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 on Thursday, **July 13, 2023** at 1:00 p.m. via Zoom Communication Media Technology and at Reunion Grande, Room 1, 7593 Gathering Drive, Kissimmee, Florida.

Present and constituting a quorum:

Mark GreensteinChairmanSteven GoldsteinVice ChairmanTrudy HobbsAssistant SecretaryJohn DryburghAssistant SecretaryJune Wispelwey (via Zoom)Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

Tricia Adams District Manager Kristen Trucco District Counsel

Steve Boyd Civil Engineering

Alan Scheerer Field Manager

Garret Huegel Yellowstone Landscape Services

Residents

The following is a summary of the discussions and actions taken at the July 13, 2023 meeting. A copy of the proceedings can be obtained by contacting the District Manager.

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS Roll Call

Ms. Adams called the meeting to order at 1:09 p.m. and called the roll. All Supervisors were present.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS Public Comment Period

Resident Jill Mulhere of 1211 Radiant Street thanked the Board for upgrades to the lattice at the entrance. Resident Lester Blades of 1530 Euston Drive did not see any information in the agenda package on The Stables. Ms. Adams would report on this item later when the Board reviewed Action Items. Mary Jean Blades of 1530 Euston Drive voiced concern with a developer

Reunion East CDD

Regular Meeting

July 13, 2023

Page 2 of 16

leaving trailers on the opposite side of the road, causing difficulties when she tried to back out of her driveway.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS

Approval of Minutes of the June 8, 2023 Meeting

Ms. Adams presented the minutes from the June 8, 2023 meeting, which were reviewed by District Counsel and the District Manager.

On MOTION by Mr. Dryburgh seconded by Mr. Goldstein with all in favor the Minutes of the June 8, 2023 Meeting was approved as presented.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Consideration of Proposal for County Road 532 Landscape Enhancement

Ms. Adams presented a proposal from Yellowstone Landscape (Yellowstone) for landscape enhancements in the amount of \$6,393.11. Mr. Scheerer worked with Yellowstone to secure this proposal for the area across from the Fire Station in the middle of County Road (CR) 532. The Loropetalum was old and Mr. Scheerer wanted permission from the Board to remove and replace it with Zoysia grass and adjust the irrigation system. Mr. Goldstein questioned whether there were any other options. Mr. Dryburgh recalled the Board preferring to rip out the Loropetalum to save money. Mr. Scheerer pointed out that the Board decided to be relieved from maintenance on the south side of CR 532, the Polk County side, which was turned over to Osceola County for maintenance. However, the CDD currently maintained the median from I-4 to Old Lake Wilson Road and the north side of CR 532 and the Board never discussed discontinuing the maintenance of CR 532. Ms. Adams recalled that the Board discussed it and ultimately decided it was worth the expense to continue maintaining it and have the ability to control the level of landscaping.

Mr. Goldstein questioned whether the District Engineer expected any issues with the county, if the CDD decided not to maintain the center median on CR 532. Mr. Boyd felt that if the CDD stopped maintaining it, it would cause a problem, but the county would not care if the CDD ripped everything out and replaced with grass. Ms. Adams stated the Interlocal Agreement between the District and Osceola County specified that the District was responsible to maintain the landscaping. The agreements requires the landscape to be restored to the original landscape

Reunion East CDD
Regular Meeting
July 13, 2023
Page 3 of 16

plan if the District wants to amend the Interlocal Agreement. For example, on the south side of CR 352, the county requested that the District remove landscaping and irrigation and re-sod it before the County assumed maintenance responsibilities. If the Board wanted to amend the Interlocal Agreement again, the Board needed to take action by vote. The County must agree to the amendment and there would be some legal expense go through the amendment process. Mr. Goldstein wanted to consider any cost savings at the next meeting. Mr. Greenstein did not want to remove the median as it was part of the look of Reunion, but would look at it if the Board wanted to look at other maintenance alternatives. Ms. Wispelwey wanted to review the situation further and possibly remove what was on the median and replace it with grass or keep it at the current standard. Mr. Greenstein noted sidewalk maintenance on CR 532 is a separate issue because the CDD is not responsible for the maintenance of the sidewalks in that area. Ms. Adams would include the median landscape maintenance item on the next agenda.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Consideration of Proposals for Roof Replacement at Seven Eagles

- A. Advantage Roofing, Inc.
- B. Springer-Peterson Roofing & Sheet Metal, Inc.

Ms. Adams presented proposals from Advantage Roofing, Inc. (Advantage) in the amount of \$134,962 and from Springer-Peterson Roofing & Sheet Metal, Inc. (Springer-Peterson) in the amount of \$157,542 for replacement of the Seven Eagles Center roof. This was a Repair and Maintenance (R&M) project that the Board considered as part of the current fiscal year and provided funding for. In the budget, the Board allocated approximately \$172,010. Mr. Scheerer reached out to several vendors, but these were the only ones that provided a bid. They were equal in materials and warranties, utilizing a peel and stick versus felt paper. There was a new code requirement for six nails per shingle. The proposals also included the pool pump house roof, which had asphalt shingles. The main Seven Eagles building had asphalt and thermoplastic roof. Mr. Scheerer was familiar with both vendors. The facility must be closed, especially during the demolition work and cleanup. Mr. Goldstein noted a \$23,000 difference between the proposals. Mr. Greenstein pointed out that Advantage offered a five-year workmanship warranty on all leaks and defects, which was substantial versus the two-year warranty that Springer-Peterson offered. Mr. Greenstein asked if any CDDs used Advantage. None of the Districts that Mr. Scheerer was involved with used Advantage, but they were used by other Districts.

On MOTION Mr. Greenstein seconded by Mr. Goldstein with all in favor the proposal with Advantage Roofing, Inc. for roof replacement at Seven Eagles in the amount of \$134,962 was approved.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Review and Acceptance of Pavement Management Plan

Ms. Adams presented the Pavement Management Plan, which was prepared by the District Engineer. Mr. Boyd presented the report and noted typos that would be corrected. Moving forward to develop the scope for roadway repairs in the next two years, they were taking core samples. Once the work was completed, a scope of work would be prepared. Mr. Goldstein felt that it was a comprehensive report. Mr. Greenstein requested a quick synopsis of the tables in order for the Board to see the magnitude of the work and the order it would be accomplished. Mr. Boyd noted that Table 2 provided recommendations on the work to be completed as soon as possible. Table 3 provided recommendations on work to be completed within the next two years. Table 4 provided recommendations on work to be planned between 2025 and 2030 and Table 5 provided recommendations on work to be planned between 2030 and 2035. These dates could be pushed back further based on the pavement conditions. The following areas were addressed:

- ➤ **Urgent:** Tradition Boulevard from Spine Road to I-4, due to significant degradation.
- Needing Attention: The pavement approaching the water park from Spine Road.
- Addressed Immediately: Spine Road from CR 545 to the gatehouse, due to base degradation. The repair would involve removal of all asphalt and re-doing the base before re-surfacing.

Core samples were requested at those locations to determine the depth of the milling and resurfacing.

- Recommended to be Completed Within Two Years: Reunion Boulevard from CR 532 to the traffic circle. Portions appeared fine, but in many places the pavement was uneven with alligator cracking, especially exiting towards CR 532 where the asphalt was starting to separate.
- To be Completed in Two Years: Remaining portions of Spine Road
- ➤ To be Re-surfaced Between 2025 and 2030: Roads in good/fair condition.

July 13, 2023 Page 5 of 16

To be Re-evaluated after 2030: All remaining roads.

Mr. Boyd stated crosswalks and stop bars needed to be re-striped and portions of the main roadways; Tradition and Reunion Boulevard needed additional re-striping. Mr. Dryburgh voiced concern about the impact of inflation over a five-to-ten-year period because if they waited until later, it would be a more difficult process due to drivers using it as a cut through and questioned the percentage of roads to be done sooner versus later. Mr. Boyd stated once they obtained prices on the initial repairs that were urgent, they could roll the unit prices over the entire program, factoring in 5% or 7% for inflation. In the next two weeks, they would complete the core samples, prepare the specifications and obtain bids. Mr. Boyd would look at recent paving costs, as he wanted to be in the position for work to start after the first of the year so that the work could be completed in the Spring.

On MOTION Mr. Greenstein seconded by Ms. Hobbs with all in favor the Pavement Management Plan was approved.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Consideration of Proposals for Geotechnical Services for Pavement Evaluation

A. UES

B. Intertek PSI

Ms. Adams presented proposals from UES in the amount of \$6,695 and from Intertek PSI (PSI) in the amount of \$15,920 for geotechnical services for the pavement evaluation. Mr. Boyd stated based on visual inspections that were performed, they identified 17 locations for core samples. Mr. Dryburgh questioned the major difference in the proposals. Mr. Boyd indicated that the written scope for UES excluded some items, but they had the required scope. They would not require extensive utility locates, but after obtaining the core samples, UES would restore the core with asphalt, which Mr. Boyd would obtain written clarification of and provide to Ms. Adams. Mr. Greenstein pointed out that Reunion West approved the same proposal.

On MOTION Mr. Greenstein seconded by Mr. Goldstein with all in favor the proposal with UES for Pavement Evaluation Geotechnical Services in the amount of \$6,695 was approved.

Reunion East CDD

Regular Meeting

July 13, 2023

Page 6 of 16

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Consideration of Proposal for Increased Preventative Maintenance Services at Seven Eagles Fitness Centers

Ms. Adams reported that there were two Fitness Centers at Seven Eagles, the Fitness Center and Functional Fitness Center. The Board currently had an agreement with Fitness Services of Florida Inc. for monthly preventative maintenance services of \$300 per visit or \$3,600 annually. Twice monthly visits were being recommended at the same rate for both Fitness Centers, due to increased usage at Seven Eagles because Reunion Resort Fitness Center was temporarily closed. The proposal included oiling, lubrication and deep cleaning of the equipment as well as an expedited repair time because with this frequency of service, they were not holding up repairs and installation of parts for the treadmills and other pieces of popular equipment. If the Board approved this, it would increase the Fiscal Year 2024 budget amount to \$7,200. Mr. Dryburgh questioned when Kingwood was re-opening the Reunion Resort Fitness Center because if it was of excessive duration, they should pay the additional expenses due to closing their facility. Ms. Adams noted that the Fitness Centers were owned by the District and the responsibility of the District to maintain. Ms. Hobbs did not see how they could go back to them and tell them to pay for the cleaning as people had the right to use it, whether there was another Reunion Resort gym or not. Ms. Wispelwey felt that the Board should do what they could to keep the people happy; however, this could go on for a long time and felt that it was not unreasonable to ask Kingwood to put that money towards the maintenance. Mr. Dryburgh was not happy with the way that Kingwood treated the Board. Mr. Greenstein agreed with Ms. Wispelwey as the District allowed Kingwood to move their fitness equipment into one half of the Heritage Crossing Community Center (HCCC) and could not recall if there was financial consideration in the agreement. Ms. Adams would include the item on next month's agenda for Board review.

On MOTION Mr. Dryburgh seconded by Mr. Goldstein with all in favor the proposal for increased preventative maintenance services at Seven Eagles in the amount of \$7,200 annually was approved.

Ms. Adams questioned the direction to staff in terms of communication with Kingwood and whether the Board wanted to wait until they reviewed the situation further and look at the terms. Ms. Wispelwey wanted to start discussions with Kingwood about the District receiving extra money because if they did not light a fire, they would be seeing an increase of people in

July 13, 2023 Page 7 of 16

October or November. Mr. Greenwood stated they would discuss the agreement between now and the next meeting and GMS could have dialogue with Kingwood.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Consideration of Temporary Construction Easement with IMF Developers, LLC.

Ms. Adams presented a Temporary Construction Easement with IMF Developers, LLC. (IMF) and a diagram of the area being discussed, which was around The Terraces. They were proposing to add 102 new units to complete construction in that area. The CDD owned property around the construction site, including the roads. Ms. Trucco explained that the developer, IMF; landowner, 7500 Mourning Dove Reunion, LLC, and the General Contractor, LB Construction of South Florida, Inc. agreed to sign the Temporary Construction Easement in the Agenda and that it was in the best interest of the District to execute it. It was for the construction of 102 units at The Terraces at Reunion Resort and Club. The Development Plans, which was approved by the county, were also attached to the Temporary Construction Easement. At this time, they were planning to start construction on the southern parcel shown in the attachment, including the installation of a fence. The Temporary Construction Easement stated the District would be indemnified for any damages resulting from their construction. They also agreed to restore the District's property at their expense to its original condition, and if they failed to do so, within 30 days, the District could restore the property and they would be responsible for reimbursing the District for the restoration. It was anticipated that construction would take 18 months and would start in 60 days. The District Engineer already reviewed the Temporary Construction Easement and agreed with it. The developer planned to use a gravel road off of Osceola Polk Line Road that was outside of the District, but there was a sliver of District property that they must use. Discussion ensued and Ms. Trucco requested that the Board approve the Temporary Construction Easement in substantial final form and delegate authority for a Board Member to execute it. Mr. Goldstein requested that Mr. Greenstein be delegated authority.

> On MOTION Mr. Goldstein seconded by Ms. Hobbs with all in favor the Temporary Construction Easement with IMF Developers, LLC. and delegating authority to the Chairman to execute it was approved.

Reunion East CDD

Regular Meeting

July 13, 2023

Page 8 of 16

Although Mr. Greenstein wanted to see The Terraces completed, there would be construction traffic and trusses on property being built on Excitement Drive. Ms. Adams requested that any unsafe roadway condition be reported to Security. Mr. Greenstein would drive around with Mr. Victor Vargas, Director of Reunion Security, in order to better manage it as well as other construction.

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Consideration of Proposal from Guardian Access Solutions for RFID Reader at Reunion Village Gates

Ms. Adams presented a proposal from Guardian Access Solutions (Guardian) for RFID Reader at the Reunion Village gates in the amount of \$16,320, which was requested by the Board. There was only one traffic lane staffed 24/7/365 by a security guard that must open the lane manually as vehicles stop at the gate. His proposal was presented so owners can have automatic access. Mr. Scheerer explained this was a TransCore RFID reader system, which the Board requested and would merge with the existing Smart Pass system at the other gates in Reunion. Guardian was formerly Access Control Technologies, which originally installed the Spine Road gates. The proposed amount of \$16,320 was a non-budgeted item for Fiscal Year 2023. Mr. Greenstein noted that residents did not have to roll their window down as the reader would pick up the transponder and cards. Mr. Goldstein was in favor of it. Ms. Adams pointed out that this gate would not be uniform as other gates had two entrance lanes versus this gate, which only one traffic lane, but there could be automatic access for residents. Mr. Goldstein noted that this gate would never get the traffic that others did and was not any shorter for people cutting through; therefore, they would not do it often.

On MOTION Mr. Goldstein seconded by Ms. Hobbs with all in favor the proposal with Guardian Access Solutions for RFID Reader at Reunion Village Gates in the amount of \$16,320 was approved.

Mr. Dryburgh questioned the technology as the gates at the entrance were down the last week-and-a-half. Mr. Scheerer explained that one of the eMerge panels failed, which he was working with ACT to resolve and did not realize that it was down for so long as he was out last week. Guardian was in the process of changing those out at several properties including this one and this system was approved by the Board at the Spine Road gates, which were currently under

Reunion East CDD

Regular Meeting

July 13, 2023

Page 9 of 16

construction. Since it had newer technology, they would not have this issue. Mr. Goldstein understood that Mr. Scheerer was out last week, but questioned who Security could contact in an emergency. Mr. Scheerer pointed out that he was always available 24/7 as part of his job, but Mr. Vargas had the authority to contact Guardian. When this issue occurred, Mr. Vargas contacted Guardian and they ordered the part.

ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Staff Reports

A. Attorney

• Approval to Engage District Engineer to Analyze Bond Requisitions Relative to Construction Costs for The Stables Parcel (*Item 11Aii*)

Ms. Trucco reported an update on the sale of stables question. The District Engineer would need to complete a review of the requisitions for the bond issuances to determine the exact amount of bond proceeds used for the construction of the stables. Then District's Bond Counsel at Greenberg Traurig would perform a tax analysis to see if the bonds could be redeemed and then determine how much of the outstanding bonds needed to be redeemed. That amount would set the minimum purchase price and depending on that amount, the Board may want to order an appraisal to see if the property was worth more today than the amount of bonds to be redeemed. Greenberg Traurig estimated it would take 10-20 hours, costing \$10,000 to \$20,000, to determine the non-essential use, evaluate the options and calculate the needed remedial redemptions for the bonds in order to sell the stables. To determine the amount of bond proceeds used for the stables, Mr. Boyd indicated that it would take one day for the data collection and initial review of the requisitions, one day to break out the costs from those requisitions and two hours to prepare a brief report at a cost of \$4,000 to \$5,000. The total amount for both professionals was \$14,000 to \$25,000.

Mr. Greenstein questioned the percentage of the bonds that would have to be redeemed. Ms. Trucco stated that the bond issuance could not have more than 5% non-qualified private use. Mr. Greenstein believed that an estimate could be perceived from the Amortization Table and from the age of the infrastructure, which was the original series of bonds, but questioned whether there was any situation where they could not dispose of that property. Ms. Trucco confirmed that they could dispose of it, but the District could potentially end up spending more than the parcel was worth. Mr. Greenstein understood that the use of any asset may have changed over time and there could not be significant activity that removed the 5%, but disposing of it, did not factor into it. It was a matter of how many bonds were still outstanding and how the appraisal factored in. Ms.

Adams clarified it had to do with the amount needed to be redeemed and if it was more than the appraised value, the District could see if there was a willing buyer. If the redemption amount is less than what the parcel is likely to be worth, the CDD can get an appraisal and sell it at market value. Mr. Greenstein asked if there was any circumstance that would prevent the District from disposing of that asset. Ms. Trucco confirmed that the District could do it, but needed to find out what bond was used to finance it and what percentage of the bond needed to be redeemed. Ms. Adams pointed out that the District could not proceed until they had the analysis from the District Engineer. Ms. Trucco recalled seeing that approximately \$300,000 of bond proceeds may have been used to construct the stables and that the 5% non-qualified private use requirement was of the entire bond issuance. Mr. Greenstein expected it to be under the 5%.

The Board suggested leasing the stables, but Ms. Trucco indicated that a lease triggered the non-qualified and the District was likely already over the 5% based on the last review when the Management Services Agreement (MSA) with Kingwood was evaluated and could not lease it, but could enter into a type of management service agreement. Mr. Greenstein felt as part of comparative analysis, they could determine the ongoing costs to maintain it, renovate it and have it managed. Mr. Goldstein agreed that the simplest way was to have an MSA. A Resident asked if there were any time constraints on the MSA. Ms. Trucco noted no time constraints but the ones that she drafted had a termination clause to protect the District. The Resident asked if an improvement was made to the property, upon termination whether it would be paid back. Ms. Trucco explained that the non-qualified private use restriction could be triggered for a joint venture between the CDD and a private entity, which would not be permitted, but the CDD could put in any renovation with CDD money. If the District was going to spend \$20,000 to \$30,000 on an analysis, Mr. Goldstein proposed selling it because it was not benefitting the District or ask if Bond Counsel could split the difference and charge \$15,000. Ms. Wispelwey agreed. Mr. Boyd must extract the amount of money dedicated to the stables, since the requisitions covered multiple items. Mr. Goldstein did not want to spend the money and then having discussion a year later. Mr. Greenstein pointed out this was the reason that they were having this discussion now.

On MOTION Mr. Greenstein seconded by Mr. Goldstein with all in favor engaging the District Engineer to review all requisitions for the bond issuances to determine the exact amount of bond proceeds used for the construction of the stables was approved.

i. Presentation of Memo Regarding Ethics Training for Elected Officials and Other Legislative Updates

Ms. Trucco presented a Memorandum regarding the ethics training for all Supervisors and other legislative updates. There was an amendment to Section 112 of the Florida Statutes, requiring each Supervisor as of January 1, 2024, to complete four hours of ethics training each calendar year. The Florida Commission on Ethics stated that the training could be completed in 50-minute increments and that there were free videos that could be utilized on their website. Viewing four videos would satisfy the requirements. It was recommended that the Supervisors complete the requirements by July 1st since the self-certification was expected to be on the Form 1. There was a change in the Concealed Carry Law to allow for carrying without permit or instructional course, but carrying weapons to CDD meetings was still not permitted under a different statute. There was also a change to Section 112.23 of the Florida Statutes so that beginning July 1, 2023, a Supervisor was prohibited from requesting the removal of content or accounts from social media platforms, as well as initiating agreements or relationships with a social media platform for the purpose of content moderation. Lastly, there was a revision to Section 287, prohibiting any Supervisor from requesting documents or giving preference to a vendor based on their social, political or ideological interests, when considering government contracts.

ii. Approval to Engage District Engineer to Analyze Bond Requisitions Relative to Construction Costs for The Stables Parcel

This item was discussed.

Ms. Trucco reported that Bond Counsel reviewed the Irrigation System Operating Agreement with Kingwood and that it was circulated to staff. Ms. Adams had some questions, which were forwarded to Kingwood's counsel. Ms. Trucco just received the exhibits, which she wanted to review before distributing to the Board as she had some follow up questions for their attorney. It was fairly cumbersome and Ms. Trucco hoped to provide it to the Board a week before the next meeting.

B. Engineer

Mr. Boyd reported on the annual certification, the report on Spine Road and the gate improvements in Reunion Village. He received as-built drawings, test results, completed his

review, anticipated starting the final closeout and was working with Mr. Scheerer to get the gate contractor what they needed.

i. Review and Acceptance of Annual Engineer's Report - ADDED

Ms. Adams reported as part of the Bond Indenture, the District was required to have an Annual Engineer's Inspection. The report in the agenda package, identified that the District's master infrastructure was maintained in good condition, there was adequate funding in place to maintain the infrastructure and adequate insurance on the infrastructure.

On MOTION Mr. Dryburgh seconded by Mr. Goldstein with all in favor the Annual Engineer's Report was accepted.

C. District Manager's Report

i. Action Items List

Ms. Adams presented the Action Items List. Mr. Dryburgh asked if they stopped using the water and replacing with plants in the Seven Eagle fountain as an alternative. Mr. Scheerer would look into it. Six different vendors were contacted and there was one quote for two new four-tier fountains with color changing lights, tile on the outside and filtration system for \$46,992 versus \$100,000 for new fountains. Much of the cost was for the filtration system. Mr. Greenstein felt that the fountains were a key feature of Linear Park and wanted to see renderings. Mr. Scheerer would include the proposal in the next agenda package. Mr. Scheerer reported that the trees were trimmed. Mr. Dryburgh noted they look great. Ms. Adams would remove this item from the Action Items List. Mr. Greenstein reported that the residential trees were trimmed by Florida Commercial and they were doing a good job. By raising the canopies, they have definition, which provides for a different look. Ms. Hobbs questioned how the traffic calming was impacted by the Pavement Management Plan since they were not going to repave the road in front of the water park for two to three years. Ms. Adams asked if the Board wanted to add traffic calming to the scope for new construction or retrofit the existing roadways. Ms. Wispelwey wanted to look at traffic calming on Excitement Drive. Mr. Boyd stated depending on whether the Board wanted traffic calming, they could include it in the first repair package. Mr. Dryburgh felt that made sense. Ms. Adams provided a map of the property to the Director of Security and asked him to mark locations where traffic calming was recommended and if the Board agreed, forward it to the District

Engineer to provide recommendations on types of traffic calming. Mr. Boyd recommended a speed table that could slow vehicles to 25 miles-per-hour. Ms. Adams asked if the Board wanted to retrofit existing roads not being milled and resurfaced, designate as a new road resurfacing project or consider locations in the interim. Ms. Hobbs preferred to look at the roads that they wanted traffic calming to see how it worked to see if it was effective and proceed with the road repairs. Mr. Goldstein asked if Mr. Scheerer looked at the satellite dish. Mr. Scheerer confirmed that it was not the District's. Ms. Hobbs questioned the replacement of the air conditioners. Mr. Scheerer reported that the contractor was bringing in two at a time until all six were replaced. The first two were being set on July 18th.

ii. Approval of Check Register

Ms. Adams presented the Check Register from June 1, 2023 through June 30, 2023 in the amount of \$411,805.55.

On MOTION by Ms. Hobbs seconded by Mr. Dryburgh with all in favor the June Check Register was approved.

iii. Balance Sheet and Income Statement

Ms. Adams presented the Unaudited Financial Statements through May 31, 2023, which was for informational purposes. There were no unusual items and the May bond payments were now populated.

iv. Replacement and Maintenance Plan

Ms. Adams presented the Replacement and Maintenance Plan, which showed projections and when projects would be completed in 2023. The dates were updated each month. It was provided for informational purposes. A preliminary project list was provided for Fiscal Year 2024 for feedback from the Board, which would affect the budget for Fiscal Year 2024. It was based on the field conditions within Reunion and recommendations from the Reserve Study. There were the following potential projects:

- Roof replacement at three pool houses for Homestead and Heritage Crossings.
- Seven Eagles exercise equipment to replace treadmills, ellipticals or bicycles.
 Would be phased out over several years.
- Asphalt pavement management. This was only an estimate.

- Concrete sidewalk replacements
- > Tree trimming

Mr. Scheerer clarified that it was a Class 2 tree trimming, which was performed several years ago in stages. It was for thinning of all the trees, cleaning them and ensuring that they had a 14 feet clearance on the roadway side and 8 feet on pedestrian sidewalks, per the Department of Transportation. The purpose was to ensure that the trees were in good shape, healthy and provided the proper clearance on CDD property.

- ➤ Signage for Reunion Village No Parking allowance. Proposals would be provided to the Board at the August meeting.
- Pool equipment allowance.
- Seven Eagles Linear Park bollard lighting, due to persistent requests, especially during Winter months.
- Seven Eagles restroom partitions as broken doors could not be replaced.
- Seven Eagles pool and spa resurfacing.
- > The Stables refurbishment.

Ms. Hobbs suggested benches on the left side of Reunion Boulevard past the main gate. Mr. Scheerer would discuss having benches with a concrete pad with Ms. Hobbs. The benches in the butterfly park were \$780 each.

D. Security Report

Ms. Adams reported that Mr. Vargas was not present, but a Board Member wanted to discuss having a procedure at the entrance gates when someone had automatic access or when a visitor was approaching the gate. Mr. Goldstein voiced concern with security guards not greeting guests and residents and allowing cars through without scanning cards, especially ride share drivers. Several times, Mr. Goldstein had to wake the security guard in order to have them open the gate and requested that the Board discuss what they expected from the security guards. Mr. Greenstein felt that security guards opening the gate without having any interaction was a serious issue. Mr. Dryburgh pointed out it was a daily event and there was a failure in the system. Mr. Greenstein felt that the points brought up by Mr. Goldstein were good points as the proper protocol should be followed by the security guards when interacting with guests, but not with residents because they had prox cards. Ms. Adams pointed out that there was an agreement with the Master

July 13, 2023 Page 15 of 16

Association to provide security services, but there was no specificity to the requirements for greeting owners, but the Board could formalize a procedure or discuss with the Director of Security. If an officer failed to follow the proper procedure, it was documented. Mr. Goldstein requested that the security guard scan guest identification and stand up and greet residents or guests, if they were not busy performing another duty. Ms. Adams felt it was okay to request identification, but could not require it since these were public roads. Mr. Greenstein suggested Mr. Vargas be informed about the Board's concerns and try to reinforce the procedures. Ms. Trucco suggested having a one-page addendum to the current agreement for the preferred Code of Conduct for security officers.

TWELFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Other Business

There being no comments, the next item followed.

THIRTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Supervisor's Requests

There being no comments, the next item followed.

FOURTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Next Meeting Date – August 10th, 2023

Ms. Adams stated the next meeting was scheduled for August 10, 2023 at 1:00 p.m. at this location.

July 13, 2023 Page 16 of 16

FIFTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Adjournment

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

DocuSigned by:
Tricia I Lams
35355565676438

Secretary/Assistant Secretary

—DocuSigned by:

Chairman/Vice Chairman