

**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, **April 11, 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 <i>via Zoom</i>	Vice Chairman
Trudy Hobbs	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
Victor Vargas	Reunion Security
Garrett Huegel	Yellowstone Landscape
Pete Whitman	Yellowstone Landscape
Residents	

The following is a summary of the discussions and actions taken at the April 11, 2024 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 1:01 p.m. and called the roll. All Supervisors were present in person, with the exception of Mr. Goldstein who was present via phone.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS**Public Comment Period**

Ms. Adams opened the public comment period. Resident Beverly Pappas of 7689 Heritage Crossing Way noted that several umbrellas and tables in the pool area were broken and was wondering if they could be addressed. In addition, the water level of the pools was below the skimmer level and there were many bugs and debris in the bottom of the pool. Ms. Adams indicated that the Field Manager would handle these items. There being no further comments, Ms. Adams closed the public comment period.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS**Approval of the Minutes of the March 14,
2024 Board of Supervisors Meeting**

Ms. Adams presented the minutes of the March 14, 2024 Board of Supervisors meeting, a draft of which were included in the agenda package. There were no corrections.

On MOTION by Mr. Dryburgh seconded by Ms. Hobbs with all in favor the Minutes of the March 14, 2024 Board of Supervisors Meetings were approved as presented.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**Review of Sidewalk Installation Locations**

Ms. Adams stated that District Counsel provided a Memorandum regarding sidewalk construction and legal matters that the Board may want to consider. She asked District Counsel to present the legal items first and then Mr. Scheerer would present the maps and sidewalk locations. Ms. Trucco indicated that this matter pertained to sidewalks in front of vacant residential lots, which was originally brought up by the Reunion West CDD Board. The following considerations from a legal perspective were presented:

- 1) Permitting: If there was a vacant lot and an owner wanted to construct a home, they must go to Osceola County to obtain a permit, which required the lot owner to construct a sidewalk, verge and driveway apron. However, if the CDD takes on the obligation to construct the sidewalk before the home was built, the CDD would likewise go to the county for a permit. It was believed that construction plans and a survey must be submitted as part of the permit process.
- 2) Surveying: In order to obtain the permit, there must be a survey showing where the residential lot ended and the roadway started, to ensure that the CDD was not

**Reunion East CDD
Regular Meeting**

**April 11, 2024
Page 3 of 16**

encroaching on the residential lot and the sidewalk was on the right-of-way (ROW) tract.

- 3) Landowner Consent: Recommended as a best practice, that the current landowner acknowledge and consent that the CDD was permitted to construct the sidewalk and agree to repair any damage to the sidewalk. There was also a concern that there could exist a purchase agreement, signed by the current landowner, obligating them to construct a sidewalk when the home was built, but if the CDD constructed the sidewalk, it could be interpreted that the CDD caused the landowner to breach their contract and they could potentially bring forth a claim, for damages, because the CDD took on the task of constructing the sidewalk or otherwise could interfere with a possible contract. In that case, the CDD would potentially have to pay to tear it down, in order to construct it in a different way, to accommodate the driveway apron for that particular home for example or other possible scenario. It may be the case that there may be no such Purchase Agreement, but the best practice would be to have a discussion with the current landowner, for the purpose of having them sign an acknowledgement and consent. The benefit to landowner would be the CDD taking on the cost of constructing the sidewalk and an increase in the property value for example.
- 5) Liability: There would be potential future damage to the sidewalk, if a sidewalk was damaged during the construction of a home. If there was no consent from the landowner, the CDD would either have to pay to repair the sidewalk or potentially bring action against the owner to make the repairs or pay for damage; however, there would be legal fees associated with it.

Ms. Trucco indicated that Mr. Scheerer spent a great deal of time, reviewing the community and identifying the sidewalks. Ms. Adams presented maps of various Reunion neighborhoods within the Reunion East CDD where there were vacant lots with no sidewalks. Mr. Scheerer pointed out that there were maps of Patriots Landing, Homestead and Liberty Bluff. There was an estimate on the number of vacant lots. The lot counts were estimated, whether a double vacant lot or house in Reunion East but did not include the Reunion Village area. Patriots Landing had 27 vacant lots, Homestead had 47 vacant lots and Liberty Bluff had 48 vacant lots, for a total of 122 vacant lots, which was estimated to be 5,110 linear feet of sidewalk. The cost of \$22 per linear

**Reunion East CDD
Regular Meeting****April 11, 2024
Page 4 of 16**

feet, based on the installation of concrete only, totaled \$112,420. However, it did not include permits, grading or surveys. All measurements were estimates only and there must be an actual field survey, to provide the actual cost. Ms. Adams pointed out that it did not include any permits, surveys, legal expenses or sod, as they were not certain of the ability to permit a sidewalk if there was not proper transition on and off the sidewalk.

Mr. Greenstein recalled at the Reunion West CDD Board meeting, there was a great deal of discussion regarding this issue, revolving around the difference between the Board having the authority to install a concrete sidewalk and informing the property owner of what the CDD was doing, versus obtaining their consent. Nothing was agreed to, but the conclusion was that the CDD could proceed with the installation of a sidewalk, if the Board agreed, and it would not require the property owner's consent. Mr. Greenstein advised that Supervisor Barry voiced concern about the legal opinion that District Counsel provided and there was discussion regarding administrative matters, but it was clear that the CDD Board preferred not taking responsibility for anything but installing and maintaining sidewalks within the CDD right of way. This was especially pertinent in Liberty Bluff, where the width of the lot was 35 feet, the house was 25 feet and many times the driveway apron and paver area were widened and the owner was permitted to install pavers into the 10-foot setback on the side, because it was not a permanent installation. At the end of the discussion, the Reunion West CDD Board agreed to proceed and to speak with the head of the Master Association, and coordinator with the Featured Builders Program, General Manager, Mr. Anthony Carll of Reunion Resort, as this was a positive step for the community to complete the sidewalks, so that people did not have to go out into the roadway to continue their walk. However, whether or not there was any financial impact on the District, was to be seen, because the cost of installing a sidewalk and driveway pad, was included in the home construction cost. Therefore, by the CDD installing the sidewalk ahead of time, assuming it was destroyed in the process was a big assumption. Yet, when Celebration developed an area, they put in all of the sidewalks. Some locations needed supporting material, such as sod and other locations, where the sidewalk transitioned down to the dirt, which they can discuss with the Master Association, because every property owner was paying a fee just to maintain the lot, which included mowing it to prevent weeds.

Mr. Goldstein asked if they installed Bahia. Mr. Greenstein believed so, but it needed to have turf, in order for the sidewalk to not shift and the driveway pad would require space from the

**Reunion East CDD
Regular Meeting****April 11, 2024
Page 5 of 16**

roadway towards the sidewalk, in order to be safe and solid. However, the important thing, was that they received an inventory of the vacant lots out of this process. Even though there were more vacant lots on the west side, versus the east side, it would be handled as a joint project. Ms. Adams pointed out that Supervisor Barry was designated by the Reunion West CDD Board, to confer with the Master Association, Kingwood Orlando Reunion Resort and Featured Builders. The Reunion East CDD Board could delegate a Supervisor to coordinate with Mr. Barry, so information was exchanged at the same time. If there was any intention with the Master Association to enforce their covenants requiring people to build a home within two years, it could change the picture. Ms. Hobbs noted that some homes were already built, but there was no sidewalk. Mr. Greenstein requested that Ms. Hobbs point out those areas to Mr. Scheerer. Ms. Hobbs stated that she provided Mr. Scheerer with a list of the lots. Mr. Dryburgh asked if they were looking at adding onto the cost of \$122,000, because they needed to have a survey, permit and there would be some legal expenses associated with contacting the various landowners. Mr. Curley estimated \$10,000 to \$20,000. Mr. Dryburgh believed that they were looking at approximately \$240,000 for the installation of all sidewalks in Reunion East, but if they did not do so and the house was built, the cost of putting the sidewalk in, would be borne by the homeowner. Therefore, they were asking current homeowners as well as future homeowners to pay for the installation of the sidewalk, versus having the builder absorb the cost.

Ms. Adams also recalled discussion at the Reunion West CDD meeting, about strategically looking at the locations and installing a sidewalk on one side of a street, to give pedestrians an option of a continuous sidewalk on one side of the road. At this time, the budget number was large, but it could be fine-tuned, once a strategy was determined. Mr. Dryburgh agreed that it was an excessive amount of money and while it was important for people to have the opportunity to walk on sidewalks, he did not think that there needed to be a sidewalk on both sides of the street. Mr. Greenstein recalled that a variety of things were looked into, but they have now reached a point where the total number of vacant lots for Reunion East and Reunion West was around 280. Mr. Greenstein believed that the Master Association and the Featured Builders, would be interested in knowing that the Reunion East CDD Board was looking into this and would opine with it, as there were some lots, where it was simple to install the sidewalk, in order to have a safe, contiguous area of sidewalk. Mr. Dryburgh wanted Mr. Carll to review the concept that all of sidewalks should be installed, in order to complete the project, but did not know what their legal recourse was. Ms.

**Reunion East CDD
Regular Meeting****April 11, 2024
Page 6 of 16**

Hobbs felt that the sidewalks added value to Reunion. Mr. Greenstein believed that when they were down to a small number of lots, that were spread out, the Master Association could re-activate their covenants and felt that they were reaching the end of the road with this matter. Ms. Wispelwey felt that it was worth talking about, as it was a safety issue to keep people out of the street. Mr. Goldstein believed that the Featured Builders would love this conversation, because they did not have to spend \$250,000 to put sidewalks in and construction was coming to an end and Mr. Carll would love it, because he was getting support from both of these groups. Mr. Greenstein pointed out that the homeowner aspect, was out of this Board's control, but it could impact the CDD. Ms. Hobbs volunteered to work with Mr. Barry, in speaking with the Master Association Feature Builders Program and the General Manager and reporting their findings back to the Board. *There was Board consensus.* Board Members thanked Mr. Scheerer for his hard work.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**Consideration of Sign Installation Request
from The Crescent at Reunion**

Ms. Adams presented a sign installation request from The Crescent at Reunion, regarding the Terraces Project, as the landowner was seeking the consent of the Reunion East CDD Board, to install signage on CDD parcels, for directional and informational signage. In 2017 Board Members participated in lengthy discussions regarding sign policies. The Sign Policy that was adopted by the Reunion East CDD Board in February of 2017, was provided to the Board for review. The policy stated that if a sign was installed on CDD property, it needed to be approved by the Board and included the type of signage to be installed. Section 1.6, indicated that the signage was for the purpose of providing direction and wayfinding information and not for marketing or advertisement purposes and the purpose of Section 1.7, included a provision for temporary signage for special events, to direct people to special parking. Furthermore, at the time that this policy was adopted, the Board allowed a 60-day grace period for signs that were not in compliance with the policy, to be uninstalled. Around that same time, the Master Association adopted sign standards and the CDD, in the spirit of community cooperation, decided to defer to the Master Association standards. A depiction of a standard signs, with white posts and caps on top, type of layout and designs, were provided to the Board. In a prior discussion by the Board, it was the Board's desire to have the Reunion palm logo included, to provide a sense of cohesion throughout the community. Ms. Adams requested that this item be deferred, as she reached out to Crescent and requested a depiction and layout of the design for the proposed signage, which she had not yet received. Her

**Reunion East CDD
Regular Meeting****April 11, 2024
Page 7 of 16**

intention of placing this item on the agenda, was to bring the Board's attention to the Signage Policy, discuss the standard that was considered in the past, provide some context and confirm that the Board Members did not want to make any changes to the policy or revisit it, before considering signage at a future meeting.

Mr. Dryburgh pointed out one issue, was with realtors putting signs into the ground, when they had open houses. At one time, security was aggressive in removing the signs as fast as they noticed them. The landscapers were also removing the signs. Recently, there were more and more signs and Mr. Dryburgh did not know if security was aware of them, but they needed to be removed. Mr. Vargas reported that the security guards were keeping track of the open houses. Mr. Dryburgh requested that Mr. Vargas instruct the guards to remove the signs when they were spotted by the guards driving around the community and questioned whether there was an exception for the Featured Builders, when they wanted to install sandwich boards, when a new house was completed and was for sale. Ms. Adams clarified that this sign policy was only for signs on CDD property and not on private property. Ms. Wispelwey pointed out that some of the signs were on District property. Ms. Adams indicated if there was signage on District Property, that was not in accordance with the District policies, meaning they were not approved by the Board, then the District had the ability to remove them. Mr. Dryburgh recalled that there was an exception for sandwich boards. Mr. Greenstein stated the sandwich board signs were approved signs but had only seen them on driveways and not on CDD property. Mr. Dryburgh noticed two sandwich boards on the sidewalk, but they were not intrusive. Mr. Greenstein did not want to see Air Dancers, but if they were on CDD property, the policy stated they would be removed. Mr. Dryburgh was in favor of confirming the Sign Policy. Ms. Adams asked if the Board wanted to have time to review the policy and consider it at the next meeting. Mr. Greenstein was comfortable with the policy, but wanted to control the number of signs and where they were located. Ms. Wispelwey preferred to monitor the number of signs and not what they looked like. This item was deferred until the May meeting.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**Consideration of Vertical Bridge Access
Easement**

Ms. Adams presented a letter from Rowstar, LLC. regarding a proposed easement access to a Department of Transportation (DOT) parcel. There was a nearby electronic billboard, that was approximately 60 feet tall. The purpose of the access easement was to install a cell phone tower

**Reunion East CDD
Regular Meeting****April 11, 2024
Page 8 of 16**

(monopole) on the parcel and information was provided to the Board regarding the height of the proposed monopole. Staff requested a Funding Agreement from the vendor, for the proposal to pay for the professional engineering and legal tasks that might come up. The initial proposal was for Rowstar, LLC. and Vertical Bridge to compensate the Reunion East CDD, with a one-time payment of \$10,000, upon execution of the Access Agreement. On April 10th, another letter was received by the CDD, identifying the purpose of the monopole and providing background information from the vendor. A map showing the proposed access easement and parcel owned by DOT was also provided to the Board. Mr. Dryburgh asked if the State had approached the CDD Board about taking any land for the expansion of I-4 that would interfere with this. Ms. Adams confirmed that staff had not received any such request. Mr. Dryburgh voiced concern if the cell tower was installed in this location, the State could come along and expand I-4 from four to six lanes. Ms. Adams indicated up until the time of the meeting, staff was not contacted by the vendor to withdraw their proposal. Mr. Dryburgh asked if they should inform DOT about this plan, so that they were aware of it. Ms. Adams explained that it was incumbent on the vendor to determine the feasibility of installing the monopole on the DOT tract. Ms. Wispelwey noted that there were many lights. Ms. Adams advised there is an existing billboard and nearby powerlines. When Ms. Wispelwey reviewed the material, she assumed that the builder for the monopole would come onto CDD roads and build from the road. Ms. Adams understood that DOT would not allow access to the tract from the I-4 corridor. It was her understanding the firm also approached the hospital for access, but they denied their request.

Ms. Adams pointed out that the Board could either deny the access easement, which District Counsel could discuss further. If the Board wanted to approve it, she recommended that a survey of the access area be completed at the expense of the proposer and that the Board delegate authority to the Chairman to provide a counter offer. Mr. Dryburgh asked if the counter offer would be \$50,000. Mr. Greenstein stated if the property was worth \$50,000, the counter offer would be \$50,000 or whatever it was worth. Ms. Adams pointed out that any final agreement would be brought back to the Board for consideration. Ms. Wispelwey agreed, but voiced concern that the widening of I 4 could affect the CDD property and residential homes. Mr. Greenstein stated this was why he wanted to see the plan, as last week the Governor, talked about prioritizing the widening from US 27 to Osceola Parkway, but there would not have been an announcement, if they did not have the plans. Mr. Dryburgh indicated that this was their only option. Mr. Greenstein

**Reunion East CDD
Regular Meeting**

**April 11, 2024
Page 9 of 16**

preferred to see what the counter offer was, as the funds could be used to offset the costs of the sidewalk project. Ms. Adams recommended that the Board also approve an appraisal of the property. Mr. Dryburgh asked if there would be an economic appraisal. Ms. Adams explained that the appraisal would be for the best and highest use and value of the property and that they would most likely use the appraiser that was appraising The Stables parcel, as they were familiar with the CDD. As a Professional Appraiser, they would be familiar with all of the criteria, in order to determine a value.

On MOTION by Mr. Dryburgh seconded by Ms. Wispelwey with all in favor to authorize appraisal of the access easement property and authority for the Chairman to provide a counter offer was approved.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

**Consideration of Proposal for Professional
Service Rate for District Engineer**

Ms. Adams presented a proposal for District engineering services which was included in the agenda package. Mr. Greenstein pointed out that there was a 10% increase, to bring the current rates, that were put into effect in 2022, up to market conditions. Mr. Dryburgh felt that the increase was reasonable, due to inflation.

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein seconded by Ms. Hobbs with all in favor the Proposal for Professional Service Rate for District Engineer as stated above was approved.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

**Ratification of Proposal for Consultative
Appraisal; Services from Pinel &
Carpenter, Inc.**

Ms. Adams recalled that at the last meeting, the Board directed staff to provide appraisal proposals to the Chairman for The Stables parcel, in order to make a selection. Included in the agenda package, was a letter from Pinel & Carpenter dated March 20, 2024, describing their services and their proposed fee of \$4,800 for Phase 1 appraisal services and \$2,150 for Phase 2 appraisal services. The Chairman considered two different proposals and ultimately felt that the proposal from Pinel & Carpenter was in the best interest of the District.

On MOTION by Mr. Dryburgh seconded by Ms. Wispelwey with all in favor the approval of the proposal for consultative appraisal services from Pinel & Carpenter, Inc. as stated above was ratified.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**Staff Reports****A. Attorney****i. Memorandum – Annual Reminder on Florida Laws for Public Officers**

Ms. Trucco presented a Memorandum providing annual reminders to the Board on Florida Laws that apply to public officials for all CDDs that they represent, which focused on the following:

1. Code of Ethics Reminders: As a CDD Supervisor, Board Members were considered government officials in the State of Florida. Under the gifts law, CDD Supervisors were prohibited from asking for or accepting anything of value, if that thing was given in order to influence their official decision making, vote, action or judgment. This also applied to a spouse or minor children if they know or should know the thing was given to influence your decision making. There was also a disclosure duty, for gifts having a value of greater than \$100, unless it was from a relative. Board Members were required to disclose the gift on Form 9, unless they paid down the value of it to \$100 or less within 90 days of receiving it. In addition, under Chapter 112, no public official could corruptly use or attempt to use their official position or any property or resource, which may be within their trust, to secure a special privilege, benefit or exemption for themselves or others.
2. Voting Conflicts: Supervisors must not vote on any matter that would result in their own special private gain or loss, or that of a principal, by whom the officer was retained and receiving compensation for something of similar value from, or that of a parent organization or subsidiary of a corporate principal, by whom the officer was retained, or that of a relative (parents, children, spouse, sibling, mother/father-in-law or son/daughter-in-law) or that of a business associate of the Board Member. For example, if a Board Member was employed by a landscaping company and the company provided a proposal to the Board, the Board Member must abstain from voting and fill out Form 8B and file with Ms. Adams within 15 days of the vote. In addition, if the Board Member owned an apartment complex or participated in a

**Reunion East CDD
Regular Meeting**

**April 11, 2024
Page 11 of 16**

joint venture with someone for profit and that endeavor was current and ongoing, they must abstain from voting if that business associate submitted a proposal to the Board; however, if a business associate was from 10 years ago and they submitted a proposal, the Board Member may be allowed to vote, because they were not a current business associate. The voting conflict does not prohibit the Board Member from discussing an issue but certain disclosure requirements apply for elected versus appointed officers so recommended to notify us if a Board Member has a voting conflict. For discussions on items with a voting conflict Board Members must be mindful of the misuse of the Public Position Statute described in the memorandum.

3. Quorum and Sunshine Law Reminders: A majority of Board Members must be physically present to establish the quorum, in order for the Board to take any official action. However, if three Board Members were physically present, a Board Member could attend by phone; but they did not count as part of the quorum requirement and could only participate by telephone, if their absence was due to an extraordinary circumstance such as an illness. They were also required to vote on every measure, unless there was a voting conflict. Regarding the Sunshine Law, Board Members were not permitted to discuss any item, upon which foreseeable action would be taken by the Board with another member of the Board, outside of a meeting, including physical conversations and virtual by for example text messages and posts on social media, especially Facebook. Even if the Board Member was not friends with another Board Member, if they read a public post from another Supervisor about CDD business, it could be construed as communicating with a Supervisor outside of a meeting, which was a violation of the Sunshine Law.
4. Public Records Reminder: Any materials made or received by a member of the Board, in connection with official business of the CDD, was considered a public record and were subject to a public records request. This included text messages, emails and any documents sent or received in connection with the official business of the CDD. Text messages must be retained for a statutory period of time as set forth on a chart that was created by the Division of Library Information Services of the Florida Department of State, indicating how long a particular document must

**Reunion East CDD
Regular Meeting****April 11, 2024
Page 12 of 16**

be retained for and how to dispose of it. District Counsel's recommendation was to send everything to GMS, the Records Custodian for the CDD, to retain for the statutory period of time. There were exceptions, like materials related to security and safety and materials related to active criminal investigations. If any Board Member received a public records request, it is recommended that it be sent to Ms. Adams or her office.

Ms. Trucco was working with EHOV Acquisition II, LLC on the remainder of tracts that needed to come to the CDD, including the Reunion Village guardhouse. An update would be provided when there was progress. The inventory was completed, based on the plats that she identified by looking at the schematic of the boundary of the District, and was provided to a Title Examiner, to confirm that any of the tracts that they listed have not been re-platted. Sometimes they received the plats, but the majority of plats were obtained was clicking on the Property Appraiser website and downloading it. In the best case, the developer would engage with the CDD during the platting process, but it appeared was not the case here on some, as several were not signed. Once Ms. Trucco heard back from the Title Examiner, it would be brought back to the Board with recommendations for next steps. Regarding the Traffic Enforcement Agreement with the Osceola County Sheriff's Office (OCSO), she was still working out some of the terms with the County and as soon as they reach a comfort level, which she anticipated by the next meeting, it would be brought back to the Board.

ii. Sidewalk Construction Discussion

This item was discussed.

B. Engineer

Mr. Curley had the signed proposal for the Spine Road gates and would get the work scheduled. A directional bore was needed. Mr. Greenstein questioned where. Mr. Scheerer stated that it was at the two new gates that go over the bridge. Mr. Dryburgh questioned how much conduit was needed. Mr. Scheerer indicated that after a survey, the contractor needed additional conduit, so he contacted Mr. Curley to obtain a proposal, which Mr. Scheerer approved. Guardian confirmed that they were in permitting and were waiting on the county and as soon as the county issued the permit, the installation would commence. Mr. Dryburgh pointed out that it became a very nice cut through. Ms. Hobbs heard there was an accident at the junction of Spine Road and

**Reunion East CDD
Regular Meeting****April 11, 2024
Page 13 of 16**

Tradition Boulevard. Mr. Dryburgh pointed out that drivers run the stop sign and speed. All County Paving (All County) committed to the repaving of the roads and Middlesex Paving (Middlesex) was re-looking at their numbers, but Mr. Curley preferred to use All County. Ms. Adams explained that this project could piggyback on other Florida government agreements because as a special purpose Florida Government, the District had the ability to piggyback on any other Florida Government contracts. The rates were negotiated by the Polk County School Board and an agreement would be brought back to the Board, as well as some resolutions that would be prepared by District Counsel. In the meantime, Mr. Curley was reviewing the rates to ensure that they were a good value for the District.

C. Field Manager Updates

Mr. Scheerer reported that on the 15th, the Heritage Crossing pool would be closed for two weeks, to renovate that pool, at no cost to the residents, including the utilities. Recently, all of the guardhouse lights were changed from ballasted compact fluorescence to LEDs. If the area was a little brighter, this was the reason why. The Reunion Village signs that were approved by the Board, were scheduled to be installed on April 17th. The No Parking signs for Excitement Drive, was discussed at the last meeting. Hopefully the signs would be installed in within the next 30 days. Regarding the fountain that was approved by the Board, they were waiting on an executed copy from UCC Group and once received, there would be coordination with the various entities, especially those at the resort that use the linear park for special events. Graham at UCC Group, was hopeful that the District would get that signed agreement back. The Spine Road bridge was discussed. Mr. Scheerer met with Mr. Jack Lott, Director of Traffic Operations Manager for Osceola County, as the county requested a site visit for all traffic control measures at Reunion. He drove around the property with Mr. Lott, to ensure that all of the signage was up to date and to ensure they had the proper signage. Mr. Lott did say that the signage in the traffic circle was outdated and would provide a new Sign Plan. Mr. Scheerer also had a subsequent meeting with Fausnight Stripe & Line (Fausnight), the same day, to inform them that the signs would be coming. The biggest issue was the striping, but good news from Mr. Curly, was if they get the Pavement Management Plan going, all of the traffic markings in the roadway was the only thing that they needed to replace, but they would get that resolved. Everything would be handled in-house, as quickly as possible, to ensure that they were up to speed and the county was happy with the work,

because Mr. Lott would come back. Once he provided a Deficiency List, the county would verify that those deficiencies have been corrected.

D. District Manager's Report**i. Action Items List**

Mr. Scheerer presented the Action Items List, which was included in the agenda package and reported on the following:

1. Access to Reunion Village/Davenport Creek Bridge: Discussed.
2. Pavement Management & Traffic Calming: Discussed.
3. Seven Eagles Fountain Replacement: The Board approved the proposal in March of 2024 for the fountain refurbishment at Fountain #1 and the agreement was in progress. The garden re-design for Fountain #2 was approved and the agreement was being prepared.
4. RFID & Transponder at Reunion Village Gate: It was approved, but they were waiting for internet at the guardhouse at Reunion Village. The RFID/prox card reader was installed. The transponder reader was also installed, but the dataline needed troubleshooting. It was pending the legal work to verify ownership of the guardhouse.
5. Determine Best Use of The Stables Parcel: The appraisal was in process.
6. Seven Eagles Fitness Center Mats: Proposals were not yet received.
7. Bid Amenity Janitorial: Proposals to be reviewed at a future meeting.

Mr. Dryburgh reported that a number of women mentioned that the Women's Room at the Seven Eagles pool needed some attention as doors were hanging off. Mr. Scheerer pointed out that there was a missing door and on the Capital Projects List, there was a proposal that the Board approved to install new metal partitions. However, it would take six to eight weeks, before those come in. The current partitions were laminate based and corrugated wood, which were there for a long time. One door totally collapsed. Mr. Dryburgh wanted this to be on the record. Mr. Scheerer pointed out that two doors were coming. Hopefully they selected the right color and everyone would be happy. Mr. Dryburgh stated as long as staff was taking action, he was satisfied. There was some inclement weather today. Yellowstone would be onsite tomorrow to clean up the property. The Board thanked Mr. Scheerer for doing a great job.

**Reunion East CDD
Regular Meeting**

**April 11, 2024
Page 15 of 16**

ii. Approval of Check Register

Ms. Adams presented the Check Register from March 1, 2024 through March 31, 2024 in the amount of \$330,256.16, which was included in the agenda package. Mr. Greenstein pointed out this was routine.

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

iii. Balance Sheet and Income Statement

Ms. Adams presented the Unaudited Financial Statements through February 29, 2024, which was included in the agenda package and were for informational purposes. No Board action was required and there were no issues to pointed out, as the District was earning good interest.

iv. Replacement and Maintenance Plan

Ms. Adams presented the R&M Plan, which was included in the agenda package and were for informational purposes. The Field Manager already discussed several of the projects that were in process, such as the Seven Eagles restroom partitions, tree trimming and signage. Mr. Scheerer reported that he was working with a vendor on the replacement of some of the aged cardio equipment, as well as flooring for the Seven Eagles Center, which they were hoping to complete this fiscal year. Ms. Wispelwey asked if staff thought about using the Reunion equipment that was in the basement, as it would not be used for years. Mr. Greenstein stated this was a great idea, as this was the equipment that they removed from The Traditions Gym. *There was Board consensus for the Field Manager to work with the Club Manager on utilizing fitness equipment from The Traditions Gym for the Seven Eagles Gym.*

V. Security Report

Mr. Vargas provided the March Security Reports for the Reunion West POA and the Master Association, under separate cover. They were getting ready for an influx of guests for the Passover holiday. Ms. Wispelwey noticed Reunion Security around more but was concerned about some of the things that took place in Reunion and felt that security needed to be around more. Mr. Vargas admitted that they were busy. Last Monday, there was a burglary in the west side, which the Sheriff's Office was investigating. A detective was assigned to the case and someone was

**Reunion East CDD
Regular Meeting**

**April 11, 2024
Page 16 of 16**

arrested on Thursday. It turned out to be a pool cleaning contractor who was working for private owners inside of the community. Ms. Wispelwey pointed out that contractors could come into the community easily. Mr. Greenstein questioned how many incidents this pool contractor was responsible for. Mr. Vargas indicated that it was just that house. Mr. Greenstein stated the contractor was just getting started and was happy that they were arrested, so they caused no further burglaries. Mr. Vargas heard from the detective that the pool contractor noticed the security presence and was scared, but it was a crime of opportunity, because the resident’s sliding door was unlocked. Ms. Adams reminded property owners to safeguard their private property and lock their doors.

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 – May 9, 2024

Ms. Adams stated that the next meeting was scheduled for May 9, 2024 at 11:00 a.m.

THIRTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Adjournment

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

DocuSigned by:
Tricia Adams
3F3E5FA5C67E43B...

Secretary/Assistant Secretary

DocuSigned by:
[Signature]
6540F4ED6BA8409...

Chairman/Vice Chairman