

**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, **May 9, 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	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
Graham Staley	Reunion East CDD Board Member
Residents	

*The following is a summary of the discussions and actions taken at the May 9, 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 1:10 p.m. and called the roll. All Supervisors were present.

**SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Public Comment Period**

There being no comments, the next item followed.

**THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS****Approval of the Minutes of the April 11  
2024 Board of Supervisors Meeting**

Ms. Adams presented the minutes of the April 11, 2024 Board of Supervisors meeting, a draft of which were included in the agenda package. Corrections were received from Supervisor Greenstein on Page 9 of 16, clarifying the language in the motion for the Chairman to provide a counteroffer for the easement access and correcting a dollar amount on Page 4.

On MOTION by Mr. Goldstein seconded by Mr. Dryburgh with all in favor the Minutes of the April 11, 2024 Board of Supervisors Meetings were approved as amended.

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

Ms. Adams received a request from the developer of The Crescent at Reunion, to install signage, which was included in the agenda package, along with the proposed signage locations, verbiage, layout and design of the sign. District Counsel reviewed the signage and was concerned that it could be construed as commercial. There was a recommendation from the Reunion West CDD Board to simplify the signage, to include the logo, address and directional arrows, in order to conform to other signage that had been approved for CDD right-of-way (ROW), including the white posts with the end caps, an arch across the top and inclusion of the Reunion logo. The Reunion West CDD Board deferred this item, as a revision would be provided at the next meeting for Board consideration and Ms. Adams questioned whether this CDD Board wanted to do the same. There was Board consensus to defer this item.

**FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS****Consideration of Resolution 2024-04  
Relating to the 2024 General Election and  
Qualifying Period Procedure**

Ms. Adams presented Resolution 2024-04, memorializing a General Election in November of 2024 for Seat 2, currently held by Mr. Steve Goldstein and Seat 4, currently held by Mr. John Dryburgh. The CDD was required by Statute to announce on the record, the qualifying period, which was from Noon on June 10, 2024 through Noon on June 14, 2024, which was stated on Exhibit A attached to the resolution. There was also contact information for the Osceola County Supervisor of Elections office, who would facilitate the election and could answer any questions

**Reunion East CDD  
Regular Meeting****May 9 2024  
Page 3 of 14**

regarding qualifying for the election. In order to qualify, the individual must be at least 18 years old, a citizen of the United States and State of Florida, registered to vote in Osceola County and reside within the Reunion East CDD boundaries. Ms. Adams recalled at the Reunion West CDD meeting, Board Members considered a similar resolution and at that time, directed staff to send out a message via electronic mail, notifying residents of the Reunion West CDD, which seats would be up for election at the General Election, the qualifying period, and declarations from the two Board Members, whose seats were up for election, of their intention to qualify. The notice was subject to final approval by District Counsel. Mr. Dryburgh asked if they ever did this before and if not, why they were doing it now. Ms. Adams confirmed it was never done before, as it was not required by Florida Statutes, but it was being considered for continuity between Reunion East and Reunion West. Reunion West was doing it in the spirit of communication and transparency, in order to be as informative as possible. Mr. Goldstein and Mr. Dryburgh had no issue declaring on the record about their intention to run and both declared their intention to run. Mr. Greenstein felt that it was the right thing to do, as they were one community and there was one process. Mr. Goldstein questioned why they were spending money to do something that they were not required to do. Mr. Greenstein pointed out that there was no cost to do so, as it was sent out by e-blast. *There was Board consensus for staff to send out a parallel announcement to what Reunion West CDD did, notifying stakeholders about the upcoming election and qualification period.*

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein seconded by Ms. Hobbs with all in favor Resolution 2024-04 Relating to the 2024 General Election and Qualifying Procedure was approved.

**SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS****Consideration of Resolution 2024-05  
Approving Entering into a Contract with  
All County Paving Inc. to Provide Paving  
and Related Services**

Ms. Trucco presented Resolution 2024-05, Approving Entering into a Contract with All County Paving Inc. (All County), to provide paving and related services, which was included in the agenda package. This related to the public bidding process under Chapter 190, that the CDD was required to follow for certain contracts that exceeded \$195,000. There was a Request for a Proposal (RFP), for the roadways that Mr. Curley and Mr. Goldstein were working on. The Board was advised at the last Board meeting, that no responsive bids were received, in response to the

**Reunion East CDD  
Regular Meeting****May 9 2024  
Page 4 of 14**

RFP. As a result, Ms. Trucco reviewed the CDD's adopted Rules of Procedure, which state that the Board was permitted to take whatever steps were reasonably necessary, in order to proceed with the procurement of a service contract, if no responsive bids were received through the public bidding process, which occurred here. Therefore, the District was not required, at this time, to piggyback off of another contract with a government agency, even though there was an option to do so. The purpose of this resolution was to allow the CDD to enter into a contract with All County Paving, which Mr. Curley was working with, under the original plan to piggyback off of their contract. The Reunion West CDD Board received the same resolution and tabled it until they were able to obtain additional details regarding speed tables.

Mr. Curley indicated that the Maintenance of Traffic (MOT) amount in the proposal was high, in order to keep everything organized within the community and provide the least amount of disruption as possible within the community, by providing additional flaggers to direct traffic. It was high, but this was what needed to happen. The unit price for asphalt and milling, was close to the engineers estimate of \$18 per linear foot, which was the majority of the cost. The pavement marking cost did increase, since it was for a double yellow line and thermoplastic. At first, they were just going to paint it, but there must also be thermoplastic to maintain traffic through that area. The cost for speed tables was \$9,800 each. Ms. Adams recalled that the Reunion West CDD Board requested that the District Engineer provide a detailed exhibit in the next agenda package, including locations for each speed table. Ms. Wispelwey pointed out there were several locations that were optional and for a cost of almost \$10,000, they may not need any speed tables. Mr. Goldstein questioned the type of speed table for \$9,800. Mr. Curley confirmed that it was an asphalt speed table that would be built into the road. Mr. Goldstein suggested installing screwed down speed tables. Mr. Scheerer pointed out that using bolts on the road would compromise the integrity of the asphalt, which would require patching at some point.

Mr. Goldstein respected Mr. Scheerer's opinion but felt that there needed to be further discussion before they spent money on speed tables. Ms. Adams pointed out this was the reason that the Reunion West CDD Board preferred to have a detailed discussion regarding the speed tables, because they were completely optional. Another item that the Reunion West CDD Board discussed was not having speed tables at the golf cart crossings and only at locations where there was the buildup of speed. Mr. Goldstein felt this made sense. Mr. Dryburgh asked if they could have speed tables on both sides of Reunion Boulevard, one concrete and the other bolted. Ms.

**Reunion East CDD  
Regular Meeting****May 9 2024  
Page 5 of 14**

Adams confirmed that this was not a recommendation from staff, as far as the integrity of the roadway; however, it was always an option, if the Board decided not to put in speed tables as part of the pavement maintenance work and consider it at a future time. The Board wanted to know the cost difference, locations, how often they would need to be replaced and the length. Mr. Scheerer anticipated the speed tables lasting a few years and would go from one edge of the asphalt to the other, give or take a few inches. Mr. Goldstein requested a ballpark number before the Board made a decision. Mr. Curley offered to go back to All County Paving and obtaining a better price. Mr. Greenstein questioned why other contractors did not submit bids. Mr. Curley explained that it was due to the location and the size of the contract.

Ms. Wispelwey questioned the amount budgeted for this project. Ms. Adams confirmed that the estimated amount for pavement management and traffic calming was \$500,000 for the fiscal year, but the proposed amount was \$903,086.71, which was the Reunion East portion. The Reunion West portion with all of the speed tables, was \$235,838. The proposals were higher than what was anticipated last year, when a placeholder was included in the budget, but there was some scope escalation with additional pavement markings and traffic calming. However, the District had funding available to proceed. Ms. Wispelwey felt that the Board should be doing their due diligence and questioned whether the proposal included paver work, as there were some locations where the pavers degraded over time. Mr. Scheerer confirmed that there were pavers at the crosswalks on Spine Road, on Grand Traverse Parkway and on Gathering Drive, but it was not included in the proposal. Mr. Greenstein pointed out that it must be separately contracted for but recalled an immediate paver repair at Spine Road and Tradition Boulevard. Mr. Scheerer noted they were repaired as needed. This item was deferred to the June meeting and Mr. Curley would include a negotiated proposal and exhibits identifying each section and speed table locations. Ms. Wispelwey requested it prior to the meeting.

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

Ms. Trucco was continuing to work on the Traffic Enforcement Agreement with the Osceola County Sheriff's Department (OCSD), regarding some of the terms and provided a draft to the OCSD. It was made clear to them that staff had no authority to approve the agreement, on behalf of the CDD and it must come back to the Board for their review and approval. Mr. Goldstein requested a copy of what was sent to OCSD. Ms. Trucco explained that someone was issued a

**Reunion East CDD  
Regular Meeting****May 9 2024  
Page 6 of 14**

ticket and complained about it, because the roads were owned by the CDD and there were other issues where people called the Sheriff's Department and were informed that they did not have traffic enforcement ability within the jurisdiction of the CDD, because the roads were mistakenly thought to be private. At one point, staff thought that there was a communication issue with the Sheriff's Department and there were multiple efforts to try to talk to them and make them understand that these were public roadways owned by the CDD within both Reunion West and East. In addition, there were Federal Laws, stating that if the CDD, as a government, were issuing tax exempt bonds and financing properties such as the roadways, they could not restrict the public from using it. As a result, this influenced the Board to direct staff to enter into the Traffic Enforcement Agreement with the Sheriff's Department, because they said that they would not provide those services, if that agreement wasn't entered into.

Mr. Goldstein pointed out that the Board never intended for there to be an agreement and wanted to find out why the Sheriff's Department was not doing their job, as residents pay taxes and their roads were public. Ms. Trucco explained in their initial conversations with the Sheriff's Department, because the county did not own the roadways, they cited a Statute in Florida Law, whereby an agreement could be entered into between the county, the Sheriff's Department and the Special District, meaning the CDD, in order for traffic enforcement services to be provided. Therefore, they required an agreement, in order to provide these services. Ms. Wispelwey questioned why this CDD was the first CDD to do this. Ms. Adams confirmed that this was not the first CDD in the State of Florida to do this, as three other Districts that she managed, recently required a Traffic Enforcement Agreement. The CDD had the same limited powers with or without the agreement, but having a Traffic Enforcement Agreement memorialized traffic enforcement powers and helped the law enforcement team feel more comfortable. Mr. Dryburgh was frustrated that every time they heard something from the police, they had another reason why they could not finalize the Traffic Enforcement Agreement and questioned what major objections they had. Mr. Dryburgh asked if the CDD could provide them with a letter granting them access to provide enforcement and issue tickets versus having this agreement. Ms. Trucco understood that OCSD would not provide any services unless the Traffic Enforcement Agreement was entered into.

Mr. Goldstein asked if the Board was able to specify what they were going to enforce. Ms. Trucco confirmed that it was for traffic enforcement, because the CDD did not have police powers. The Law only gives the CDD the right to adopt Parking and Towing Rules, which the CDD

**Reunion East CDD  
Regular Meeting****May 9 2024  
Page 7 of 14**

adopted, but did not have the authority to stop someone driving under the influence or speeding. Ms. Adams recalled that a Lieutenant from OCSD, attended a CDD meeting, at the request of the Board and ultimately the Sheriff's Office stated that they preferred to have an agreement. Mr. Dryburgh believed that until they had an agreement, requiring them to come into the community to provide enforcement, OCSD would ignore them. Mr. Greenstein pointed out that the CDD operated for 15 years with nothing in writing and over the years, they had some flagrant violations of speeding. However, innocent people got ticketed and not the major violators. The CDD was in a unique situation, because it was a Special District and not an unincorporated county, which was why OCSD required an agreement. Mr. Goldstein suggested finding out why Margaritaville was forced to open their gates. Ms. Adams explained that the Margaritaville gates were managed by an association and the logistics evolved.

Ms. Hobbs pointed out whether or not they had this agreement, the police could request the guards to open the gate. Ms. Adams explained that it did not change the powers that the CDD had, nor the powers of the OCSD and only memorialized the language in the Florida Statutes that OCSD could patrol and enforce traffic on public roadways, including roadways that were maintained by the Reunion East and West CDDs. Ms. Wispelwey felt that the CDD was not high on OCSD's priority list and this was a complicated issue that the Board needed to discuss, as there was already pushback from people living in the community, who were concerned that it would impact their rental properties and their ability to drive golf carts. Mr. Goldstein agreed, as people who had golf carts, that were not street legal, would be upset. Mr. Greenstein noted they were operating in a controlled, safe, comfortable manner, until OCSD asked for this agreement. Mr. Greenstein suggested it be considered a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). Ms. Trucco clarified her statement that this agreement was needed and would confirm with OCSD, that they would not provide traffic enforcement services without this agreement. Ms. Wispelwey questioned whether OCSD would actually provide enforcement, because they were told that they did not have the staff. Mr. Greenstein believed that they were doing this as a way to support their staffing levels. Ms. Trucco recalled that there were also a liability and indemnification issues, for the CDD being responsible for the signage and re-paving.

As a first step, Ms. Trucco wanted to clarify with OCSD whether without this agreement, they would not provide traffic enforcement services. As far as golf carts on roads owned by the CDD, Ms. Trucco advised that the CDD did not have the authority to decide whether or not to

**Reunion East CDD  
Regular Meeting****May 9 2024  
Page 8 of 14**

allow it and deferred to the county, as there was a State Statute whereby county or municipalities must designate the roads permissible for golf cart use. Mr. Greenstein asked if golf carts were included in the Traffic Enforcement Agreement. Ms. Trucco confirmed it was not included and Mr. Greenstein requested that it not be in there, as the Board could decide when to call in for police enforcement to monitor traffic; however, it would not just be for traffic enforcement, which would expose the CDD to other issues. Ms. Adams explained that what was reported by the Sheriff's Office on the record, was that they prioritize traffic enforcement based on accident and crash reports; however, CDDs did not have a high volume of accident or crash reports. However, there was an ability to engage law enforcement for enhanced traffic enforcement, but this was not the purpose of this agreement, as the purpose was for the Sheriff's Office to be in agreement that these were public roads and they had law enforcement powers, including traffic enforcement. Mr. Goldstein was concerned because the last version of the agreement that he reviewed, stated that it enforced all Florida Laws, including golf carts. Mr. Dryburgh recommended postponing this matter until the Board reviewed the Traffic Enforcement Agreement. *There was Board consensus for District Counsel to provide a draft of the agreement to the Board as soon as possible and confirm with OCSD whether they would provide traffic enforcement services without the agreement.* Ms. Trucco reported that the Inventory Review Project was proceeding and requested a motion to allow staff to perform legal research on some related issues.

On MOTION by Mr. Dryburgh seconded by Ms. Wispelwey with all in favor authorization for staff to provide additional legal research on the Inventory Review Project was approved.

**B. Engineer**

Ms. Adams asked if Mr. Curley had anything to report, such as updates regarding the Davenport Creek Bridge Project. Mr. Curley confirmed that it was still in permitting.

**C. Field Manager Updates**

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: Still in permitting.
2. Pavement Management & Traffic Calming: Discussed.



**Reunion East CDD  
Regular Meeting**

**May 9 2024  
Page 9 of 14**

3. Seven Eagles Fountain Replacement: UCC Group was working on the design for the proposal approved by the Board at a prior meeting. He was trying to obtain a construction schedule and once received, would provide it to the Board.
4. RFID & Transponder at Reunion Village Gate: Waiting for the ownership issue of the guardhouse to be resolved, in order to apply for a permanent address of the gatehouse. Then the internet could be installed.
5. Seven Eagles Fitness Center Mats: There was a change with the salesperson. A proposal would be provided to the Board at a later date for up-to-date fitness equipment. There was a request for a bicep/triceps machine and leg press. *Ms. Wispelwey asked if Mr. Scheerer spoke to Kingwood about using the Reunion equipment that was in the basement.* Mr. Scheerer confirmed that he spoke to Kingwood, but they had plans for it.
6. Heritage Crossing Pool B Renovation: Completed. The roof project at the Homestead pool house was starting on May 20<sup>th</sup>. There would be a temporary closure at the entrance, while the roof tiles were stripped and once that was completed, the pool would be re-open. A pre-construction meeting was scheduled next week with Advantage Roofing to discuss the timeline. Once Homestead was completed, they would proceed to the Heritage A and B pools.
7. Reunion Village Signs: Delivered. They would be installed and then Mr. Vargas could perform parking enforcement for Phases 1 through 3 in Reunion Village. The signs approved for Excitement Drive were being powder coated and once completed, they would be installed.

Ms. Adams reported that Ms. Hobbs accompanied Mr. Mike Barry from the Reunion West CDD Board, to meet with Mr. Carll, a representative of Kingwood Orlando Reunion Resort (KORR), the HOA Master association and the Preferred Builder Program, to get feedback regarding the potential of the CDD undertaking the installation of sidewalks. Ms. Hobbs reported that Mr. Carll was supportive of the concept of the CDD installing sidewalks on main roads, such as Excitement Drive and Gathering Drive, but not the smaller inner roads. In addition, if a builder was building on the lot, the builder would be required to repair or replace the sidewalk, if they damaged it. Ms. Wispelwey voiced concern that they were talking about installing sod on either side, but there would be no irrigation system to water it. Mr. Goldstein pointed out that Bahia did

**Reunion East CDD  
Regular Meeting****May 9 2024  
Page 10 of 14**

not require water and would be better than dirt to hold the sidewalk in. Mr. Dryburgh had an issue with Mr. Carll only wanting sidewalks on selected streets, because the basis for installing sidewalks, was for people who used wheelchairs. Mr. Greenstein thanked Ms. Hobbs for participating in this project and reporting on it, as it was similar to what Mr. Barry reported at the Reunion West CDD meeting. The comment regarding underdeveloped areas or less densely populated areas, pertained more to the west side and the plan was to identify the lots that made the most sense to install a sidewalk, like on Gathering Drive, where there were six vacant lots, versus along Grand Traverse Parkway on the west side, that had large parcels of undeveloped property. Mr. Greenstein was appreciative that Ms. Hobbs and Mr. Barry were able to get Kingwood to buy into the concept and pointed out that the next step was for the Board to identify the locations.

Ms. Trucco explained that this was part of the inventory discussion, which they would take a closer look at, but as an administrative step, there was no issue with identifying the lots that the Board was interested in installing sidewalks. There was discussion about the cost, but once the lots were identified, they would be better able to determine which stakeholders to reach out to, in order to ensure that the construction of the sidewalk did not interfere with an agreement that existed. Mr. Goldstein offered to identify the lots. Ms. Adams recalled that Reunion West CDD Board authorized Mr. Barry to continue working with Ms. Hobbs, but the Board could designate any Supervisor they chose. Mr. Goldstein preferred that Mr. Barry and Ms. Hobbs handle it. Mr. Dryburgh recalled that there was an agreement with the Preferred Builders. Ms. Adams stated that Mr. Carll had suggested including language in the agreement with the builders, when it was renewed in November, reflecting that the builders would be responsible for any damages to the sidewalks. Other points that were discussed by the Reunion West CDD Board, was including a placeholder on Replacement and Maintenance (R&M) Project List for Fiscal Year 2025. Ms. Wispelwey asked if they were going to enforce some of the other requirements, such as installing sidewalks on lots on the east side that had no sidewalks, as property owners developed recreational activity, such as a pool or pavers, on land that they owned. Mr. Greenstein pointed out that it would be a special situation, that may get shifted from the CDD's responsibility to the property owner and should be discussed with the Master Association. Ms. Trucco advised that the CDD did not have jurisdiction over private property. Ms. Wispelwey felt that the Master Association should require the property owners to install the sidewalk. Ms. Trucco stated it would be helpful to identify those lots. Mr. Goldstein would provide a list.

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

This item was discussed.

**ii. Approval of Check Register**

Ms. Adams presented the Check Register from April 1, 2024 through April 30, 2024 in the amount of \$570,978.13, which was included in the agenda package, along with a detailed register.

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

**iii. Balance Sheet and Income Statement**

Ms. Adams presented the Unaudited Financial Statements through March 31, 2024, which was included in the agenda package. It was for informational purposes and no Board action was required. Mr. Dryburgh voiced concern about the CDD being a target for fraud, as there was money sitting in various banks and someone who was sophisticated enough, would figure out how to access those funds. Ms. Adams explained that CDDs were required to deposit funds with a public depository that had statutory protections, which was different than FDIC insurance. The vulnerability for fraud was with check theft and additional safeguards were put into place for positive pay fraud protection services, so that checks presented had an additional approval step. In addition, GMS accounting and the accounts payable team, made some changes to the way that checks were mailed to vendors, so they were not subject to mail theft. Mr. Dryburgh was concerned about people accessing accounts electronically and asked if the institutions that held the funds, were insured, should theft occur. Ms. Adams confirmed that public depository accounts had additional safeguards as required by Florida Statutes for Florida governments, a stronger guarantee than FDIC. Ms. Trucco stated there were protections and would research this matter further and bring it back to the Board.

**iv. Replacement and Maintenance Plan**

Ms. Adams presented the R&M Plan, which was included in the agenda package and were for informational purposes. It was a Project List, that was approved by the Board in conjunction with the current budget. The Field Manager provided an update regarding the fitness equipment

**Reunion East CDD  
Regular Meeting****May 9 2024  
Page 12 of 14**

and all of the other items were either marked in process or completed. Mr. Greenstein asked if it would be updated with the Fiscal Year 2025 budget. Ms. Adams explained that when the Proposed Budget for Fiscal Year 2025 was reviewed, it would include spending projections for the R&M Fund.

**v. Presentation of Number of Registered Voters: 709**

Ms. Adams stated that the District was required to present each year on the record, the number of registered voters. A letter was provided by the Osceola County Supervisor of Elections, confirming as of April 15, 2024, the Reunion East CDD had 709 registered voters. No Board action was required. Mr. Dryburgh asked if it was fairly consistent with last year's number. Ms. Adams confirmed that last year, there were 718 registered voters, for a loss of nine voters. Mr. Greenstein recalled on the west side they lost 12 voters.

**V. Security Report**

Mr. Vargas provided the April Security Reports from Reunion Security, representing all areas of the Master Association regarding security matters. A report was also provided from the Reunion West POA for the Encore neighborhood.

Mr. Goldstein spoke with Mr. Vargas about the guards at all of the different gates, as his concern was that the guards were not acknowledging residents and guests, opening the gate, not looking up from their computer screens or requesting ID. The CDD was paying for the guards to greet people, open and close the gates and check IDs. Disney guards would never be sitting down at a guard gate. They were always standing and greeting people. However, there was one guard, when Mr. Goldstein entered the community on a Saturday night, that stood up and greeted him and requested that this guard train the other guards. They should either be paying for security and getting security at those gates or leave the gates open. Ms. Wispelwey agreed, as many times she did not see a guard at the Sinclair Gate, when driving through the gate at 7:40 a.m. Mr. Vargas felt that he had a great team and as soon as he was notified that a guard was not doing their job, they were put on notice. Mr. Goldstein pointed out this morning, when he drove through the gate, the guard never stood up. Mr. Vargas stated it should be reported to him. Mr. Goldstein felt that he should not have to do that. Mr. Dryburgh walked to the guardhouse two or three times a week for exercise and at least two-thirds of the time, the guard was on their phone and when someone

**Reunion East CDD  
Regular Meeting****May 9 2024  
Page 13 of 14**

showed up, they opened the gate. Mr. Vargas pointed out that most of the vehicles had decals that opened the gate. Mr. Goldstein noted that the gates on Spine Road were wide open, the other day.

Mr. Vargas advised that there were gate issues in the last couple of weeks, due to an upgrade to the system; however, anytime there was an issue, he handled it. Mr. Goldstein estimated that 50% of the time that he comes through the gates, the guards were not doing their jobs. Mr. Vargas requested that any issues be reported to him and not the guards. Mr. Dryburgh questioned what the computer on their desk was used for. Mr. Vargas stated it was used to process vehicles. Mr. Dryburgh asked if they had access to the internet. Mr. Vargas confirmed that there was no access to the internet. Mr. Dryburgh noted that was a good decision; however, the building that was hit by a truck unloading equipment for an event, needed to be repaired. Mr. Vargas was contacting the owner of the truck to get them to pay for the repairs. Mr. Scheerer explained that it would go through the insurance of the truck driver. Anytime that they had an accident, security was diligent in providing an accurate report with Driver's License numbers and insurance cards and their vendor was immediately contacted in order to make repairs. When it was repaired, the invoice was sent to their insurance company. Mr. Scheerer felt that Mr. Vargas' team did a great job on their incident reports and never had a problem recovering money for repairs. The clearance bar sign was immediately repaired. It was 10 feet high, but the clearance bar was at 9 feet for a reason. Mr. Goldstein agreed that Mr. Vargas' team did a great job with the resort, overall and his only issue was with the guards at the entrance gates.

**EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS****Other Business**

There being no comments, the next item followed.

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

There being no comments, the next item followed.

**TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS****Next Meeting Date – June 13, 2024**

Ms. Adams announced that the next meeting was scheduled for June 13, 2024 at 11:00 a.m. and questioned whether there would be a quorum, as the Proposed Budget would be presented. The Board confirmed that there would be a quorum.

**Reunion East CDD  
Regular Meeting**

**May 9 2024  
Page 14 of 14**

**ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Adjournment**

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

DocuSigned by:  
*Tricia Adams*  
3F3E5FA5C67E43B...

Secretary/Assistant Secretary

DocuSigned by:  
*[Signature]*  
6540F4ED6DA8409...

Chairman/Vice Chairman