

**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, **March 14, 2024** at 1:00 p.m. via Zoom Communication Media Technology and at the Heritage Crossing Community Center, 7715 Heritage Crossing Way, Reunion, Florida.

Present and constituting a quorum:

Mark Greenstein	Chairman
Steven Goldstein	Vice Chairman
Trudy Hobbs <i>via Zoom</i>	Assistant Secretary
John Dryburgh	Assistant Secretary
June Wispelwey	Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

Tricia Adams	District Manager
Kristen Trucco	District Counsel
James Curley	District Engineer
Alan Scheerer	Field Manager
Garrett Huegel	Yellowstone Landscape
Residents	

*The following is a summary of the discussions and actions taken at the March 14, 2024 Reunion East Community Development District's regular Board of Supervisors meeting.*

**FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Roll Call**

Ms. Adams called the meeting to order at 1:01 p.m. and called the roll. All Supervisors were present in person, with the exception of Ms. Hobbs who attended via Zoom.

**SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Public Comment Period**

Ms. Adams opened the public comment period. Resident Ed Lenard of 7697 Heritage Crossing Way, who lived in the community for the past 14 years, requested a hot tub, as Heritage Crossing pool was the only pool in Reunion that did not have one. Of the 170 owners within

**Reunion East CDD  
Regular Meeting****March 14, 2024  
Page 2 of 16**

Heritage Crossing, more than half did not have a hot tub within a reasonable distance and 90% of the owners, who owned vacation rentals, were at a disadvantage by not having a hot tub within a reasonable distance from their units. In addition, the rental occupancy for Buildings A and K, was much lower than the rentals for Buildings L to V, it was a disadvantage for Reunion Management to market and rent their units in this area, compared to other areas and having a hot tub, would increase revenues for Reunion Management, Kingwood Orlando Reunion Resort (Kingwood) and increase property values for homeowners. Mr. Lenard requested that Kingwood participate in the cost of a hot tub, as it was beneficial to them for revenue purposes.

Resident Rita Carvajal of 7616 Cabana Court had issues with how unkept the community was and the lack of service on the elevator, as it keeps breaking and her husband had a disability. Every time they come to their unit, they must call security to find out if the elevator was working, before they travel from Tampa. No one was taking their calls or returning calls. Ms. Adams indicated that although this property was within the CDD boundaries, the Association owned the common areas and maintained the property. The CDD did not maintain private property. The Association Management Company would handle this matter. Ms. Wispelwey suggested that Ms. Carvajal speak to someone in her building. There being no further comments, Ms. Adams closed the public comment period.

**THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS****Approval of the Minutes of the February 8, 2024 Board of Supervisors Meeting**

Ms. Adams presented the minutes of the February 8, 2024 Board of Supervisors meeting, a draft of which were included in the agenda package. Mr. Greenstein indicated that “*Mr. Greenstein*” was “*Mr. Greenwood*,” on Pages 7 and 8 and on Page 4, “*Watson Court*” should be “*Watson Course*.”

On MOTION by Mr. Goldstein seconded by Mr. Dryburgh with all in favor the Minutes of the February 8, 2024 Board of Supervisors Meetings were approved as amended.
---

**FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS****Public Hearing to Amend and Restate  
Parking Rules****A. Open Public Hearing**

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein seconded by Mr. Goldstein with all in favor the Public Hearing to Amend and Restate Parking Rules was opened.

Ms. Adams presented Resolution 2024-03, Adopting the Amended and Restated Parking and Towing Rules, along with a clean copy of the Parking Rules, with the changes that the Board approved, which were included in the agenda package. In order to make the rules parallel with the Reunion West CDD Parking Rules there was language added to refer to the verge areas. Language was added regarding not parking in the vicinity of a fire hydrant, in accordance with Florida Law. District Counsel reviewed the proposed Parking Rules and provided updates, which were incorporated into the final version presented to the Board. The other changes that were discussed, was to define an *abandoned vehicle* in Section 5.3.5, as one that was left on the roadway for five days and to give the District the ability to tow abandoned vehicles as well as vehicles in disrepair. The only other changes were to the District's parking map, which were made in ink. After the Board approved the changes, the maps would be finalized by the District Engineer. The area marked in blue, was a No Parking Zone on both sides, coming out of the s-curve on Excitement Drive and on a corner of Radiant Street. Once this was approved by the Board, this area would be marked in red on the map to indicate No Parking zones. Mr. Goldstein recalled the Board requested a No Parking Zone, coming up Radiant Street and making a right-hand turn past the first house. Ms. Adams would make both sides of Radiant Street, a No Parking Zone on Sheet 1.01. Mr. Goldstein questioned the distance for a car making a turn safely from the corner. Mr. Scheerer recalled from the stop bar back, it was about 14 feet at a 30-degree angle, to have clean line of sight traffic on both sides. From the stop bar, Mr. Scheerer estimated about a little more than a car length and about 30 degrees both ways. Mr. Curley confirmed that it was a car length back to the stop bar. Ms. Adams noted the other proposed change, was to designate both sides of a vegetated median on both sides of Excitement Drive and one side of the roadway on Excitement Drive around the s-curve, as a No Parking Zone, which was marked in blue on Sheet 1.03.

**Reunion East CDD  
Regular Meeting**

**March 14, 2024  
Page 4 of 16**

**B. Public Comment**

Resident Sandy Kaplan of 1594 Heritage Crossing Court asked why a vehicle was parked for a couple of months in the Heritage Crossings association parking lot. Ms. Adams explained that the rules were related to the CDD public roadways and the area that Ms. Kaplan was referring to, was owned by the Association and the CDD only had the ability to tow vehicles from District property. Heritage Crossing was complex, because the District owned the main roadway, but the Association owned the parking spaces. Mr. Dryburgh recalled that the Heritage Crossings HOA had a security contract. Ms. Kaplan stated that she spoke with security and was told that there were specific Association parking rules. A Heritage Crossings HOA Board Member explained that they allowed their homeowners to park their cars at their own discretion and the Association parking rules were on the website. Mr. Goldstein asked if there was a length of time that people could leave their car. The HOA Member confirmed that it was in the by-laws and was at the Board's discretion, but it could change with the next Board. However, as long as the registration was updated, windows were not blown out and the vehicle was drivable, it was permitted. Mr. Dryburgh questioned how they identify that a car belonged to a homeowner. The HOA Member explained that it goes by their license plate. Ms. Adams pointed out this was an Association matter and advised Board members can focus on taking public comments regarding CDD Parking Rules.

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein seconded by Mr. Dryburgh with all in favor the Public Hearing to Amend and Restate Parking Rules was closed.

**C. Consideration of Resolution 2024-03 Adopting Amended and Restated Parking Rules**

Ms. Adams presented Resolution 2024-03 Adopting the Amended and Restated Parking Rules, which was included in the agenda package.

On MOTION by Mr. Dryburgh seconded by Mr. Goldstein with all in favor Resolution 2024-03 Adopting the Amended and Restated Parking Rules was adopted.

Ms. Adams stated that staff would take the necessary administrative steps to update the agreements, install the proper signage and communicate the District's revised rules to residents.

**FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS****Discussion of Status of Road Resurfacing  
Proposals**

Ms. Adams recalled that the Board authorized the District Engineer to take an inventory of all CDD roadways, where deficiencies were noted and subsequently authorized geotechnical work, to determine the scope of work that would be required to facilitate right of way repairs. There were priority areas that were identified, along with the scope of work that the Board approved for milling and resurfacing, as well as for painting stop bars, crosswalks and the installation of traffic calming devices such as speed tables. The District issued the Request for Proposal (RFP), in accordance with Florida Statutes, which was managed by the CDD's engineering firm. They reached out to six different service providers, but unfortunately, there were no responses and District management staff was conferring with the engineering team on several options, in order to obtain proposals. As a Florida Government, the CDD could piggyback on other government contracts, such as work being facilitated by Osceola County, the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) or local Cities. This was one option that the District engineering and management teams were exploring. Mr. Curley pointed out that he received six inquiries, followed up with the proposers and sent out reminders prior to the submittal date, but did not receive any proposals. He was currently reaching out to the proposers who received the bid package, to find out why they did not provide a proposal. Ms. Wispelwey asked if other CDDs had this issue now versus five or ten years ago. Ms. Adams recalled this issue going back at least five years and, in those cases, they were able to piggyback on other local government contracts. Mr. Greenstein pointed out in the interim, they were taking interim steps to identify areas where there were potholes and doing a cold patch, especially on the strip of road in front of the water park, as a temporary measure, until the permanent work was completed.

Ms. Wispelwey recalled that there was County road work at the Excitement Drive exit and at some point, the exit would be closed and asked if there could be prior notification to all residents on when it would occur. Mr. Scheerer did not have any further information, but it did not hurt to ask. Mr. Greenstein requested that Mr. Scheerer ask the County for a timeframe and Mr. Goldstein suggested finding out if it was going to be a right-hand turn only. Mr. Scheerer recalled that there was a rendering but would try to find it. Ms. Adams stated the County likely has a Maintenance of Traffic (MOT) Plan showing any road closures. Mr. Scheerer had seen where they run a layer of asphalt down and close the road for an hour or do it at night. Mr. Dryburgh recalled that there was

**Reunion East CDD  
Regular Meeting****March 14, 2024  
Page 6 of 16**

a No Entrance sign at the entrance to Wawa. Mr. Scheerer confirmed that there was construction at the entrance to Wawa, but at least there was a way in and out and would see what he could find out and provide it to Ms. Adams to forward to the Board. Mr. Dryburgh stated at the last meeting, there was a discussion regarding the road going into Heritage Crossing and speed bumps, which they did not pursue; however, there should have been a cost. Ms. Adams believed that the Field Operations Manager was doing a speed limit signage review for anything that needed to be updated or replaced, but if there was direction from the Board, staff could take additional efforts. Mr. Dryburgh was in favor of taking further steps, as there were 15 places around Reunion that needed speed bumps, which was going to be tied into the resurfacing. Mr. Scheerer reached out to Fausnight Stripe & Line (Fausnight) on the speed limit signs, which were requested at the last meeting. An audit was performed of the entire area and they were in the process of installing six signs, at the request of Heritage Crossing, three in different locations coming in and three coming out. Ms. Adams clarified that the signs would be placed on the District right-of-way (ROW) within Heritage Crossing.

**SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS****Ratification of Auditing Services  
Agreement with DiBartolomeo, McBee,  
Harley & Barnes for Fiscal Years 2024-  
2028**

Ms. Adams recalled that the Board previously met as an Audit Committee and selected DiBartolomeo, McBee, Harley & Barnes to provide five years of audit services, starting with Fiscal Year 2024. In accordance with the terms of the proposal, a five-year agreement was prepared, which was reviewed and edited by District Counsel and a clean version was provided to the Board. It was signed electronically by the Chairman and needed to be ratified by the Board.

On MOTION by Mr. Goldstein seconded by Mr. Dryburgh with all in favor the Auditing Services Agreement with DiBartolomeo, McBee, Harley & Barnes for Fiscal Years 2024-2028 was ratified.
--

**SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS****Consideration of No Parking Sign  
Proposal for Reunion Village**

Ms. Adams recalled while Reunion Village was being developed, the District adopted Parking Rules in accordance with other areas of Reunion, to restrict parking on one side of the roadway to maintain free flow of traffic. However, because of the high volume of residential construction and the fragility of the No Parking signs being damaged over and over again by construction vehicles, staff recommended to wait until and install No Parking signs at a later time. This Reunion Village area was recently reviewed by the Field Services Manager because of requests from property owners in the area for No Parking signs to control street parking. Reunion Security confirmed that this was the time to install them, for the first phase of Reunion Village only. A sign locate diagram was provided by Mr. Scheerer and was included in the agenda package. Mr. Goldstein questioned why they needed 81 signs. Mr. Scheerer indicated there was No Parking everywhere, except for the I-4 side and the proposal included the sign post, sign and installation for \$400 each. Ms. Adams explained that the posts were the upgraded black round, smooth posts and not the galvanized U-Channel posts that were on County ROWs. It did not have a decorative finial on top, but it was still a nice post and matched the other No Parking signs that were in other areas of Reunion. Mr. Scheerer noted that the signs were all powder coated. The installation plan coincided with the CDD Parking Rules and was budgeted. Mr. Dryburgh was surprised with the \$30,000 amount, as he was expecting a proposal in the \$25,000 range. Ms. Adams explained that the Board allocated \$50,000 for signage expenditures and even though the proposal came in higher than what was budgeted, there was funding available in the Repair & Maintenance (R&M) Fund.

<p>Mr. Goldstein MOVED to approve the proposal from Fausnight Stripe &amp; Line for 81 No Parking signs in the amount of \$33,210 and Mr. Dryburgh seconded the motion.</p>
---

Ms. Wispelwey wondered if they could eliminate some of the signs, as some were very close. Mr. Scheerer pointed out in order for the signs to be enforced, not only by Reunion Security, but by Osceola County, there must be a start and end point, a sign pointing one way and a sign pointing into itself. Therefore, the signs were placed 150 to 175 feet, depending on the length of traffic, because people would not see them. Mr. Greenstein recalled in prior discussions about the signage, they decided to have the maximum number of signs to clearly communicate with drivers.

**Reunion East CDD  
Regular Meeting**

**March 14, 2024  
Page 8 of 16**

Mr. Scheerer pointed out that people were parking on either side of the road Reunion Village Boulevard, which they did not want.

On VOICE VOTE with all in favor the proposal from Fausnight Stripe & Line for 81 No Parking signs in the amount of \$33,210 was approved.

Ms. Wispelwey noted a safety issue where Starbucks traffic backed up onto Reunion Village Boulevard and Osceola Polk Line Road. Ms. Adams suggested that the District Engineer review the current traffic pattern and provide a recommendation to the Board, as well as coordinate with Osceola County regarding free flow of traffic on and off of CR 532. There was Board consensus.

**EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Consideration of Proposals for Seven  
Eagles Fountain Refurbishment or  
Replacement**

- A. UCC**
- B. Yellowstone**

Ms. Adams recalled that this item was discussed several times regarding two fountains, Fountain #1, which was the fountain closer to Reunion Grande and Fountain #2, which was closer to the Seven Eagles facilities. There was also discussion about replacing or refurbishing the fountains and re-designing the area at Fountain #2, to a garden design. Ultimately, the Board decided to refurbish Fountain #1 and request that Kingwood Orlando Reunion Resort (KORR) assist with the funding, due to KORR utilizing the area for weddings and other private events. There was also discussion about the potential of KORR re-designing the area around Fountain #2, but there were legal issues to consider and questions about KORR's participation. As a result of those issues, the Board delegated authority to the Chairman to negotiate with KORR. Mr. Greenstein indicated that there were two modification proposals, one for \$61,500 to keep the existing fountain, rehab it and include a filtration system and LED lights and the other for \$65,000 to keep existing fountain, rehab it and include a filtration system, LED lights and a vault. Mr. Scheerer explained that it was based on the size of the fountain there was a 10-foot fountain proposal and a 15-foot fountain proposal.



**Reunion East CDD  
Regular Meeting**

**March 14, 2024  
Page 9 of 16**

Mr. Greenstein reported that he met with Mr. Anthony Carll of Kingwood and informed him of the Board's decision to renovate Fountain #1 and Mr. Carll agreed to fund half of the cost and to demolish Fountain #2, which was closer to Seven Eagles, level the ground and install a flower bed at their expense. Mr. Greenstein was satisfied with the outcome and recommended having an agreement with Kingwood for Fountain #2, with the standard indemnification provisions. Ms. Adams recommended also having an agreement with UCC Group for Fountain #1, based on the option that the Board selected.. Ms. Trucco stated from a legal standpoint, the fountain could be demolished as the District Engineer confirmed that no bond funds were expended. Mr. Greenstein pointed out that it would look great at a relatively low cost. Mr. Dryburgh noted that the District saved a great deal of money. Mr. Goldstein felt that Mr. Carll's offer to demolish it and redesigns the garden area was a good one.

On MOTION by Mr. Goldstein seconded by Mr. Greenstein with all in favor Option #3 in the proposal with UCC Group to refurbish Fountain #1 in the amount of \$61,500, with Kingswood Orlando Reunion Resort funding half of the cost, authorization for Kingswood Orlando Reunion Resort to demolish Fountain #2 and re-design into a garden area at their expense and authorization for staff to prepare the proper agreements was approved.

**NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Staff Reports**

**A. Attorney**

Ms. Trucco received comments from the Legal Department at the Osceola County Sheriff's Office (OCSO), regarding the Traffic Enforcement Agreement, which were provided to the Board. It could take several days for Ms. Trucco to review them and OCSO was made aware that it was subject to final execution from this Board. Some changes were extensive, some they could live with and some needed to be clarified. After their review, they would bring back a final form. Mr. Goldstein requested that Ms. Trucco paraphrase everything, so the Board knew what to expect. Ms. Trucco agreed, as they never had an agreement like this one, since the roads were public and there was a soft gate. However, the OCSO had provided some good reasons for requesting the agreement, such as confirming jurisdiction for coming in and writing tickets, so that someone could not argue that the ticket should be dismissed, because the CDD did not have jurisdiction over private roadways, which Ms. Trucco did not object to, but there was some language in the agreement that she was not comfortable with. Once she received comments back from OCSO and

**Reunion East CDD  
Regular Meeting****March 14, 2024  
Page 10 of 16**

it was in final form, she would bring it back to the Board and discuss each provision. Counsel was performing a plat inventory and some title work, which they would analyze and bring back an analysis and recommendation to the Board. They were also in the process of reviewing the application that was received from Kingwood, regarding the redevelopment. It was discussed with Kingwood and they were more than willing to come before the Board with a presentation of the concept and what they were requesting, in the next month or two. Any legal issues that they see, would be discussed with the Board, but ultimately, it was the Board's decision. Mr. Dryburgh asked if what Ms. Trucco was working with the OCSO on, would apply to roads that were not public. Ms. Trucco confirmed that it would not; it would only apply to roads that were owned and operated by the CDD and it was staff's position that these were public roadways due to being owned by the CDD and financed with CDD bond funds, as opposed to roads owned by an Association, which were not public and not financed with CDD bond funds.

**B. Engineer**

Mr. Curley reported that they were working hard to get the pavement management bids resolved, in the hopes of having something before the Board at the next meeting. Mr. Greenstein questioned the timeframe for the installation of the card readers at the Spine Road bridge. Mr. Scheerer stated that some additional borings were needed and the District Manager filled out the Notice of Commencement, which was forwarded to the contractor and were currently in the permitting phase and once the additional borings were installed and the permits were issued, the project would be started relatively quickly, but he did not have a definitive start date. Ms. Wispelwey pointed out on the Davenport Creek Bridge, there was a divider in the road that needed to be removed. Mr. Scheerer stated that it would be moved at some point. There were barriers on either side for pedestrian traffic, which were installed, because people were cutting through the road. *There was Board consensus to remove the barriers.*

**C. Field Manager Updates**

Mr. Scheerer recalled that there were lengthy discussions about tree trimming in both Districts. He did not know if it was complete, as they were working on a few other areas between the sidewalk and curb in CDD areas and would be meeting with Mr. Garrett Huegel of Yellowstone Landscape next week to would review the project before payment was made. This would take care of all of the tree trimming in the budget. Their concrete guy was onsite, making all of the

**Reunion East CDD  
Regular Meeting**

**March 14, 2024  
Page 11 of 16**

replacements that they deem necessary and were currently grinding in Patriots Landing. Once they assessed all of the grinding, they would be moving to the Reunion West side and would get with Fausnight regarding the new signage for Reunion Village. Mr. Scheerer met with the insurance company yesterday, who sent an appraiser out to the community, to appraise all of the CDD property that was insured and update appraisals. All of the pools, The Stables and the Heritage Crossing Community Center, (HCCC), anything insured \$100,000 and up, were reviewed. They are preparing for hurricane season, which starts in a couple of months and cleaned some additional furniture for the Seven Eagles pool, for the upcoming Spring Break for Polk County, which starts next week and Brevard County the following week. Spring Break for Osceola County, ends this week. They have umbrellas at all of the pools. He spoke to Supervisor Dryburgh about repairing a pop-off at Heritage Crossing Pool B around April 15<sup>th</sup>. The contractor would drain and resurface the entire pool, at no cost to the District, as there was a five-year warranty on any pool resurfacing. If all goes well, they will commence with the roofing project. These projects should not be completed at the same time, because of the heavy equipment that they must use.

Mr. Dryburgh asked if the contractor would reimburse the cost of putting water back into the pool. Mr. Scheerer confirmed that the contractor would pay for the water. Ms. Wispelwey asked if Heritage Crossing and the HOA would be notified. Mr. Scheerer stated that he just notified them, as he just received the date yesterday. Mr. Goldstein requested that the striping on Reunion Boulevard be re-done, as it looked terrible. Mr. Greenstein was hoping to have permanent resurfacing completed in six months and anticipated by the next meeting, having a better idea of what contracts they could piggyback on. As long as the terms were in the ballpark of what they were budgeting for, they could get some commitment and then re-evaluate the striping. Mr. Goldstein did not want to wait any more than six months. Mr. Dryburgh agreed. Mr. Greenstein asked if they could have temporary striping. Mr. Scheerer would obtain cost estimates for striping after the next meeting, once there was a paving plan. Mr. Greenstein pointed out that they could prioritize the areas, doing certain areas first and then coming back to repave three months later. Regarding the repainting of the Homestead pool buildings, including the mail kiosks, Mr. Greenstein noted that it looked good and the HOA did a nice job. Mr. Scheerer presented the Action Items List, which was included in the agenda package and reported on the following:

1. Seven Eagles Fountain Replacement: Discussed.
2. Access to Reunion Village/Davenport Creek Bridge: Discussed.

**Reunion East CDD  
Regular Meeting**

**March 14, 2024  
Page 12 of 16**

Mr. Goldstein asked about the dog park gate. Mr. Scheerer stated it was approved and was waiting for the contractor to install it.

3. Inventory of Residential Lots where Sidewalk Installation is Pending: In process. It would be presented at next month's meeting, as they were trying to figure out a simplified format.
4. Whitemarsh Mound: Discussed at the Reunion West CDD meeting.

Ms. Wispelwey asked about the dumpsters at The Stables. Mr. Greenstein pointed out that the area was much better, as it was clean and tidy, except that the sign for the dumpster was falling apart and needed to be properly attached to the post, which needed to be painted. Mr. Scheerer would handle it. Mr. Goldstein requested that the dog park be closed for a month for refurbishment, since all of the winter residents were leaving. Mr. Scheerer would speak with Yellowstone about filling in the holes.

**D. District Manager's Report**

**i. Action Items List**

Ms. Adams reported that Board Members recognized that The Stables parcel was not being as utilized as it could be and wanted to improve the area, either under the purview of the CDD or for the CDD to sell it to someone who would want to make improvements, to make it a useful amenity for the community. The District Engineer confirmed the amount of bond funds that were used and provided the bond series information that was used. There was now enough information to engage Bond Counsel in an analysis of the amount needed to be redeemed and to further determine the feasibility of selling the parcel. The estimate that District Counsel has received, was between \$10,000 to \$20,000 for bond counsel services. Staff is seeking direction from the Board to confirm that staff should bring back a proposal for appraisal services. Mr. Greenstein felt that the next step was to obtain a market appraisal, as there was interest to either dispose of the property or having it renovated and managed under the current Management Services Agreement (MSA) for the HCCC and The Stables. Mr. Greenstein asked if the property was going to be worth more than what was covered in the sale of the bonds. Ms. Trucco stated it was possible that the bond tax attorneys could come to determine that \$10 million in bonds must be redeemed for example, because the series was part of a default, which was more than the value of The Stables, but until the numbers were run, they did not know for sure. Mr. Dryburgh did not even want to consider it until the approximate value was known.

**Reunion East CDD  
Regular Meeting****March 14, 2024  
Page 13 of 16**

Ms. Wispelwey asked if they could get the amount of bonds to be redeemed and the appraisal at the same time. Mr. Greenstein confirmed that getting the Bond Trustee involved would cost money. Ms. Wispelwey stated if the appraisal comes in at the market value of \$2 million, they should proceed with the next step, but if it was \$200,000, they should not, except for the fact that there were two acres and it probably would not be that low. Mr. Greenstein pointed out that the decision of whether to hold onto the property and maintain it as an asset under an MSA or dispose of it, was based on the bond redemption. If the bond redemption amount was an astronomical number, they must re-evaluate it, as the cost to find out that information, was \$10,000 to 20,000. Mr. Goldstein stated if the property was zoned for commercial use, it would make a difference. Ms. Adams noted that the appraisal would address the permitted use. Ms. Wispelwey believed that the amount of bonds to be redeemed, was the decision maker and questioned why they would get the appraisal without knowing the amount of bonds. Ms. Trucco explained if the Board wanted to know whether they could sell the property, change the purpose to allow a for profit restaurant on the parcel for example, they must get the bond tax attorney's opinion, which would cost \$20,000, versus \$5,000 to \$10,000 for an appraisal. Mr. Dryburgh was in favor of finding out the value of the property first and then proceeding to the next step. Mr. Greenstein agreed, as knowing what the property was worth, would influence interested buyers, developers or stakeholders, on what to do with the property. Ms. Wispelwey felt that they needed to do both and to do them now. Mr. Goldstein pointed out there was no rush and questioned how soon they could get an appraisal. Ms. Adams asked whether the Board wanted her to bring back proposals for an appraisal or obtain the proposals and have the Chairman choose one, so that the Board would have the appraisal sooner. Mr. Goldstein preferred that Ms. Adams obtain proposals and have the Chairman approval the proposal.

On MOTION by Mr. Dryburgh seconded by Mr. Goldstein with all in favor authorization for the Chairman to approve the proposal for appraisal services for The Stables parcel was approved.
--

Ms. Adams would solicit proposals and provide them to the Chairman and once he approved the proposal, there would be a timeline for when the appraisal would be presented to the Board.

**ii. Approval of Check Register**

Ms. Adams presented the Check Register from February 1, 2024 through February 29, 2024 in the amount of \$437,090.02, which was included in the agenda package.

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein seconded by Mr. Goldstein with all in favor the February Check Register was approved.

**iii. Balance Sheet and Income Statement**

Ms. Adams presented the Unaudited Financial Statements through February 29, 2024, which were included in the agenda package and were for informational purposes. Surplus Funds in the General Fund were moved to the State Board of Administration (SBA) account, which earned 5.67% interest. Likewise, the majority of funds in the R&M Fund was in the SBA account, for the purpose of earning interest. There were some assessments that were direct billed, which staff was monitoring. There was also a \$500,000 transfer out to the R&M Fund for the current fiscal year. No Board action was required.

**iv. Replacement and Maintenance Plan**

Ms. Adams presented the R&M Plan, which was included in the agenda package and were for informational purposes. They were reviewed and updated by Mr. Scheerer on an ongoing basis and were for projects approved as part of the Fiscal Year 2024 Budget and items that were either deferred from the prior fiscal year or the Board approved as part of the current fiscal year, after the budget was adopted. Several items were for April. Mr. Scheerer was working with a service provider, regarding the replacement of certain cardio equipment and upgrades for the Fitness Center.

**v. Presentation of Series 2015A and 2021 Arbitrage Rebate Calculation Reports - ADDED**

Ms. Adams presented the Arbitrage Rebate Calculation Reports for Series 2015A and 2021, which were included in the agenda package. This report was required by the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) at five-year intervals on the tax-exempt bonds, to show that the bonds were not earning more interest than what the District was paying on the bonds. If there was an arbitrage issue, a penalty was associated with it, but based upon the computations, no rebate liability existed and there were no arbitrage issues.

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein seconded by Mr. Goldstein with all in favor the Series 2015A and 2021 Arbitrage Rebate Calculation Reports were approved.

**V. Security Report**

Ms. Adams reported that no one from Reunion Security was able to attend this meeting. The January Security Reports, were provided under separate cover, detailing the activities with the Reunion security team on behalf of the Master Association. Mr. Dryburgh personally observed slow response times to security enforcing the District's Parking Rules and the District's Amenity Policies at the CDD pools which Ms. Adams reported to the Assistant Security Director for Reunion Security. Ms. Wispelwey voiced concern about Reunion Security not enforcing the Parking Rules, as people were parking at the Homestead pool for three hours, at the two signs that were for 15-minute parking. Mr. Goldstein had an issue with Assistant Security Director, as he called her this morning about a car parked on the grass on Euston Drive, but no one handled it. Mr. Greenstein requested that it be followed up. Since no one was present from Reunion Security, Ms. Adams would inform them about the short-term parking enforcement at the Homestead pool and the cars parking on the grass on Euston Drive. Mr. Greenstein requested that security pay attention to all mail kiosk locations, where there was 15-minute parking and Mr. Goldstein requested that the guards at the gatehouses stand up and greet people instead of sitting down and not acknowledging them. Ms. Adams would inform Mr. Vargas about the items that the Board spoke about, as well as the protocol for greeting drivers as they enter the community.

**TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS****Other Business**

There being no comments, the next item followed.

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

There being no comments, the next item followed.

**TWELFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS****Next Meeting Date – April 11, 2024**

Ms. Adams stated that the next meeting was scheduled for April 11, 2024 at 11:00 a.m.

**Reunion East CDD  
Regular Meeting**

**March 14, 2024  
Page 16 of 16**

**THIRTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Adjournment**

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

DocuSigned by:  
*Tricia Adams*  
3F3E5FA5C67E43B...  
Secretary/Assistant Secretary

DocuSigned by:  
*[Signature]*  
6540F4ED6DA6409...  
Chairman/Vice Chairman