

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, August 15, 2019 at 1:05 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 |
| Steven Goldstein | Assistant Secretary |
| Trudy Hobbs      | Assistant Secretary |

Also present were:

|                 |                               |
|-----------------|-------------------------------|
| George Flint    | District Manager              |
| Andrew d'Adesky | District Counsel              |
| Alan Scheerer   | Field Manager                 |
| Rob Stultz      | Yellowstone                   |
| John Cruz       | CWS Security                  |
| Richard Nasser  | Kingwood International Resort |

**FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Roll Call**

Mr. Flint called the meeting to order, all five members of the Board were present.

**SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Public Comment Period**

Mr. Flint: Any members of the public have comment for the Reunion East Board? We are having a public hearing for the budget adoption, so if you have a concern about the proposed budget or associated assessments it would be more appropriate for those comments to come up under the public hearing. Hearing none, we will move to the next item.

**THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Approval of the Minutes of the July 11, 2019 Meeting**

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

Mr. Harding: On page 3, I think that is David Burman not David Thurman. On page 11 they have me saying something but I don't think I said that. I believe that was Steve who said that.

Mr. Goldstein: Yes, that was me.

Mr. Harding: Other than that they looked good. I recommend they be approved.

On MOTION by Mr. Harding seconded by Mr. Greenstein with all in favor, the Minutes of July 11, 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: This is a request made from the developer of the Reunion Village. Reunion Village is the 109-acre piece that runs parallel to I4, where Orlando Health will be in the front and the back will be a residential development. This issue first came up because of what came up when they were approaching Osceola County regarding the development plan for the residential portion of Reunion Village. There's a bridge at the southern end of Spine Road that traverses Davenport Creek.

Mr. Scheerer: Right now it's a bridge to nowhere.

Mr. Flint: Yes, the bridge does not connect to anything. At the time, the developer was proposing to only have that as an emergency access or exit. As a result of that, the county requested they get the approval of the CDD for that plan. When that request was presented to the Board, the Board had some discussion about whether it would be preferable for that to be general access for residents or if it would be closed as an emergency exit. That's where we are at now.

Mr. Greenstein: We deferred action at the last meeting and we are going to have to defer action again at this meeting. The hope is by next meeting the developer of the property, Encore, and the successor will review some different aspects of the project. One of those aspects is access between that property and the rest of Reunion East over the bridge that goes nowhere. I'm hoping within the next month they will reach an agreement as to what is best overall. We will take action on whatever request that is. It surfaced because when they put in for the permit, the county asked for approval of that action and we were totally unaware of anything regarding that parcel and the access on that bridge. We needed time to assess the situation. If you go past the

property you will see that they are clearing the property. Hopefully by next meeting we will have clarity as to what the direction should be.

Resident: Has anyone on the Board seen any plans?

Mr. Flint: Yes, we've seen one layout.

Resident: Where does the District's property stop?

Mr. Flint: I don't know offhand and I don't have the drawings with me. We own to the southern end of the bridge and I'm not sure beyond that where the CDD property line ends.

Resident: Where is the hospital in relationship to that?

Mr. Flint: On the far side, on 532. It's going to be gated on the southern end of the residential piece between the commercial and residential. Whether there is through access to the bridge or not, we know there will be restricted access at the southern end of the commercial piece.

Mr. Goldstein: Everybody is talking about what to do to that bridge. I don't want another entrance into Reunion where people can just drive through. We know if we put another manned gate there, it will be an open hole into Reunion. They come through the manned gate now off of 429, the back way. We could put a resident only gate on both sides, like we have on Excitement. You and the ambulances could come through but nobody else could come through. It won't be cheap because it's two gates but it's the only safe way to open that bridge up. You just don't want the public coming through that gate.

Ms. Hobbs: We also don't know whether that new development road is going to be a private road. If that is a private road, then we wouldn't have access to the hospital that way anyways.

Mr. Bagley: I'm not sure if that's accurate. The County has a policy to have connectivity, and they don't like public private then public. I think the Board has more input than they think.

Mr. d'Adesky: We don't have anything in front of the Board today for them to decide on so there isn't an action item. It needs to be discussed and brought back.

Mr. Dryburgh: I can't, in my wildest dreams, imagine a developer proposing something where it says no ambulances can use the most convenient route to get to citizens to take them to the nearest hospital which is 12 blocks away. That would never happen, so ambulance should be allowed there under any condition.

Mr. Greenstein: I spoke with Kingwood and Encore outside of the meeting, and the replication of the Liberty Bluff entrance gate is a cost effective solution. It is resident only; you don't have the traffic coming through but ambulances can. The decision to place a guardhouse at the entrance of the property on the hospital side is totally up to the developer of the property. That was something that was agreed to in the declaration. I don't know if anybody would force anyone to do it, but I think that's the direction they are heading in anyway. We will probably end up with a normal guardhouse like we have everywhere within Reunion at 532. To go over the bridge to connect to the rest of Reunion East would be a resident only Liberty Bluff type gate. Until Kingwood and Encore finish discussions, there is nothing for us to do.

Mr. Harding: That would work for me.

Mr. Goldstein: I agree. I think you have to go over all the considerations at 532, which looks like it is going to be a connector from Poinciana Parkway.

Mr. Greenstein: Well, there's a hearing on the 29<sup>th</sup> to officially adopt their finding, which is to connect Poinciana Parkway to 532. That's going to be done close to OBT at the other end, but nonetheless the cars have to go somewhere.

## **FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

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

Mr. Flint: The Board has talked about the issue of parking at a couple different meetings. There are some areas that are worse than others in Reunion East. There was some new legislation adopted a couple of years ago that give CDD's the ability to adopt towing policies. Although CDD's don't have police powers, they do have the ability to adopt towing policies with the proper signage and designation of no parking areas. We asked John Cruz to come up with some preliminary areas that are the most problematic that the Board might consider putting a no parking/towing policy in place at. For the Board to do that, they have to go through a public hearing process called a Rule Hearing. We would have the proposed policy in front of the Board at the time they set the public hearing to put the towing policy in place.

Mr. Scheerer: The streets John identified were Corolla, Titian, Excitement, and Oconee.

Mr. Dryburgh: Why wasn't Gathering included?

Mr. Scheerer: We can add it.

Mr. d'Adesky: I suggest adding that in, get all the maps in the next agenda, and bring that back to the Board at the next agenda.

Mr. Greenstein: Does the identification of the streets and the proposed hours of enforcement have to be set in advance of the hearing?

Mr. d'Adesky: There is some wiggle room to change it, but due to the nature of this I would prefer to have a clear document path all the way through.

Mr. Greenstein: Got it. So between now and the next meeting we can solidify this.

Resident: I have no idea what you are talking about. Are you talking about restricting the parking on those streets overnight? Do you know what a major undertaking that is and all the problems and concerns the property owners would have?

Mr. Flint: They do, and that's why there's a public hearing required to do that.

Resident: You will have major pushback on that.

Mr. Dryburgh: We would expect that. You have to understand the way the parking situation is set up currently, you cannot get an emergency vehicle like a firetruck through the lanes at night because the cars are blocking so much of the street. At midnight you have a difficult time getting an emergency vehicle down there. We're trying to address everyone's concerns.

Mr. d'Adesky: We've had folks come to the Board and say they cannot get regular vehicles through.

Mr. Harding: Per the law, emergency vehicles can plough through those areas in case of emergency.

Resident: I understand. But there are 10-12 bedroom homes that have been approved and the guests park on the street. The reality is you have a number of people that have homes that have tenants in them that require parking on the street.

Mr. Greenstein: We've been officially discussing the subject at the meetings for the last 6 months or so. We started talking about our authority to do it before then. It is being presented for evaluation purposes. It is a test called a demonstration project. We identified the most egregious parking problems that we have on the east side, and that's what we are starting with. The resort is impacted by this. Every guest or resident can be impacted by this. We need to develop a parking plan for Reunion, and it won't happen overnight.

Mr. Dryburgh: We have discussed this with resort security, their input is very big with us. They're the ones that have to deal with it on Friday and Saturday nights. Those guys need a legal guideline they can go by when there are problems. It's not safe for people to park wherever they want, whenever they want.

Mr. Harding: We have people complaining about not being able to get out of their driveways.

Resident: That's a different situation. I find it hard to believe you can't get an ambulance or firetruck down any street in Reunion.

Mr. Harding: If you park on both sides of the street in some areas you could not get a firetruck through it.

Mr. Flint: The Board is not making a decision right now. They're making the decision next month.

## **SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

### **Public Hearing**

#### **A. Consideration of Resolution 2019-05 Adopting the Fiscal Year 2020 Budget and Relating to the Annual Appropriations**

Mr. Flint: Is there a motion to open the public hearing.

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein seconded by Mr. Harding with all in favor, the Public Hearing was opened.

Mr. Flint: The Board has discussed this budget at two meetings, the proposed was initially approved at the May meeting. It was revised at the June meeting. You set the date, place, and time of the public hearing for today for its final consideration. There is a proposed increase in the assessment amount. We will walk through the budget and take any public comments before you consider any action. On page 1 you have the revenue section. You have a combination of on roll assessments which are designated as tax collector, those are certified to the county for collection. That is on all the platted lots within Reunion East. You have an off roll or direct billed section, that is for any of the unplatted lots. We send them a direct bill versus it being on the tax bill. The total of that is not significantly different from the current budget. You can see the major categories. Administrative has a slight increase of \$6,000. Maintenance has about a \$20,000 adjustment, and half of that was pressure washing. The Heritage Crossings

Community Center costs have remained the same. We have an allowance in the event we need to operate the irrigation system as a utility. There would be certain operational costs the District would be obligated to fund. We have a transfer out to the Capital Reserve, and that is based on a Reserve Study the District had done a number of years ago. The total expenses are fairly close from the current year to the next year. The District has certain shared costs, like the maintenance of the roads and landscaping. The shared costs are on page 2. Originally they were split out by planned unit, but a couple years ago it was changed to be split by platted lot. When it was split to platted lots, the original percentage was about Reunion East 70% and Reunion West around 30%. Right now it is close to 56/44%. The portion that East pays has reduced over time, but the change in development plan and reduction of density has overridden any potential savings by the shift in shared cost. On page 3 you will see the current year and next years proposed assessments. At the bottom of Table 3 you will see the historical per unit amount. A single-family home is currently paying \$655.27. That number has been fairly flat for a number of years. It is proposed to go up by \$190.80 from 2019 to 2020. Again, it's not that our costs are increasing it is that we have trued up the original development plan to what is actually on the ground. Encore, the owner of that 109-acre piece, was really bearing a much larger portion of the assessments than they should have based on the development plan. They were paying based on a proposed development plan. If you go back far enough, you will see that the per unit assessments were actually higher at one point than what they are proposed to be in 2020. Are there any questions from the Board? If not, we will ask for public comments at this time on the budget and assessments.

Mr. Stanley Tourbush (7521 Morning Dove Circle): Is the increase the same for The Terraces?

Mr. Flint: The terraces are classified as multifamily and the proposed increase is \$143.10. The letter can be confusing, but it is a legal document and is required to be written a certain way. The only impact to you would be \$143 over a 12-month period.

Resident (Unidentified): What is the difference between single family and golf?

Mr. Flint: Golf only applies to the golf course. The golf club pays an assessment. The multi family is the terraces and Seven Eagles. Are there any other public comments? If not, I will bring it back to the Board for discussion and consideration of the resolution.



On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein seconded by Mr. Dryburgh with all in favor, Resolution 2019-05 Adopting the Fiscal Year 2020 Budget and Relating to the Annual Appropriations, was approved.

**B. Consideration of Resolution 2019-06 Imposing Special Assessments and Certifying an Assessment Roll**

Mr. Flint: This resolution attaches the budget you just adopted and the assessment roll according to the per unit assessments that were approved in the budget. Are there any questions?

On MOTION by Mr. Harding seconded by Mr. Goldstein with all in favor, Resolution 2019-06 Imposing Special Assessments and Certifying an Assessment Roll, was approved.

Mr. Flint: I'll ask for a motion to close the public hearing now.

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein seconded by Mr. Dryburgh with all in favor, the Public Hearing was closed.

Mr. Flint: I want to mention that we received a letter from Orlando Health yesterday and provided you all with a copy.

Mr. Scheerer: They were asking us something that is pretty much impermissible. We haven't done it in any other case. We can't do what they asked us to do, so there is no action that needs to be taken. We just want to note that we received it, we read it, and we cannot do anything about it.

Mr. Flint: We originally assessed them based on the planned development, then it converts to the actual development. In this case, the assessment for Orlando Health is based on their ultimate development of that site which would result in O&M assessments of \$235,000 a year. They are planning to build 370,000 square feet of commercial on that piece. They are going to be developing that site over time, and will initially have a free standing emergency room. That will be expanded to a free standing emergency room and a medical office building, then a hospital bed tower, and then the future phases are to be determined. They were asking consideration from the Board to phase in how those are assessments. Ultimately, we can't do that even if we wanted to. I apologize for not bringing this up during the hearing. As a result of this information, is there any desire to reopen the hearing and reconsider any action?



Mr. Greenstein: No.

**SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS****Acceptance of Audit Committee  
Recommendation and Selection of an Auditor**

Mr. Flint: The Board sat as the Audit Committee and ranked Grau & Associates as the #1 ranked firm. I would ask for a motion to accept the Audit Committee's recommendation.

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein seconded by Mr. Goldstein with all in favor, the Audit Committee's Recommendation Ranking Grau & Associates #1 and Selecting them as the Auditor, was approved.

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

Mr. d'Adesky: I have a couple things. There are some tweaks on the MSA based on comments from Bond Counsel. We are trying to get that moved forward as quickly as we can. We have bonds levied on these properties, so we have to take the opinion of our Bond Counsel into consideration. The next item, next week we have a meeting with the attorney for Kingwood regarding the unexchanged bond. We will get back with the Board with whatever comes out of that meeting. We will work on finalizing the towing rules. Don asked me to provide some bullet points on the public roads and the nature of the roads. The roads inside Reunion are public roads. All the rules that apply to public streets also apply to the rules within Reunion, and we are not excepted from any of the rules that apply to public streets. One of those rules is you cannot drive golf carts on public street unless they have been designated as a golf cart road, which the roads within Reunion have not. You can drive them in 55+ communities, this is not one of those communities. There are exemptions, one of the exemptions is if they are doing government work or contractors for a government. Our landscapers are allowed to drive their landscaping vehicles around, and contractors are allowed. Driving golf carts on the street is a ticket-able offense by the Osceola Sheriff's Department.

Mr. Flint: There are ways to modify them to make them street legal.

Mr. d'Adesky: Yes, you can. It is expensive, but you can do it. That's all I have unless there are any other issues that the Board would like to discuss.

**B. Engineer**

There being none, the next item followed.

**C. District Manager's Report****i. Action Items Lists**

Mr. Flint: The first two items are on hold and Andrew hit on the MSA. Item 4 has been completed. The County has indicated that we can move forward with the four way stop without them requiring a study. Steve is putting together the schematics for that. We already discussed the parking issue. Can someone speak on the dog park playgrounds?

Mr. Goldstein: We are going to do a fenced dog park with the double gate. On the other side we proposed to do a playground since there isn't a decent playground in Reunion right now. Across from the dog park there is an area with a bench and trashcan right now. In that area we are going to put a really nice playground. We've done our due diligence.

Mr. Scheerer: The size of the dog park was estimated at 65 feet by 70 feet. It would have a double 4-foot gate with a concrete pad as a staging area for the pets when you're transitioning from the sidewalk to the park. There would be a trashcan there, and in the park there would be a station with bags. On the backside of the park we have to have a 5-foot gate, so the landscapers can get their equipment in there. It's double picket to help prevent small dogs from escaping. Steve and I met with multiple vendors. Service Solutions provided a quote for \$13,718.52 for the fence, to install the three gates was an additional \$1,224, and to pour an 8x8 path was \$1,600. We had another quote for the same fencing with a 5x5 pad for \$16,968. Rose Fence was a little more reasonable. For the same size, 65x70 with three gates and double picket fence, was \$10,200. Fence Outlet quoted \$13,096. This project was not budget for 2019. If the Board chooses to do, in talking with Steve we believe the logical approach would be to go with Rose Fence. We could get the pad poured for less than \$1,600. We are also working to add water to the park, but Toho is being very slow.

Mr. Flint: Do we own the property?

Mr. Scheerer: We do not own that. Should this be something the Board would like to do, we would have to approach the property owner, which is Kingwood.

Mr. Goldstein: We talked about budgeting for the dog park now, and building in the playground to the budget.

Mr. Flint: The Board already approved the budget, but you can amend it.

Mr. Scheerer: On the playground, we looked at an area approximately 30x40. It's an open piece of property. I have a picture of a playground that American Parks Company installed in another CDD in Osceola County. It's a turnkey operation, they do it all except for a sidewalk leading to the ADA access. There's a company called Playmore that we contacted. They haven't submitted their proposal yet.

Mr. Goldstein: We will bring this back to the next meeting with more information.

**ii. Approval of Check Register**

Mr. Flint: The total for July is \$628,895. A very large portion of that is moving assessment revenue to the Debt Service Fund.

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein seconded by Mr. Harding with all in favor of Check Register for July totaling \$628,895, was approved.

**iii. Balance Sheet and Income Statement**

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

**iv. Status of Direct Bill Assessments**

Mr. Flint: We are 100% collected on our on-roll assessments and direct assessments.

Mr. Greenstein: That's great.

**v. Approval of the Fiscal Year 2020 Meeting Schedule**

Mr. Flint: We suggested the second Thursday of each month at 1:00 p.m. in this location.

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein seconded by Ms. Hobbs with all in favor, the Fiscal Year 2020 Meeting Schedule, was approved.

**NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Other Business**

Mr. Flint: Is there any other business? Do you want to open the floor to public comment?

Mr. Greenstein: Sure.

Mr. Bagley: Three years I approached the Board about acquiring the stables, if the Board was inclined, I would pursue that again.

Mr. Flint: We are in the process of interfacing with Bond Counsel on what would be required. We received a letter of interest from another entity about acquiring this facility. We have bond funds that were used originally to construct it, and some tax issues that we would have to navigate through.

Mr. d'Adesky: We would either have to redeem bonds with an equivalent amount of what we sold it for. Or we would have to use the funds within two years for an eligible public project.

**TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Supervisor's Request**

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

There being none,

**ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Next Meeting Date**

Mr. Flint: The next meeting date is September 12<sup>th</sup> at this location.

**TWELFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Adjournment**

|  |
|--|
| On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein seconded by Mr. Harding with all in favor the meeting adjourned at 2:14 p.m. |
|--|

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary/Assistant Secretary

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman/Vice Chairman