where they are blocking sidewalks overnight. Which currently doesn't seem to happen.

Mr. d'Adesky: You can't do that yet, though.

Mr. Flint: Well, they could put a warning on there.

Mr. d'Adesky: I guess you could put a warning, but it can't.

Mr. Dryburgh: I'm not suggesting tow them, but I am suggesting to start applying warnings to these people so they can become aware.

Mr. Goldstein: Is there an Osceola County ordinance against parking on sidewalks?

Mr. d'Adesky: We can't enforce Osceola County ordinance. He's correct, yes, but the sheriff would need to be contacted.

Mr. Flint: It's either sheriff or code enforcer. I think code enforcer.

Mr. d'Adesky: Code enforcer would be more likely to do it.

Mr. Harding: The proposed policy that says no overnight parking based on those hours. It will be parking on one side of the street only. Then just get that out there and then we will have our hearing along with other things.

Mr. d'Adesky: I would keep most of the other stuff that I have in there because it's stuff like don't keep derelict cars, don't park on the grass I mean stuff like that. That we don't currently have in writing, but clearly, logically you want that.

Ms. Hobbs: Yes.

Mr. Harding: Let's do that.

Mr. d'Adesky: So, what I'll do is I'll make.

Mr. Dryburgh: Do you have to give the time of 90 days for discussion? This is not going into effect yet?

Mr. d'Adesky: No, no in fact I'll bring back this resolution at the next meeting. Because we really need the map. So, we will bring back the resolution with the revised map. John, do you feel comfortable with that direction?

Mr. Cruz: Yes.

Mr. Flint: There's going to be those limited streets then designating which side would be no parking.

Mr. Cruz: Going back to what Mark suggested, what option are you going to give these people? There's no option to give to people.

Mr. Flint: Well, with parking on one side of the street, there's still going to have an alternative to parking on the other side of the street. Right now, they can't park on both sides.

Mr. d'Adesky: I guess they could park on a different street; you know. Move to a different street. Park on that side and walk a little bit.

Mr. Cruz: It's probably not something new, it's just people can't park on both sides. That's something that you always see.

Mr. Greenstein: Well, that's basically the administrative approach that we've taken. The officers are not going to knock on someone's door and ask them if they own that vehicle. They would just point out; I don't know if they would give them a warning to say you know. A warning sticker or whatever, but they would always be looking for choke points where it could be a problem. And if they saw somebody parking there, they would tell them you know they shouldn't park there, but how often does that happen.

Mr. Flint: The sophisticated consumer knows and we've had that. Haven't we had that circumstance? Where you've got the homeowner that knows there's no enforceability to a sticker and they keep pressing you on and then they call me. Then they call you again.

Mr. d'Adesky: Look I do that in my parking garage all the time. They tell me I'm double parking and I tell them to go take a walk, you know.

Mr. Flint: We can be flexible on how we enforce it, but at least this gives the ability to ultimately tow somebody.

Mr. Greenstein: If there's any suggestions to getting something that we have to run up the flagpole, we have to have the public hearing, we're not announcing this tomorrow, but.

Mr. d'Adesky: It's just like your budget, you know. You put it for a hearing and you can ultimately, if you get a bunch of people complaining about it you can just not adopt it. But we just have to start the process.

Mr. Greenstein: We amend it or whatever. I think the idea that we are doing a demonstration project is the right approach. This way we will learn from it and hopefully we will get, I'm not saying we are looking for their permission, but we'd like the consensus of the community that yes, we should continue down this road.

Mr. Goldstein: Maybe they will be happy with it.

Mr. Harding: So, you are going to revise this for the next meeting?

Mr. d'Adesky: Yes, I will revise it.

Mr. Harding: Then how will we get it out to the general public.

Mr. d'Adesky: You can do whatever you want to get it out. You can circulate it through the HOA, you can slip it under people's doors.

Mr. Greenstein: Like you said the HOA and out and about. Anything that impacts Resort guests or people that live here, I mean.

Mr. Cruz: Say, here's a proposal.

Mr. Greenstein: This is what we are doing. The other thing I'm going to mention last but not least administratively, it is not that we have to plan for this I think it should be an evening meeting. When we have just the one time, we need to have whether it's a 6 o'clock or 7 o'clock or whatever time you want. Because this is where the most, otherwise we're not going to participation we will just get a whole bunch of complaints.

Mr. Flint: Is it going to be after cocktail because I usually don't like meetings after that.

Mr. d'Adesky: George has other managers that he can send.

Mr. Flint: Not for me, but for the people who come after cocktail hour.

Mr. Greenstein: Who knows? Just do it in the evening so that we can max the participation.

Mr. d'Adesky: Sure. So, we don't have to set the date or time until the next meeting. So, we will bring all of this back to the next meeting. I think it was good to get the overview because once again, it's a huge thing for the community and there's lots of repercussions.

Mr. Greenstein: Absolutely.

Mr. Flint: So, then at the next meeting you would set the public hearing and it would have to be at least 30 days out which means it's probably going to be October. You can do the October hearing in the evening if you choose to do that.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Ratification of Agreement for Use of Amenity Facilities

Mr. Flint: The Resort requested the use of the facility on June 19th and they contributed a donation associated with their use. I'm just asking the Board to ratify the agreement.

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein seconded by Mr. Goldstein with all in favor of Ratification of Agreement for Use of Amenity Facilities, was approved.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Discussion of The Terraces Fountain Maintenance

Mr. Flint: Back when the economy went in a downward spiral and we were looking at ways to save money. I mean we were reducing annuals. We had made a decision because the Terraces pool was heated with propane that we were not going to heat it year-round. Another issue a step that was taken at the time is the fountain at the Terraces which is owned by the CDD. Because we didn't really operate any other fountains, the decision was made that we were going to turn the fountain off. So, the developer at the time said, no don't do that, the Terraces will pay those costs to keep it going. So, that's been going on since then, it was probably 2007.

Mr. Scheerer: No, I think it was 2010 or 2011.

Mr. Flint: Oh, it was that late? Okay. I thought it was earlier than that. Since, 2010 or 2011 the developer through the Association has been paying the cleaning costs and the electric for the fountain. With the recent transition, the residents apparently have gotten control of that Association. They've gone back and have been reviewing the books and they ask the question, "Why are we paying for the maintenance and the electricity?" They've contacted Don. You know, frankly, it's a valid question. We've been paying the capital expense on repairs but the ongoing electricity and the cleaning we've been billing the Association for those services. We actually stopped billing it. I think the last bill we sent was last October. So, their current fiscal year would start on January 1 and they haven't paid anything. So, the question is for the Board going forward and you have the costs.

Mr. Scheerer: Yes, so the monthly cleaning cost is \$435 a month. That's just to clean the fountain and then they were paying a portion of the electric at \$275.

Mr. Greenstein: Who do they have cleaning it? What are they cleaning it with? I mean, how big is this fountain?

Mr. Scheerer: It's huge.

Mr. Greenstein: I'll have to go over there to appreciate the cost of the maintenance. I'd have to go look at the fountain itself.

Mr. Flint: That price is not a bad price.

Mr. Scheerer: It's 7 days a week. It's not a couple days a week. It's 7 day a week service. Yellowstone provides that service and we pay them.

Mr. Goldstein: So, it's cleaned out every day?

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah.

Mr. Flint: And it's chlorinated.

Mr. Scheerer: It's like a pool. Our pools are treated 7 days a week.

Mr. Goldstein: Right, I understand that, but fountains aren't. County doesn't say you have to check your fountains every day.

Mr. Greenstein: Unless someone's going to jump in it. It seems kind of a high price for maintenance.

Mr. Goldstein: That's crazy.

Mr. Flint: We can look at reducing the number of days as far as responsibility. I think the CDD should take it back it over.

Mr. Greenstein: That's not a problem. I think we need to find a more efficient way of maintaining it.

Mr. Goldstein: I mean capitals are in it. The only thing that could be wrong with it is leaves and stuff in it, right?

Mr. Scheerer: Yes.

Mr. Harding: Why don't we just agree that we are going to take responsibility for it. It is a CDD fountain and if we can get a better price and leave it up to Alan.

Mr. Flint: Let's just do a not to exceed based on the current contract. We will go back and see what we can do to reduce.

On MOTION by Mr. Harding seconded by Mr. Goldstein with all in favor of Discussion of The Terraces Fountain Maintenance not to exceed current contract price, was approved.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Staff Reports

A. Attorney

Mr. d'Adesky: Okay, a couple of things. We anticipate at some point there will be an update in the development status for Kingwood. So, there's no update on the unexchanged bond issue as of yet. We did transfer over. Alan got back to me promptly after last meeting and gave me the parcel ID number. There was that dog park that we were interested in the children's playground. We were under the impression I think we talked about that being a POA track. That is not a POA track, that is a Kingwood track. So, I did send the information to them and they have the information. So, here are the options so you are aware of what we need to happen. It's still a private analysis, so it's still the same thing. So, what would need if CDD was going to do it, would be either a permanent easement for the public to access those or just to transfer over the land. The land transfer is easier mechanically, but there are a lot of reasons why you might want to make it an easement instead. Either way we would have to guarantee that we have access before we spend monies from public funds on a private plan. So, that's been transferred over to the MSA's. I think pretty buttoned up.

Mr. Greenstein: I think we are at the finish line. We just need to finalize the document. We will schedule walk-throughs so we can agree on, so you can project when you think you can get a set of keys so to speak. Oh, we have to have a hearing on setting rates.

Mr. d'Adesky: Yes, we have to do that.

Mr. Greenstein: So, we will do that and then hopefully we can schedule that.

Mr. d'Adesky: We could do it at the same time as the towing one if you wanted to?

Mr. Greenstein: Or sooner. We could always administratively control that; we just have to obviously publish it.

Mr. d'Adesky: Right, well it's the same timeline. So, it's a 30-day timeline. We can always call a special meeting if it really needs to happen, but it's through the same notice requirements.

Mr. Greenstein: That's good.

Mr. d'Adesky: That's all that I have unless there's some questions about anything specifically. I know I've already answered some questions for Supervisor Harding. He had some questions for me. If anybody ever has any questions, just please email or call me and I'm happy to walk you through.

B. Engineer

Mr. Boyd: There are 3 things actually. The first, we are still looking into the 4-way stop at Spine Rd. and Tradition. Some issues with Reunion West. In addition to that, we've got you've asked me to look into crosswalks at the Reunion Grand. I'm still working through that, but I do have some concerns about that request. Right now, there's 2 approved crosswalks in the middle and you've got 2 roads that come out on Seven Eagles. Where you are looking to provide crosswalks there. So, you would potentially, if you need crosswalks on each one of those roads, you'd end up having 6 crosswalks in a span of about 100ft. I have a concern with that.

Mr. Goldstein: You mean 3 crosswalks?

Mr. Boyd: Well, you have potentially, if you did each side of the driveway, you would have 2 and the middle and 2 on the other side.

Mr. Flint: Yeah, I would think you would only do one side of each driveway.

Mr. Boyd: One side on each drive then that's a little bit better, but it just seems like you create this huge span of people going back and forth.

Mr. d'Adesky: Which is probably what's going on today anyway.

Mr. Goldstein: Exactly. You've got people crossing up the middle, you've got people crossing in the driveways right now. You've still got to watch no matter what we do. The lights better there; we can see at least.

Mr. Boyd: What are your thoughts about moving the crosswalk signs back? Right now, you pass the driveways before you see the crosswalk warning sign. If those were moved back and you had signs on the pedestrian side, directing people to the existing crosswalks. I'm trying to direct people to the crosswalks planned as opposed to adding new crosswalks.

Mr. Goldstein: They will either walk up the center or they walk up the drive, you know. You can't guess what they are going to do. They are going to cross wherever they want to cross.

Mr. Greenstein: How do you think it's worked there at the waterparks? That was the very first one; heavy traffic going across from the parking lot. We had a natural place based upon curb cuts and everything else, well cross walking and the short cuts that people would take and we kind of compromised where we located it. Nonetheless, we couldn't put one, like you say, every 20ft.

Mr. Boyd: If you start adding the 2 on the outside, you warn somebody to use the crosswalk. They look, they slow down, they pass through it and they're not going to expect another crosswalk to be 60ft away from them.

Mr. Goldstein: Yet, if they leave it in the middle and people are crossing the street and they are not paying attention, you've got people crossing the street and there's no crosswalk. At this point, right now we have the middle which to me it still looks like that's where it belongs. Because you've got coming up from Seven Eagles you've got beautiful walkway up to the hotel, you don't want people walking up your driveways, I know. I don't know, Mark, what do you think?

Mr. Greenstein: It's tough, but I guess your concern is that it's unnecessary impediment to vehicular traffic.

Mr. Boyd: I think we are creating an illusion so to speak by have adding additional sidewalks that would encourage people to cross and potentially give the driver the impression that he's yielded to a pedestrian here, so he's good to go. And he's got 3 more crosswalks, maybe even 4 in front of him.

Mr. Greenstein: Am I correct to say, Richard, wasn't it the Resort that came to us with the crosswalk request?

Mr. Flint: Yes.

Mr. Greenstein: Yeah, that's what I thought. I would think as the engineer; I would think you would give us your best proposal as to however you think those crosswalks should be aligned balancing out pedestrian traffic and vehicular traffic.

Mr. Boyd: I'm going to look for some other similar circumstances and get some more thought to help you.

Mr. d'Adesky: Oh yeah, there are other communities.

Mr. Harding: The current problem is them finding the road too, aren't they?

Mr. Boyd: They are vague with their directions.

Mr. Harding: That doesn't mean that's a crosswalk.

Mr. d'Adesky: There are improvements in other ways to do it. You can put the crosswalk with the flashing crosswalk signs.

Mr. Goldstein: Sounds to me like you just need it on one side and keep it center would be better.

Mr. Boyd: If we put one at the first driveway, that might not be that difficult.

Mr. Harding: Both of your employees park in Seven Eagles where you own that property, right?

Mr. Nasser: Right.

Mr. Harding: So, that's probably where you really want to have one crosswalk.

Mr. Goldstein: And then the center one.

Mr. Harding: And then we've got the center crosswalk. So, what if we just did that?

Mr. Boyd: I would feel better about that.

Mr. Harding: Let's do that.

Mr. d'Adesky: Well, I'm just wondering if we want to set a cap on what we would want him to proceed with in terms of actual. For example, certain improvements cost more than others. So, if you are doing a raised crosswalk, that's going to cost a lot more than if you are doing a simple striping.

Mr. Flint: I think the idea is he's going to come back with a recommendation.

Mr. d'Adesky: Okay, that's what I was going to ask.

Mr. Flint: So, I don't think you need to vote it. Seems to me like you've got consensus and you've got direction. It's on your actions item list, so.

Mr. Boyd: I think those were my only 2 action items for East I believe.

Mr. Greenstein: So, if you didn't do anything to the roadway other than surface marking, do you have to get a permit?

Mr. Boyd: I'm going to find out on that. I think I'm going to deal with the county on bigger issues and try to take the path that these are CDD roads.

Mr. Greenstein: We have an anxious Board that likes to limit tomorrow, we do it. But we know once we get the process going, it's like okay we've got to sit back and wait a few months or whatever.

Mr. Flint: I think if you are putting up a stop sign, you may want to get approval because you are going to ask the County to enforce the stop sign. A crosswalk, I think we would just do it. I think we've almost hit everything on the action items list.

C. District Manager's Report

i. Action Items Lists

Mr. Goldstein: George, on the dog park, we've brought it up and found the land was different, but Alan and I met 2 contractors on this basic cost including fencing for both the dog park area and the playground. They were a major difference. One was \$30,000 and one was \$12,000. We know both of these people.

Mr. d'Adesky: That's why you get multiple bids.

Mr. Goldstein: So, we are going to get a third bid and we are going to try to get something a little more formal. But we actually got this right before the meeting.

Mr. Flint: You don't have to have a fence around a playground unless you want to.

Mr. Goldstein: We know, but we just wanted to have the pricing for when we go ahead and decided on what we want to do.

Mr. Flint: Yeah, okay.

Mr. Goldstein: Okay, we will just push it to next month.

Mr. Flint: And then we will wait to hear back.

Mr. d'Adesky: Ultimately, whether there's interest to proceed.

Mr. Goldstein: Yeah, whether you want the amenity or not.

Mr. Flint: Okay, anything else on the action items lists that the Board wants to discuss? We've hit on most everything. What we didn't talk about I think has been completed.

Mr. Scheerer: The speed limit signs are in. The new ones are in.

Mr. Greenstein: I just want to say one thing. Trudy, Yellowstone, Alan, anyone who had anything to do with the Watson Court park. I was pretty confident that we would be able to do it and it wouldn't be a tremendous effort, but it takes coordination and diligence to see it happen.

Mr. Goldstein: It looks better than I thought it ever would.

Mr. Greenstein: It looks good.

Mr. Scheerer: It turned out great.

Ms. Hobbs: Seeing the butterflies right now.

Mr. Greenstein: At the last meeting I asked for, I think we agreed to it, to proceed with the pole project with the Terraces.

Mr. Scheerer: There are 12 poles in the Terraces that will cost us \$21,470. Those are the decorative poles with the gold pineapples and the back plates for the stop signs. So.

Mr. d'Adesky: Those decorative poles are expensive.

Mr. Greenstein: They are expensive, but on a verbally, written equality is the Terraces. The developer did the wrong thing by taking out what was originally there.

Mr. Scheerer: If he'd paid to build a phosnite, we'd of had the decorative poles because they were installed. then when he didn't pay the bill, they removed them and put the galvanized posts in. And that's why we are where we are.

Mr. Greenstein: And it looks like you are in a different community when you are driving by because signs are the cheap stuff.

Mr. Scheerer: There's a lot of internal post mark. If you want me to just do the approach of what you can see off of Excitement Dr. as you're driving by?

Mr. Greenstein: Let's start there. How does that sound? How many is that across the street?

Mr. Scheerer: I think it's just 2.

Mr. d'Adesky: So, do you want to give a not to exceed of what \$5,000?

Mr. Scheerer: Yeah, there are just 2 right there because it's Carolina Run and Northern Harrier. I believe are the 2 main roads that come in off of Excitement.

Mr. Greenstein: The ones that are directly across from property at Excitement.

Mr. Scheerer: From the homes. For the Terraces.

Mr. Greenstein: Some are better than none and we can look at see where our budget lies at the end of the year. Then if we have some money, we'll continue.

Mr. Scheerer: I think we can make that happen pretty quickly.

Mr. Greenstein: This is a start. It looks tacky.

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein seconded by Mr. Dryburgh with all in favor, Terrace Signs, not to exceed amount of \$5,000, was approved.

ii. Approval of Check Register

Mr. Flint: I handed out the Check Register for June totaling \$118,123.47. Are there any questions on it?

On MOTION by Mr. Harding seconded by Mr. Greenstein with all in favor of Check Register, was approved.

iii. Balance Sheet and Income Statement

Mr. Flint: You also have the May 31st unaudited financial statements. If there's any questions, we can discuss it. Otherwise, there's no action required.

Mr. Harding: While we are talking about financial items, the proposed 2020 Budget's concerned. I was kind of going through that with detail and there's a lot of money being spent relative on major roof repairs and so forth. I was wondering, does our insurance cover any of that?

Mr. d'Adesky: If it's the result of.

Mr. Harding: Because hasn't some of the roof damage been caused by. I'm going through that with my own home right now with hurricane weather.

Mr. Flint: No, this roof has leaked since day 1. I think the major roof repair that's in there, is the replacement of the roof on this building. Correct?

Mr. Scheerer: Correct.

Mr. Harding: I thought there was something on Seven Eagles too.

Mr. Scheerer: Well, we had money in the budget to replace the roof at Seven Eagles, but we coated it because it's flat. We've had no problems with Seven Eagles that I am aware of since that's been done. But what I've done for 2020 is the original roof contractor that did this roof, One Source, provided us an outrageous quote to redo it. Then I asked for Durham Roofing who gave us a more reasonable quote to remove. We've got experience with them as well. That's also in the budget to replace the roof. They also came out after several attempts and made minimal dollar amount repairs to this roof. They seem to be holding up pretty well so far, but I anticipate this building will need to be reroofed just because of the different pitches and everything that's associated with this roof. We've got multiple stages. You have an upper tier, a lower tier, so.

Mr. Harding: So, we do have insurance, but we can't make any claims relative.

Mr. Flint: No, for those result of a lightning strike or wind damage or hail, I mean, but we don't have any evidence that that's why it's leaking.

Mr. Scheerer: Correct.

Mr. Harding: Okay.

Mr. Scheerer: Basically, the material has started to shrink or get exposed or whatever and water has penetrated.

Mr. Harding: Alright.

Mr. Greenstein: It's hard to believe that it's already 16 or 17 years old. Did we build this in 2003?

Mr. d'Adesky: Between 2003 and 2005.

Mr. Flint: If there was an opportunity with insurance, of course we would pursue that, but I don't believe there is.

Mr. Greenstein: Budget meeting tomorrow.

Mr. Flint: Yes, that will be at the August meeting.

iv. Status of Direct Bill Assessments

Mr. Greenstein: The one thing I mentioned relative budget is we need to come up, I'm not saying it's something going, we can talk about this, how much we need to publish information about assessments. Because in the past things have been very level or if we had increases, they've been more modest. We're really, this is where I refer to it as a true-up. It's a completion of the community where, I mean, that's the major driver that I see in the assessment going up. They projected X number of units based upon acreage and based upon land development, then it turned out that things changed. Now, we only have about 1,000 units less. So, even though there's more growth, the original plan actually had more units planned. So, now the assessment has to go up for that reason.

Mr. d'Adesky: And you delayed it as long as you could.

Mr. Greenstein: Right, exactly. We held it off as long as we could. And now, as a percentage, it's not that much, but some people are very tax sensitive. When you say \$200 a year, which is less than \$20 a month and they jump you. Yet, this is what it is. Hopefully we will have a cheat sheet of something.

Mr. Flint: We will put a presentation together.

Mr. d'Adesky: Well, and remember the mail notice had to go out and that's, you know. We all should get it in the mail as well. Which is pretty clear.

Mr. Flint: It will go out 21 days before the meeting. Unfortunately, it usually creates confusion because it's a legal document and we don't have a lot of flexibility on how we structure that mailed notice. But we can be prepared with some sort of presentation for the hearing. To go through it. And we usually put a script together for our office. So, when we get the phone calls, we are all singing off the same sheet of music as far as the justification or the causes.

Mr. d'Adesky: Which they do get.

Mr. Flint: Unless you guys want me to put your phone numbers in there? We do still have some delinquent payments from Yehoff. I need to light a fire under them on those. So, I will follow up.

v. Statement of Financial Interests Filing Reminder

Mr. Flint: Statement of Financial Interest, we do that as a courtesy to the Board Members so they don't end up having any issues. You should have received the Form 1 by June and it's due July 1st. If you haven't filed it, please make sure you do so. There is a grace period for a certain period of time, but after that, you will get fined \$25 per day.

Mr. Flint: Up to \$1,500. Then you may get an engraved invitation to the Commissioner of Ethics in Tallahassee. I've had that happen before for Board Members, so.

Mr. Dryburgh: Could you repeat that last part?

Mr. Flint: The Statement of Financial Interests Form 1, the Supervisor of Elections mails that out and in early June and it's due by July 1st. So, you should have gotten that.

Mr. Dryburgh: No, I've not.

Mr. Flint: Our records show you haven't filed it yet, so.

Mr. Dryburgh: I haven't gotten it either.

Mr. Flint: Okay, I can email you the form. It's a standard form that is used state wide.

Mr. Dryburgh: Would you do that? We have a new mail person who's not been the brightest. They probably put it in a mailbox front and it's probably still sitting there.

Mr. Flint: Yes, and I would just get it filed as soon as you can because it was due July 1.

Mr. Greenstein: Hey John, it's actually available. I can show you on the website. There is a PDF that you can actually just fill it out on the screen and then print it off. It makes it a lot easier.

Mr. Dryburgh: Well, I'll do my best. If you could email me, that would be great too.

Mr. Flint: Yes, we will do both. I'll send you the link and the hard copy PDF.

Mr. Greenstein: Yea, we just never talked about that in general administrative.

Mr. Flint: What's that?

Mr. d'Adesky: It's a nice surprise.

Mr. Greenstein: The need for the filing of the Financial Interest form.

Mr. Flint: Yea, every year we try to. We're not obligated because it's really the individual Board Member's obligation, but it doesn't reflect well on anyone if you have a Board Member that didn't file it. Then they blame me for not letting them know. So, we have a practice of doing that just so everyone knows.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Other Business

Mr. Harding: I just wanted to let the Board know that I've been going through some stuff because of some owners concerns about our CDD roads being public and why they have to be that way. Especially when we have our amenities where we can control access from the residents' user thing. Comparing it to other CDD's and so forth. Andy's been good enough to give me some feedback and I'm going to try to feed that through my contacts and so forth. They even went through the HOA as far as some more information about it. It also came up to the regards of the golf carts. Where the Resort just recently put out a notice that they are going to rent out golf carts and they are doing it. I advised Mr. Baker that they make sure they were licensed and properly equipped. He kept saying they were going to be equipped and they would follow the same rules as they do, but any of the members having golf carts. I said again, they just make sure they are licensed. That or they have to stay off of the roads. Same thing with our house keeping people staying off the roads and not traveling on them. Crossing them, I'm fine, but not traveling on them. Of course, it's a different situation with our landscaping company. You sent me more information on that too. But it isn't a lot of information going back and forth regard to that. But again, a reminder to homeowners and so forth with the golf carts. If they are going to have a golf cart and they are going to ride it in the streets, they need to be licensed. That will be Mark because I'm not sure that's a Resort thing. I was kind of hoping to say that comment in front of Mr. Bates when he was here. He was assuring me that they were abiding by the same rules.

Mr. Flint: I can assure you that in our company, we manage 160 CDD's. We deal with every bond counsel that's out there. Every District counsel that's out there. The issue of public access is interpreted uniformly among the entire legal.

Mr. d'Adesky: I'm not giving you my interpretation. I'm giving you what it's consistent with every process.

Mr. Flint: You brought up the example of ChampionsGate. Well, those roads are private.

Mr. d'Adesky: That's a big difference like we mentioned. If they are privately funded vs publicly funded.

Mr. Flint: If you are going to the Oasis Club over at the Lennar Development, those roads within there are owned by the HOA. That's why they can say, no you can't come in here.

Mr. d'Adesky: Even within the same CDD there can be different sections of the CDD which the roads are public in one section and private in another. It's completely permissible. It's all how they are financed.

Mr. Flint: So, the concept is soft gates. This is been something that's been discussed since CDD's started being created. We've dealt with this issue and many communities the question has come up before and the answer has always been the same. Over in the Tampa area, you actually have the State's Attorney's office going around and testing CDD's that had public roads and soft gates to see if they could actually go in. It was quite an issue. In Osceola County, in addition to the fact that there's tax law and other reasons you have to do it, when they created the Districts, they also required an inner local to be entered into mandating that the roads remain accessible.

Mr. d'Adesky: But that's above and beyond.

Mr. Flint: We had, in that case, people from the County Attorney's office testing the gates at different periods of time. Not always successfully because you have to constantly educate the people that are staffing the gates on the issue.

Mr. Harding: Well, Andrew said he was going to provide me with some data that I could share.

Mr. d'Adesky: Yeah, I'll provide you with a quick summary. I'll email a quick couple of points so you will have that.

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Supervisor's Request

Mr. Flint: Any Supervisor's requests on the business?

ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Next Meeting Date

This item was not discussed.

TWELFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Adjournment

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein seconded by Mr. Harding with all in favor the meeting adjourned at 2:21 p.m.
--



Secretary/Assistant Secretary



Chairman/Vice Chairman