

MINUTES OF MEETING
REUNION EAST
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

A Special Meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Reunion East Community Development District was held on Thursday, December 19, 2019 at 7:00 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
Trudy Hobbs	Assistant Secretary
Steven Goldstein	Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

George Flint	District Manager
Andrew d'Adesky	District Counsel
Alan Scheerer	Field Manager
Tricia Adams	GMS
John Cruz	CWS Security
Victor Vargas	CWS Security
Anthony Carll	Kingwood
Residents	

****Due to a technical issue with the audio, the beginning of the meeting was summarized. The recording commenced during the Third Order of Business.****

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

Roll Call

Mr. Greenstein called the meeting to order and Mr. Flint called the roll. All Supervisors were present.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS

Public Comment Period

There not being any, the next item as followed.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS

Public Hearing

Mr. Greenstein: Tonight we are starting with prohibiting parking on selected roadways within Reunion East. We are trying to determine how our proposed rule is going to impact our way of life, if the efficiency of those rules make sense, should they be modified or what have you.

There are some folks who basically said, "*Why don't you supply it to the entire community at once?*" It's a big change. We have been living with no rules on parking and/or towing for 15 years. So we don't take this lightly and we don't do this overnight. The plan is if we are able to adopt the rule as proposed or as modified by the Board during our deliberations, then we will implement it with Reunion East on those designated roads. We will learn from it. I will carry the ball on the Reunion West side for Reunion West to catch up, sort of speak, for the one month that we are behind. We must have a legal notice to have a hearing on the Reunion West side. I would expect a different group of people might attend that meeting or it might be the same ones or maybe a fewer number, but I really don't see that there are distinctive differences between Reunion East and Reunion West. Hopefully when we do proceed to implement this fully within the entire resort, both Reunion East and Reunion West, I anticipate that the implementation would be simultaneous, that Reunion East and Reunion West would have the same rules and the same coverage, the same procedures and go into effect at the same time. It would not be next week or next month, but several months down the road. This is just the first step. I wanted to make it clear that we made the decision not to start the process on both sides simultaneously for efficiency and economy. If there's something we learned that is unique about Reunion West, we will address it. If there's something we learned that is unique about Reunion East, their Board will address it. With that being said, I will start with the front row. Mr. Bagley, would you like to make a comment?

Mr. Jim Bagley: I think it would be beneficial before we start talking one-by-one. Can you describe what this one side of the road policy looks like? Is it an odd number or even number? Is it 24/7?

Mr. Flint: We don't want to have a question or answer (Q&A) session. We will answer questions at the end.

Mr. d'Adesky: Jim, you of all people know that we don't do Q&As.

Mr. Greenstein: Jim, if you want to make a suggestion, we will hear it. Make a positive statement on what you want to see us do.

Mr. Bagley: I understand that something has to be done, but the current Board, as I understand it, is made up of primarily principal residents. This community is a short-term rental community. The understanding of value and the predominance of the ownership is that residents bought here with the expectation that their rental guests would be treated fairly. There was an income component on why they bought here. I think setting policies to deter, will infringe on

that owner's expectation, making their guests overburdened with regulation. I think it is very problematic, especially since this Board's constituency is primary residents. I understand Mr. Flint was articulate in how he made notification, but the reality is that 90% of this community doesn't live within 50 miles of here and doesn't read the local papers. So I suggest, before the Board takes action, that they take a vote of the entire community. Send a notification out and make some opportunity where non-residents could vote since the constituency base is probably 90% non-residents. Thank you.

Mr. Jim Mabbott (Gathering Drive): My wife and I bought our house and we moved into it on August 4th. We love this community. We can't believe we found this community. Its amazing. We go out on Excitement Drive quite a bit and you can't get through there most days. If there are cars coming the other way, you have to stop and play chicken to figure out who is going to go where. Its dangerous. I think this is a good idea to look into. I understand the whole notion of the rental properties, but my wife and I live here all year long and we like a community that we can travel through safely and not worry too much about crashing. I know that you are not doing a Q&A period, but my wife and I actually looked at every one of the roads and we're not sure how you are picking what side of the road you are going to select for parking. I imagine you are going to hear some folks say, *"To get to my road, I have to go all the way past my house, make a U-turn and come back,"* but my wife Joann and I support the general concept.

Mr. Greenstein: Thank you. Chris?

Ms. Christina Sussman (Oconne Street): I wasn't prepared to speak this evening, but one of the things that I need to draw the Board's attention to is my street basically has 10 houses. Three of those are empty lots. For the remaining homes, only three are occupied. We are the only ones on the entire street that occupy it full-time. There is one at one end of the street that occupies their home half of the time, but most come and go. So obviously we don't want to have parking in front of our home. The other thing that needs to be brought to your attention is the fact that Oconne Street is a way into the spa. So of the congested parking that's there, 90% are spa workers who are parking along that street to report to duty. The other 5% are patrons of the spa. So I think that needs to be taken into consideration also.

Mr. Greenstein: Thank you, Chris. Mr. Glasser?

Mr. David Glasser (Desert Mountain Court): It's not often that I disagree with Mr. Bagley, but tonight is one of those occasions. I can see Jim's point of view in terms of speaking to those people that rent here, but that's a fallacy. If those people were interested in what is going on in

the community, which they profit from by renting their homes out, then they should put up with the fact that we are going to make some rules that govern the people that live here, whether they are renters or permanent residents. So I'm sorry, Jim, but I disagree with you on that point. The second point is the point that Mark raised about Reunion East and Reunion West. I would like to know how you managed to put signs on the streets, when there was no meeting, consensus or agreement. Can you please reply?

Mr. Greenstein: Thank you, David. I'm going to save the answer until the end. Next is Mr. Pyle.

Mr. Jeffrey Pyle (Corolla Court): Fortunately or unfortunately, we live at the end of Corolla Court, on the cul-de-sac. I don't see where its been addressed what's going to happen with parking on the cul-de-sac. I'm not sure about Florida, but in other states, cul-de-sacs were designed for fire trucks to turn around. I'm not sure if that's the same in this state or not, so I'm wondering how that's going to be handled. There are two problems on Corolla Court. One is a daytime problem with construction trucks and vehicles. I don't know how you handle that. The other problem is a nighttime problem, which is when you have single lot owners putting 13 bedrooms in. Right now we have 25 bedrooms on the cul-de-sac, and I understand another big one is being built with 20 bedrooms. So we will be up to 40 some bedrooms in one cul-de-sac. I've been in the business of building short-term homes in Disney for years, but in all of the communities where we had homes, there has not been a parking issue. Maybe the streets are a little bit wider. I'm not sure about Windsor Hills, Windsor Palms and Champions Gate, but there is a problem here and its very dangerous to get an emergency vehicle down the street. So I'm concerned about the safety issue and hopefully you are going in the right direction. I think having one side for parking would certainly be a big help and we appreciate you doing that. Thank you.

Mr. Greenstein: Thank you, Jeffrey. Dr. McKeon?

Dr. Thomas McKeon (Palmilla Court): I bought my first house in Reunion West, so I've been here a long time. I am pleased to hear Mark, that you addressed the Reunion West Board to try to include them in the parking. One statement that was made is we don't want to initiate too much of a change too fast. We've had changes where Encore came in, closed the parking for the water park and finally reopened it after a period of time. Now we have Kingwood. There have been a lot of changes and we can adapt to those changes, but I really think if they don't do all of the streets on both sides, you are going to be back here in five years doing this all over again, which I feel doesn't really need to be done. The biggest issue, according to the pictures that Jeff

provided, is congestion. You have two representatives of the security. In talking with them, Reunion West is worse than Reunion East because we have mega mansions and rentals. Also, if Jim is correct, 90% are renters, but 10% live here and we have to drive these streets every day. We have to play chicken. On some streets, trucks will block you in and you have to literally turn around and go out a different way. So that has to be taken into consideration because we live here and are contributing to all of the different amenities that are here and the restaurants. The others don't and that has to be taken into consideration. So I'm glad that we have the foresight to get things completed. Let's just take it the whole way and try to get both sides done. Thank you.

Mr. Greenstein: Nancy?

Ms. Nancy Dryburgh (Gathering Court): I just want to re-emphasize what Tom said with regard to having this apply to more than just selected streets. The reason for that is because, as I think we've experienced in other places, when there is restricted parking in one area, it overflows into adjacent areas. If we do not implement something on all of the streets within Reunion, because all of the streets are too narrow, when emergency vehicles come through when there are cars parked on both sides, we are going to continue to have the same safety problems. I think it will be exacerbated by having people who are driving around trying to find another parking place outside of their street, if parking on two sides is allowed. Thanks.

Mr. Greenstein: Thank you.

Mr. Matthew Babaian (Muirfield Loop): I agree with the parking rules. I think this is a good thing, but I would like for there to be a timeline for Reunion West. Having implemented the first quarter of 2020, the need is in the present and we have a serious liability issue in Reunion West. There are terrible issues on Whitemarsh Way. Residents don't use their driveways and there are constant rear collisions. Trucks get stuck and block traffic. I missed a flight because of renters parked across my driveway and security saying they couldn't move the car because the renters said it was their Sabbath. So I ended up having to reschedule my flight instead. Security said there were no rules for them to have the car towed. Also its fallacious reasoning that since we live in a vacation community, we shouldn't have residential improvements. For a renter that needs an ambulance that cannot get to them due to impassible streets, it isn't going to be good for the rest of the community. It certainly would not be good for that person. A Board Member here had the exact situation in the past month. On that note, rental homes are over rented. For example, two parking spots are provided for a home that rents out to 32 people. They block the sidewalk

constantly. Security stops by and looks at it. They might need a second notice, but we need some sort of policy. Thank you.

Mr. Greenstein: Thank you.

Resident (Not Identified): I didn't think that I would speak tonight, but my question is where are the neighbors going to go? We have to call security because many trucks and cars are parked in the street and their owners actually live here. So it's good to have rules, but what do we do with a house that has 20 or 30 rooms? If we said, "*You can park here*," I don't think the question has been asked yet. Thank you.

Mr. Richard Cowling (Assembly Court): Good evening. My street is known as the redheaded stepchild to Reunion. Our services suck over there. Sorry for the language, but they are terrible. We get no security. People park anywhere they want, and the maintenance is lacking. I'm sorry, but I have a broader agenda here. I didn't understand why I received a note on my car for an HOA meeting. I didn't know if was just about parking. I don't even know if I live in Reunion East or Reunion West.

Mr. Greenstein: Carriage Pointe is within the Reunion East CDD; however it is not one of the areas that have been designated. Let's call this Phase 2.

Mr. Cowling: When I moved there two years ago, they put up no parking signs in places where you would not block a driveway and its insane. So I don't know whose making these decisions. It's terrible down there. Renters come in and park everywhere because they don't care. Owners like myself feel if we are going to rent out, we have to take responsibility for talking to these people. Thank you.

Mr. James Feely (Assembly Court): I know that we are not included today, but something obviously needs to be included. Renters are obviously the concern. The only problem with Carriage Pointe is that there are one car garages and one car driveways. So parking on the street needs to be considered. We just don't have the spots. We have 94 individual units. I think there are 14 or 15 buildings, so we are right on top of each other. The hardest thing is that the "*No Parking*" signs are actually in the wrong spots. They should be enforced in between individual units in that tiny slab of grass. In between buildings, you can fit three cars with no problem. So that's probably the place you should be parking. As we move forward, it's something that needs to be considered and adopted. I took some measurements while preparing for today's meeting. I just wanted to look at the other roads you guys are enforcing. The average road is only about 20 feet wide. Carriage Pointe is 24 feet wide. Our roads are a little wider, so we have to consider

something. We are extremely limited. I know that the 429 expansion will affect our neighborhood, in the front, so who knows what we will have after that gets built, but we have to consider something there. Obviously, Carriage Pointe is very different. We have townhouses. I know one individual unit, a four-bedroom house that is rented out to seven or eight people, which is absurd. I think they have six vehicles there. I have two vehicles and I use my garage as a gym. We could clear it up if we have to, but we should look at alternatives. Thank you.

Mr. Greenstein: Thank you.

Mr. Chris Downing: As Mr. Bagley said, we all need verification on what this towing is going to be about, what side of the street is going to have restricted parking, exactly where the towaway zone is going to be designated and if there are going to be "*No Parking*" signs. I might have misunderstood, but I thought I read something that Reunion was going to start issuing parking tickets. I know it's not a Q&A, but are you going to issue parking tickets or is that idea nixed?

Mr. d'Adesky: We will address that question at the end.

Mr. Flint: We can't legally issue parking tickets.

Mr. Downing: Like I said, you are proposing towing zones. At what point is that vehicle going to be towed? I know we talked about the nightmares of everyone who bought in Reunion as an investment. Specifically the management company is going to be an absolute nightmare. Just consider the possibility of the situation of Mom and Dad getting the kids together, grandparents getting into the car and going to Disney and all of a sudden, their car is towed. That's going to be a problem that is going to be throughout the community and it's going to be an absolute nightmare for the management company. What's going to happen is people are going to start writing bad reviews about Reunion, which is going to affect Reunion as a whole. You guys should really not take that lightly, especially in Reunion West because there are larger homes and parking is going to be a nightmare. We understand and would be the first to appreciate that safety needs to be a priority; however, the homes in Reunion West are significantly larger and you can't just arbitrarily burden the owner of the homes and the renters enjoyment of the homes by towing cars. That's all I have.

Mr. d'Adesky: We will address it.

Mr. Greenstein: We have a procedure. I have a list of at least 15 to 20 things that we are going to have to address.

Mr. Dowling: With all due respect, I totally disagree with this policy or practice you guys are talking about and the question of having Q&A session or not. I think it's ludicrous to be honest to you. If it's written down somewhere and etched in stone, that's fine, if that's a law that we have to abide by, but you haven't even explained what the towing policy is. You make reference to a towing policy and parking on one side of the street. Is it the right side or the left side? Are you coming in the back end of Reunion or off of S. Old Lake Wilson Road? The right side or left side of the street is going to be questionable. We don't have that problem. We own 18 properties in Reunion East. We are the largest property owner in Reunion, so we have a huge vested interest here. So I agree with having a towing policy, but not letting everybody know what that policy is. I think it's totally inappropriate to be honest with you. We have handouts showing lines on a map with some of the streets. I agree with a couple of people that made reference to doing all of Reunion East. Chris and I were driving around yesterday on Devereux Street and Soiree Way and there were cars parked directly across from each other. So if your concern is emergency vehicles having to plough through, that would be a problem. So there is no good reason not to include the inside streets. None whatsoever. Okay? If you initiate a towing policy, as far as ticketing, once again, it hasn't been explained why you are not ticketing. I understand the resort may not have the authority, but these are public roads. So whoever issues tickets on other roads I'm sure can issue tickets in here. I don't see why not. Security is supposed to take the license plate number and address of every car that comes in. So if there's a car that is parked illegally, there's no reason why security can't knock on that door. There are enough security people driving around the resort at all times. Okay? But we haven't even been told what the towing policy is and that is a nail in the coffin to the resort. Because like it or not, I fully understand the permanent residents here and these are concerns. I appreciate that.

Mr. Flint: That's three minutes.

Mr. Dowling: Ninety percent of the resort are vacation rentals and whether you like the 20 veteran homes or not, they are here to stay, and more are going to be built. Reunion West will address it. If I went over my time, I can move it to my next property because we have 18 properties.

Mr. Greenstein: Its by person, not by how many properties you have.

Mr. Dowling: I guess I'm making too many valid points.

Mr. Greenstein: Just conclude your comments.

Mr. Dowling: I believe that two or three other people want to speak.

Mr. Greenstein: Why don't we give other people the chance to speak. Thank you. Just hang around.

Ms. Stephanie Glasser (Desert Mountain Court): The parking policy has been an issue on our street for the way that people park and the fact that they can't actually park in their driveways. Many times I leave for work early in the morning and sometimes you have to look around here because before you know it, there will be an accident. I do believe when we first bought in Reunion, you were not allowed to park on the street. You were not allowed to leave your vehicle on your driveway. You had to have a garage that was functional and that your car had to be in. So when did those rules change? If somebody can tell me that, then talk about why it is that you have so many issues regarding parking, because if you decided not to have functional garages and not have enough space for parking, then that is really your concern. It's not the permanent homeowners' concern. Thank you.

Mr. Greenstein: Thank you, Stephanie.

Ms. Sharon Holly: I'm on both sides of the fence. I'm a full-time resident of Reunion and I also own a management company that operates resort and vacation rentals in here. I think I speak for most of the other reputable companies here who are fully aware that there is a parking issue. We are more than happy to cooperate and try to find a solution. The solution isn't just to instill hard and fast rules. It will be detrimental to our renters. Exactly as Mr. Downing said, a family coming out and finding that their vehicle is being towed is going to be devastated. I think the reviews are going to affect the overall impact of the resort and although some of us are residents, it is detrimental that this resort survives as a rental community. That's our biggest contributor. So we want to work together, and I think that I speak for the other management companies in here, certainly the large ones and definitely the ones that have morals amongst them. We want to find a solution, but you have to give us alternatives. These people are coming in with vehicles and they need to park them. So we need to know where they can park. Just give us options so we can tell them. The directions have to be clear and simple because we are talking about people coming here that don't even speak English. So telling them to park on the outside or even side on a Wednesday, will be difficult. We need something simple. But we absolutely want to work with you and find a solution that is good for the residents, renters and the overall health of the resort.

Mr. Greenstein: Thank you. Are there any final comments during the public hearing portion? If not, then we are going to close the public hearing. We received comments and I have

a list of answers and I'm sure each one of the Board Members has a list. I can address a number of these, and we can just get the ball rolling. First of all, I have a 33-year career in the Federal government and there were many times when the rules and regulations really bit me in the rear end. I did not like them, but I had to observe them and follow them. At times we moved away from the formal proceeding. Jim Bagley knows this personally, in fact he probably started us moving in that direction. During the public comment period, he would ask us to get into a dialogue and we would completely go off the agenda. We would be talking about all kinds of different things and we have an agenda to follow. So we agreed when we get into the actual subject matter on the agenda, to address questions and get into a dialogue sort of speak. If we need to clarify some things, which I think we do, then that is what we are going to do now. These are in no order. We are just trying to get some information out to you. So don't think that one thing is more important than another. What we are legally required to do is to notify the constituents, property owners, people who own property in the District of the proposed rule change, through dual notices that are very expensive. We decided as a Board not to do the entire Reunion East side at one time because that would only exacerbate the problem of where people are going to park, which is a long-term issue that needs to be resolved. But we approached this problem solely from the standpoint of needing to address a safety concern. We have too many situations where emergency vehicles could not get through and where residents could not get back to their homes. Forget about the distinction between a renter and a property owner. To me, it doesn't exist. We are all living in the community, whether you are a renter, own property, whether you are short term or long term, it is one community. One part of the community doesn't function without the other. This rule is for the safety of all of us. So we are trying to address the issue of how to maintain the roadways so that emergency vehicles and other large vehicles can get through without being impeded. We notified the community of the proposed rule change and the parking and towing policy that the CDD will approve. In other words, what I'm trying to accentuate is the fact that the procedural part of this process is something that we will work on administratively. It's like Congress issuing an Authorization Bill, but then they have to appropriate the funds to implement the Bill. One without the other doesn't work. Many times policies are established without procedure and nothing ever gets done. But a lot of you are concerned and want to know the details of the procedures, whether parking is going to be on one side of the street or the other, how much warning we are going to give people and if we are going to ticket them. All of these things fall under the procedure heading, which we have yet to fully address. There are some

things that we can honestly say we don't have the authority to do. Am I correct in saying that we cannot ticket?

Mr. d'Adesky: Yes. We cannot ticket.

Mr. Greenstein: Why don't you address that.

Mr. d'Adesky: Let me elaborate. So the CDD is a very limited power government entity and our Statutes, Chapter 190 goes through very specific things we can do. Towing is one of the few options we have. I know a lot of the speakers stood up and talked about other alternatives, but this Board is very limited in the number of options they have. We can't issue tickets. Only the County Sheriff's Department can issue tickets within Reunion. In terms of the priorities for the County Sheriff's Department and what they do day-to-day operationally, issuing parking tickets is very low on their priority list, but we can ask them to. In the past, this District specifically reached out to the Sheriff's Office and asked them to come into Reunion to see what they can do. The effect has been nominal at best in the past. So that's one thing. I know that a couple of speakers talked about alternatives like building a parking garage. The CDD is also limited in what property we own. To what I'm aware of, we don't have any property that would support a parking garage.

Ms. Hobbs: So you are suggesting that residents use their own garage instead of converting them to bedrooms or game rooms?

Mr. d'Adesky: Yes. Now there might be an opportunity for other entities within the community or the resort to offer a parking garage or some other option, but that is something we would have to collaborate with our partners on within the community to accomplish it. It is not something that we as an entity as this Board could accomplish ourselves. I just want to make that clear.

Mr. Greenstein: Thank you Andrew. While we cannot issue tickets, we would plan on being judicious and being reasonable, just like the four-way stops. David Glasser brought up the issue of why we are able to immediately determine two places in the resort that were becoming a safety issue for pedestrian and vehicular traffic. We decided that we needed four-way stops. Because it's not a traffic signal, the county did not require a study of the volume of traffic, so we had the administrative ability to do it. We saw a need and we did it. We had our engineer look at it. Quite honestly, I give Alan Shira all the credit for getting that done as quickly as he did because we did not raise it to the point where we didn't have to overregulate it. We felt it was something that was needed and were able to do it, but because it could impose costs, such as

towing fees to the public, we must have a rule that allowing us to do that. There are no fees other than for violating a parking rule, which of course the Sheriff or the highway patrol would have to issue tickets for going, such as through our new four-way stop. We had the ability to do that. We saw a need and did it right away. It happened to work out in both Reunion East and Reunion West, but was strictly a coincidence. Someone brought up the fact that you would have to make a U-Turn or whatever in order to get to the right side of the street, so we are going to have to deal with all of that. On a timeline basis, wouldn't you think George, that based upon further discussion and adoption of the policy rule, the implementation phase, the procedural part would have to take us at least 60 to 90 days to get going.

Mr. Flint: Yes.

Mr. Greenstein: We will have meetings. We meet the second Thursday of every month and those meetings will address the procedural aspects of it. We will adopt the rules and make you aware of them. You can read them in the minutes if you don't attend the meetings, because it's something that requires what I call, "*On the ground implementation.*" It will be communicated to you the way this meeting was communicated to you, which was through Artemis, the management company for the HOA. I'm only speaking personally, because this is not something the Board has deliberated over yet. So it will not be implemented tomorrow. We will agree on the appropriate number of warnings to give a particular vehicle before we call the tow truck. You will be advised of all of that. The whole purpose tonight is to take input to vote on adopting the rule, so that we can begin to limit parking within Reunion East and to tow.

Mr. Goldstein: I know some of you were concerned about towed cars. We don't want to do that. The whole reason for doing this isn't to give tickets, tow cars, cost people money, because parents will come out with their kids in the morning and scream because their car isn't there. We are not going to tow a car that is sitting in front of a house. John and his guys are going to make every attempt to contact the owner of the car first and get that car moved. Like Mark said, we are going to give warnings. We are not going to tow the first time or second time. We haven't set the rule yet. We haven't agreed to what we are going to do, but we are not going to come out here and just start towing. That's not going to solve the problem. We are trying to be human beings about it. I know that John and his guys, when they see a car sitting out in the street blocking a driveway, go house to house to try to find out who it belongs to. The problem we have is a lot of times people will park their cars and go to the parks for 15 hours. If enough people do that and an ambulance needs to come by, we have a problem. As Matt said, I was with him one night

when a fire truck and three police cars couldn't get through the street when a lady was struck. We do have a problem and are going to be very, very cautious about how we proceed going forward. Hopefully everyone is very happy about it and we have great results.

Mr. Harding: One thing I think everybody here agrees with if that we have to do something. The parking situation in here has been discussed ever since I have been on the Board and even prior to that. We have been working with the county and the police department. We had recommendations from security before. Security made recommendations regarding the streets on your map as being the major problem areas. There are other areas in the community, as some of the people have said and situations that need to be resolved. We wanted to try this to see if it can work. Again, how we handle each individual case for towing and all of the specifics as far as the procedures, we need to discuss and work on it some more. We have been trying to work on this for some time. Maybe one of the solutions to which side of the street we prevent parking is the side of the street with the least amount of homes facing that side of the street. So the majority of homes that face the street, are the ones that we want to make sure that people are able to park. I live on Radiant Street where there are a number of homes. That wasn't even on the map, but a number of homes there don't even face the street on one side, so that would be an easy street to have parking on one side. So part of the rationale is what we decide in terms of how we address that particular issue. What troubles me is that we have to have some solution. To say that we are not going to have any solution or not do anything, not tow or have any parking rules or regulations at all, I think is ignoring the problem. With that, I will turn it over to Mark.

Mr. Greenstein: Trudy or John, did you want to comment? I still have four or five points to make.

Mr. Dryburgh: Go ahead Mark.

Mr. Greenstein: One of the questions that was mentioned, I think by Stephanie Glasser, brought us back to the good old days when cars had to be parked in garages. The streets are narrow because there was no on street parking anticipated; not on an overnight basis or long-term basis. That rule was an HOA rule. It was basically an association/HOA covenant policy or procedure that was relaxed or not enforced. When we purchased the lots, I believe there was a requirement to build within a particular period of time, and they fixed upon the real estate world like gangbusters. They said that there was no need to evoke that rule and cause chaos. So they did not enforce the rule. I'm pretty sure that rule is still in the books.

Mr. Goldstein: It's not in the books anymore.

Mr. Greenstein: Did they remove it?

Mr. Goldstein: Yes.

Mr. Greenstein: But it was there a long time. That wasn't something that the CDD had any control over. That was on a person's private property, but the Master Association Covenants controlled that particular situation. What else? I mentioned this before, but we need a permanent parking solution. Our previous owners, as managed by a cast of thousands, had a plan for expanding The Grand for more ballroom space, and taking the parking area that parallels S. Old Lake Wilson Road and putting in a parking garage. I still believe, unless there was some other location that would work out better for the overall community, that there is a need for a permanent parking garage. I consider myself to have a modest home, a four-bedroom home and if I have a party, 15 or 20 cars would be strewn up and down the street. So while, yes, the larger homes seem to have this stigma attached to them that they are the cause of the problem, they are not the total cause of the problem. It may be a significant piece, but it can happen to you or I or those of us who have a modest home. The point is that we need a facility that all of us, regardless of the size of our home, for guests to use with a shuttle service of some kind. I agree that the community was not envisioned to have the kind of homes it has now, but even a smaller home, on a temporary basis, can have a large number of people in it and a large number of vehicles. They have to park somewhere. A number of people commented on the fact that we should've had a Reunion East towaway. If we did that, during peak season, I think it would've been chaotic. People would not know where to park. So that's one of the reasons we are going in this less than forward implementation approach. I'm trying to think if there were any other items that we needed to discuss.

Mr. Goldstein: No, we discussed everything.

Mr. Flint: You might want to address the concept of putting it to a vote. There was a question about the majority of people not living here for a time and not represented, but the reality is, just like any other government in the United States, it's a represented government. This Board was elected to represent its constituents. So every time you make a decision, if you were going to survey of the community, that's not how governments operate, but you could do that. I think this Board is elected through a process and you are here to make those decisions. Other than that, I don't know if there were any other issues. I don't have any other notes. Mark, it's up to you.

Mr. d'Adesky: If you want to open it, you would just do another round of three minutes of comments.

Mr. Greenstein: Why can't we just address the questions and not do another round of three minutes?

Mr. Dowling: It's a public hearing. You should let us speak.

Mr. Greenstein: We will be here as long as you want to be here.

Mr. Dowling: Maybe a possible solution is for Osceola County to engage developers. It is similar to what we had to do for Encore Club. I think the Board has this within their rights. So now what they do is they make you do wider right-of-ways (ROWS) in the roads and pave it, which probably is not practical because you have fixed points. What happened was they set aside parking areas that the CDD controlled or the developer controlled, but those were designated parking spots. When there was overflow, a renter or owner could use those areas and Encore Club uses an overflow area for their clubhouse. There is property that the developer controls and the CDD controls. I know on the Reunion West side, we swapped some CDD property. I don't know that you are going to get large parking areas, but you could alleviate some of the parking by creating your own parking spots. As a matter of fact, Osceola County makes us create our own parking spot within a lot so we could put nine cars in a parking lot. These are creative things that can be done rather than implement onerous towing policies, because I think the Board realizes that you are going to implement a policy and set up policies and procedures, but John and his wonderful team have to implement it. That's where the friction starts. Where they start or stop is gray, so why create all this friction. Why not just solve the long-term problem by making parking areas. The Board can levy and assess.

Mr. Greenstein: If we had the land, we would be discussing it, but there are very few parcels and I'm not even aware of anything that's workable on the Reunion East side. On the Reunion West side, there might be a few vacant ones, but to me, it doesn't conform to parking management for a resort that people would appreciate. Regarding the location, I spoke about the previous plan and I'm hoping that Kingwood looks at previous plans and consider a parking garage, centrally located where guests and residents can park their cars. The areas you are talking about are very, very limited and small and would not address the problem of having to take half of the cars off of the street. How do we deal with it? I think we had larger pieces of land that we could consider, and I'm open to your suggestions.

Mr. Dowling: When a builder does a model, they buy a lot and build a parking lot. The CDD could buy two lots and make a 15-spot parking area.

Mr. Greenstein: That's a great idea. I heard some concepts within residential areas where people want to build houses that literally are just indoor parking garages. That's something I don't think the community would want, yet I've seen plans for that and it's scary. To me, that changes the entire streetscape and landscape, but I understand what you are saying, and we will consider anything that's available. But there are very few places within the community where you can do centralized parking that would make any sense, long term.

Resident (Not Identified): I just expanded on what you said as far as you going over the rules and regulations, so perhaps we can have something put in so in the event someone has a party and they clear it with security first that they are going to have people parking on the street, they can get a permit for that particular night.

Mr. Greenstein: That would be fine, as long as it does not prevent an emergency vehicle from getting through. We could consider it on a temporary basis.

Mr. William Sussman (Ocoee Street): My only comment is that I wish we would've prepared more to be responsive from the Board to some of the questions with regard to the questions that the people who live and rent and manage the properties. So they can get a definition as to what they are expected to do and what the people who utilize this facility are expected to do. As I sit there and listen to the questions, we really don't have a lot of answers tonight with regard to where you want to go with your proposals. At least that's not what I have seen or heard. I'm sure there are many people who have the same questions that I do. But let me just say that I think people would leave here with that idea.

Ms. Hobbs: That was not true.

Mr. Sussman (Ocoee Street): No. That's why somebody who has 17 properties in here is asking the question. Exactly what are you asking or commenting about. I can't understand and I feel the pain of everybody who not only rents those properties or manages those properties only has a couple of properties like we do. All we are looking for is some definition, some answers. What I'm leaving here tonight with is more questions than answers. I think anybody in this room would say the same thing.

Mr. Greenstein: The issue is that as a government entity, we cannot put the cart before the horse. We are basically considering establishing legal authority to be able to implement a towing policy, which obviously includes a parking policy. It is a policy. That was why I was trying to give you the analogy with an Authorization and Appropriations Bill. It's not exactly the same thing, but it is very similar. We have to decide whether or not as a policy, we should go

forward with parking and towing. The procedures have to be worked out. This will not be implemented without further discussion by the Board with input from the community. You can attend any of our meetings, email us and we can have various forums. The point is, the devil is in the details or the details are the procedure. We have not worked out the procedure, but we couldn't work out a procedure without having the legal authority to do it.

Mr. Sussman: So what you are saying is this is a preliminary meeting to finalize.

Mr. Greenstein: The policy is permitting in the sense that we have the legal ability. If we continue this meeting and vote on implementing this policy, we will then have the authority to proceed with the procedures. But we are not implementing the procedural aspect of this tonight. It's kind of like the who, what, when, where, why and how. It has to be worth it. Some of the things have been designated or identified because we had to. We had to designate the streets, but we couldn't implement it procedurally. So we cut back to a smaller area.

Mr. Harding: We came up with a specific plan of what security suggested we do as far as the major roadways in Reunion East and what you see on that map. They said, "*This is where we believe we have the most problems,*" again, as far as the specifics as how we do the towing or whatever else. This defines exactly what roads we are recommending doing first based on security's input. We had some discussions too about which side of the road we and like I mentioned before, we pick which side has the least amount of homes facing it. That might be the idea we go with. The whole idea of this meeting was to get some public input. So that's why it wasn't totally defined all the way through.

Mr. Greenstein: We couldn't.

Mr. Harding: That's why we all want to do it here.

Mr. Greenstein: We are totally cognizant of the unique nature of our community, the fact that one without the other doesn't work. I never had the opportunity to look at the financials to see how permanent residents there are, because let's face it, the membership within the club has a high percentage of permanent residents. There are also seasonal residents, but they are residents. We are not proceeding in a capricious or haphazard way. It's going to be measured. The procedures have to be worked out. If we had already worked out those procedures, we would've shared them with you. We did not say to have parking on one side of the street or the other. We just said that it will be one side of the street. So the concept of only being able to park on one side of the street to allow for emergency vehicles, is the extent of the detail that we basically worked out. Hopefully most of you agree that it's reasonable to proceed in that manner. That's

all we are really looking for feedback on. We had to package it the way we did. We had to have this meeting. We deliberately scheduled it at night, so it wouldn't be done at a time when most people aren't available to discuss it. We wanted your input.

Mr. Harding: By the way, if the local police come in and we have no parking signs on one side of the street or if you park in the wrong direction on the street, they will ticket you. The neighborhood watch had the Osceola County Police Department come in here occasionally because the traffic was so crazy. In fact, people asked us to get the police to come in here because they think things are out of hand. When the police come in here and see violations, they will issue tickets. Then we will get complaints from people in the neighborhood saying, "*Who called them in here?*" Whatever rules we put together, if you have signs on one side of the street that says, "*No Parking,*" that's the rule. So I'm concerned about people getting their cars towed, but you must follow the rules.

Mr. Greenstein: You have to think about safety. We don't want to be in a situation where a serious result or death occurs because a fire truck couldn't get through or an ambulance couldn't get through.

Mr. Harding: By the way, if the streets are blocked and a house is on fire, they have the right to just plow right through a car to get to the house.

Ms. Sussman: They just did it in Solara.

Mr. Harding: The night I was at Dan's house, the Fire Captain told me if it wasn't a brand new fire truck, he would've knocked two cars out of the way to get to the fire hydrant.

Mr. Mabbott: I have worked for the last 30 years with Boards, governmental agencies and state legislatures, and I will tell you the process you are utilizing is done 100% of the time. That's the way it works. If you had procedures in advance, you would've had at least half of this crowd mad at you from the very beginning of the meeting. The reason why we talk about policies and procedures is you don't hear people say, "*Procedures and policies.*" Its policies and procedures. That's the way it works. I appreciate what you are doing, and I hope you pass this tonight. Then I and others would be happy to help you mold those procedures, so they work best for our community. Thanks for your service.

Mr. Greenstein: Thank you.

Mr. Glasser: I think what has come out of this evening for me is that you put a proposal on the floor regarding parking and towing. I'm not sure to what extent there has been involvement from any of the major players in Reunion, but I know that the remarks are very unsettling and the

amount of support that you are going to get is minimal. I think the vote that came up was understandable, but not implementable. Because there are too many unknowns, whether in policy or procedure, I'm going to suggest adjourning the meeting and that a small committee including people from Reunion West and Reunion East, get together. I think it will take a long time if we don't do something more concrete than what is just being presented here tonight.

Mr. Greenstein: Thank you, David. Tom?

Dr. McKeon: I just have two concerns that I want to bring up. We still have one side of the street parking, so to go to the Greenstein party, I'm going to walk two or three blocks, even with my bad knee and stay on the correct side so I don't get towed. For the many years that I served on the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) and Mark served on the Architectural Control Board (ACB), there was a formula for a home when it was built that based on the number of bidders, you had to have a certain number of parking spaces. That has never been enforced. We have a lot of these problems. Then again, a lot of homes have taken their garage, closed them in, air conditioned them and made them game rooms or more bedrooms. We can't undo that, but I'm thinking that any future homes should follow that policy. There are ways to correct this. We just can't be building these monster homes. They are beautiful, but they need to have huge parking in the front to be able to accommodate the number of bedrooms and the number of people. Thank you.

Mr. Greenstein: Thank you. Let's see if I can remember all of the comments. The first one is having to do with the bedroom count. There is a formula, a correlation between the number of bedrooms and required off-street parking. The Master Association of the HOA actually had rules on the books in that area before the county codified it. In other words, it is now a county code, but the Reunion East rules were in existence through the HOA before the county codified it. Then of course, subsequently Reunion West had rules. So we were covered by both. The point is this. Every home that is built in Reunion that requires review by the ACB on which I sit, has to meet a parking requirement. Basically, for up to five bedrooms, you must have four parking spaces. Once you go beyond five, for every two additional bedrooms, you must have one additional space. If the number of bedrooms correlated to the sleeping capacity, we would have no problems whatsoever, but if you have an eight bedroom house that can sleep 15 to 20 people, you will end up with more cars than the number that is required. Let's say nine or ten cars may be required by the number of bedrooms, but you end up with 15 cars. So we have that one issue. For every home that's built, even the largest homes, we take on the task in coming up with parking

solutions that work, meaning having wider driveways, circular driveways, pads on the side, whatever we can do that we believe does not destroy the streetscape, we would approve as required off-street parking. But that is insufficient for the actual number of cars that are at a home. The business about the garage conversions is not something that the CDD has anything to say about or any power to do anything about. It is a reality that two parking spaces are taken out of every home that gets converted, but if that was the only reason why we have a problem, I think we would've done something about it. When I say, "*We*," I mean the community overall, not the CDD, but the Master Association and the real estate community. I think it adds to the problem, but it doesn't resolve the total problem. It's something that maybe down the road, the community and the Master Association is going to have to look at. What was the other point you made Tom?

Dr. McKeon: What side of the street to park on.

Mr. Greenstein: Yes. Again, if you have a party and you need parking, then you have to figure out where people are going to park. If you go into Celebration, what do you do? Their people play a chicken game by parking on both sides of the street. They do not allow short-term rentals.

Dr. McKeon: So visitors don't have any idea where to park.

Mr. Greenstein: All I know is that Celebration has a similar problem, but it's a different environment. Its more residential, more permanent residents, but nevertheless, the number of cars on a street are related to the size of homes to a degree. But it's also related to the nature of the community and the fact that we have a lot of visitors coming in. So the permanent solution has to be some kind of centralized parking facility, but in the meantime, we have to maintain a safe community. So we can implement a one side of the street parking solution with the ability to tow when people violate. That is the scope of what we are trying to deal with, basically tonight. We have to announce and go forward with another hearing in order to expand it to all of Reunion, if we are going to do anything other than doing totally doing the Reunion West all at once.

Resident (Not Identified): Just a quick question. If you enact a towing policy, how do you take it away if there is a better solution than parking on one side of the street with signage?

Mr. Greenstein: We wouldn't enforce it. There are thousands of Authorization Bills that Congress like to take credit for, but they don't implement them because they don't appropriate funding. So this is similar. I'm not saying that we are going to do that, but all we are trying to do is have the legal authority to go forward with implementing some form of parking and towing controls. We haven't decided what side of the street, even though I think it's pretty logical which

streets we will pick. It should be on the way in and shouldn't force you to make a U-Turn to park on the other side of the street. So I'm not looking for people to raise their hands because we are going to close the public comment period. I just want to know if you basically feel we adequately discussed the policy. Are there any other questions relative to the policy, not the procedure, but to the concept, the policy of enforced parking and towing? If not, we will close the public comment section.

Mr. d'Adesky: You can consider the resolution.

Mr. Flint: You can have Board discussion.

Mr. Greenstein: I would like to have discussion with the Board Members.

The meeting was recessed at 8:25 p.m.

The meeting was reconvened at 8:30 p.m.

A. Consideration of Resolution 2020-04 Adopting Parking and Towing Rules

Mr. Greenstein: The Board will now deliberate on the policy.

Mr. Harding MOVED to adopt Resolution 2020-04 Adopting Parking and Towing Rules as stated and Mr. Goldstein seconded the motion.

Mr. Harding: I think Jeffrey brought up a great point regarding cul-de-sacs and how we would apply this parking to those cul-de-sacs. We haven't really discussed it and I think it has a direct impact on quite a few homes. Jeffrey's point is if he has 30 or 35 potential cars at the end of a cul-de-sac, that's problematic. We haven't decided just far into the cul-de-sac to allow parking and what side of the road versus the other, but I think we can designate half of it for parking. I don't know. We will have to look at that. That presents a different situation.

Mr. Dryburgh: We may want to talk to the Fire Department to see what they suggest. Let's get the fire chief out here. The Osceola County Sheriff will participate with us too.

Mr. d'Adesky: Then we will have it in writing.

Mr. Greenstein: We received input that cul-de-sacs are problematic, and construction will come to an end at some point down the road, but large vehicles like fire trucks need a place to turn around. Usually a cul-de-sac is in a court because there's no way out. That's why it's not a drive. We will get an official determination from the Fire Department as to whether the entire area in a cul-de-sac should have prohibited parking.

On VOICE VOTE with all in favor Resolution 2020-04 Adopting Parking and Towing Rules as stated was adopted.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Staff Reports

A. Attorney

Mr. Flint: Andrew do you have anything else?

Mr. d'Adesky: I will report briefly that Wyndham sent us a letter expressing interest in the clubhouse and I just wrote them a simple letter stating that we entered into the Management Services Agreement, but right now we are not interested in pursuing that option and appreciated their interest.

Mr. Greenstein: Just to be clear, Wyndham was interested in this building.

An argument ensued between two residents.

Mr. Greenstein: There is no need for fighting.

Mr. Flint: We can ban them.

Mr. Greenstein: I think we should.

Mr. Flint: They are going to get a letter.

Mr. Greenstein: We are all adults. We are all human beings. We can express our opinions without fists and without getting in each other faces. If this was a simple issue to solve, it would've been done years ago. This is a complex area and we are trying to handle it in a gentle way, in a way that helps us figure out where our future path lies. I still believe in having some permanent large centralized parking facility, because eventually all of the land we have is going to be built on.

Resident (Not identified): As long as it doesn't cost us anything.

Mr. Greenstein: I was talking with someone in the audience about another issue. We are not going to discuss that issue now because it's not on the agenda, but the point is, it would be simple to implement if we can say that there will be no further increases in assessments or any future costs. All liability would be assumed by the CDD and the sun is going to shine tomorrow, but that doesn't happen. Everything has a negative impact or some aspect that's negative and we have to work through it. I think we are working through it. That's why it saddens me to see that folks can't communicate in a way, short of getting into fights.

Mr. d'Adesky: That's all I have.

Mr. Greenstein: I want to clarify something and then we are going to wrap this up. Andrew was talking about Wyndham showing interest in procuring property from the CDD. They

made reference to the clubhouse. It wasn't the clubhouse that they were interested in. They were interested in this building, but we indicated to them and we entered into a Management Services Agreement with the resort and with Kingwood as we had in the past with the other management companies. We had an agreement where they would use this building and we would empower them to manage it on our behalf because it's good for the community and for the resort. They are also taking over the stables. They are finally going to have a good use for the stables. The resort is going to do it. Kingwood is going to do it. So he was just explaining that they wanted to buy the building, but we said that the building is not for sale.

Mr. d'Adesky: Politely.

Mr. Greenstein: So I just wanted to clarify that.

B. Engineer

There being none, the next item followed.

C. District Manager's Report

There being none, the next item followed.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Other Business

There not being any, the next item as followed.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Supervisor's Request

There not being any, the next item as followed.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Next Meeting Date


This item was not discussed.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Adjournment

There being no further business,

On MOTION by Mr. Harding seconded by Mr. Goldstein with all in favor the meeting was adjourned.


Secretary/Assistant Secretary


Chairman/Vice-Chairman