# 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, **August 15, 2024** at 2:00 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 Trudy Hobbs Vice Chair

John DryburghAssistant SecretaryJune WispelweyAssistant SecretaryDiane DavisAssistant Secretary

## Also present were:

Tricia Adams District Manager
Kristen Trucco District Counsel
James Curley District Engineer
Alan Scheerer Field Manager

Pete Whitman Yellowstone Landscape

Zory Ramos Reunion Security

Residents

The following is a summary of the discussions and actions taken at the August 15, 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 2:03 p.m. and called the roll. All Supervisors were present.

#### SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS Public Comment Period

Ms. Adams opened the public comment period. Resident Steve Goldstein of 1532 Euston Drive requested speed tables on Euston Drive, as people were cutting through to go out the back

Reunion East CDD

Regular Meeting

August 15, 2024

Page 2 of 14

gate, versus going around the circle on Excitement Drive. In 30 minutes, there were 45 cars, cutting through in the middle of the day, driving 40 miles-per-hour (MPH), which Mr. Scheerer witnessed. Resident Jill Mulhere of 1211 Radiant Street agreed and requested speed tables on Radiant Street. There being no further comments, Ms. Adams closed the public comment period.

#### THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS

# Approval of the Minutes of the July 11, 2024 Board of Supervisors Meeting

Ms. Adams presented the minutes of the July 11, 2024 Board of Supervisors meeting, a draft of which were included in the agenda package. Minor corrections were received from Ms. Wispelwey and Mr. Greenstein prior to the meeting, which would be incorporated.

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein seconded by Ms. Hobbs with all in favor the Minutes of the July 11, 2024 Board of Supervisors Meetings were approved as amended.

#### FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

**Public Hearing** 

On MOTION by Mr. Dryburgh seconded by Ms. Hobbs with all in favor the public hearing on the adoption of the Fiscal Year 2025 budget and imposition of special assessments was opened.

There were no public comments.

On MOTION by Mr. Dryburgh seconded by Mr. Greenstein with all in favor the public hearing on the adoption of the Fiscal Year 2025 budget and imposition of special assessments was closed.

# A. Consideration of Resolution 2024-08 Adopting the Fiscal Year 2025 Budget and Relating to the Annual Appropriations

Ms. Adams presented Resolution 2024-08, Adopting the Fiscal Year (FY) 2025 Budget, starting October 1, 2024 and ending September 30, 2025. The Board was required by Statute, to approve a Proposed Budget by June 15<sup>th</sup> of each calendar year and set a public hearing 60 days from the date that the Proposed Budget was approved. As memorialized in the resolution, the Proposed Budget was provided to the local government, posted on the District's website, in

advance of today's public hearing and the public hearing had been set and noticed in accordance with Florida Statutes. The resolution also identified appropriations for the General and Debt Service Funds and provided a provision in case the budget needed to be amended for FY 2025. Attached to the Resolution as Exhibit A, was the Proposed Budget for 2025. There was a substantive change to the budget related to the operation of the Heritage Crossings Community Center (HCCC), as the Board recently received a termination letter from Kingwood Orlando Reunion Resort (KORR), terminating the Management Services Agreement (MSA) for the HCCC and The Stables by October 1<sup>st</sup>. As a result, the CDD would be directly managing the HCCC and The Stables, which impacted the budget. Ms. Adams highlighted the following regarding the FY 2025 budget:

- The budget was updated with financials, as of the end of June 30<sup>th</sup>.
- All property was platted and were now be billed on the Osceola County property
  Tax Bill.
- There was no proposed assessment increase, due to *Revenues* of \$3,118,035, *Interest* of \$24,000, *Rental Income* of \$6,000 and *Carry Forward Surplus* of \$1,079,183, due to the Board controlling expenses and spending under budget.
- For *Administrative Expenditures*, the amount proposed for FY 2025 was \$219,912.

Mr. Dryburgh questioned whether *Attorney* should be increased, due to the increase in activity for this year and next year. Ms. Trucco felt that \$60,000 was sufficient through this fiscal year. Ms. Adams pointed out that the *Transfer Out – R&M Fund* could be reduced to increase *Attorney*, in order to balance the budget without increasing assessments. Discussion ensued and there was Board consensus to increase Attorney's Fees to \$75,000.

- The shared costs between the two Districts, increased slightly for Reunion East, because of additional units that were platted. For FY 2025, the Reunion East CDD was responsible for 57% and the Reunion West CDD was responsible for 43% of the shared costs. The increases in proposed costs were due to increases in utility services and as a result of feedback from the Board and the CDD taking over the operations of HCCC.
- The Board approved \$9,100 for *Management Services Agreement*, but the CDD would no longer be paying this amount and it was zeroed out. A new section was added to the budget for the HCCC, based on historical information, from the CDD

operating the HCCC in the past and KORR providing 12 months of recent utility bills for electric, water and sewer, gas, trash services, cleaning, pest control, operating supplies and Repairs & Maintenance (R&M). A proposal was provided by Yellowstone for landscape maintenance at HCCC and The Stables. The total amount of this line item was \$100,403.

Ms. Wispelwey questioned what trash services would be provided. Ms. Adams stated that there was a dumpster, which the District was not required to have. There was a working list of transition items that she and Mr. Scheerer were working through and this item would be included, for the Board to discuss whether or not to continue trash services. Mr. Dryburgh felt that the Board should look at whether a dumpster was needed at HCCC and The Stables. Ms. Adams pointed out that the CDD did not pay for The Stables dumpster, but there was a License Agreement with the Master Association, which the Board could revoke. Ms. Wispelwey suggested asking Heritage Crossing HOA if they were interested in the dumpster. Ms. Adams would contact them and if they were interested, there could be a License Agreement.

- According to the Gross Per Unit Assessment Chart, the District had revenues from having commercial, hotel/condo, multi-family, single-family and golf units assessments. There was no proposed change in the gross amount per unit for FY 2025, but the number of units increased.
- For the R&M Fund, rather than having categories of projects, there were separate R&M Project Lists. The Board reviewed the proposed FY 25 Project List and provided feedback at the July meeting.
- The remainder of the budget was the Debt Service Fund, listing the bonds that were issued, which were Series 2015A and 2021. It included interest and principal payments that were due in November and May, based on Amortization Schedules. The amounts were imposed at the time that the bonds were issued and the Board did not have the ability to change the debt assessment level, but authorized collection.

Mr. Greenstein appreciated Ms. Adams explaining the budget in detail, noting that the District had strong reserves, which allowed the District to undertake large upcoming projects, such as the roadway paving. Ms. Adams pointed out that the Board did an excellent job of controlling expenses.

On MOTION by Ms. Hobbs seconded by Mr. Dryburgh with all in favor Resolution 2024-08 Adopting the Proposed Fiscal Year 2025 Budget as amended, increasing Attorney's Fees to \$75,000 and reducing the Transfer Out in the R&M Fund to balance the budget and Relating to the Annual Appropriations was adopted.

# B. Consideration of Resolution 2024-09 Imposing Special Assessments and Certifying an Assessment Roll

Ms. Adams presented Resolution 2024-09, authorizing the collection of O&M and debt service fees on the Tax Roll, which was the funding mechanism for the budget. Attached to the resolution as exhibits, was the Proposed Budget and Tax Roll. The Tax Roll identified every parcel within the Reunion East CDD and the amounts for O&M and debt service fees, in the non-advalorem section. Mr. Dryburgh pointed out that many residents informed him in the last 30 to 60 days, how excited they were that the bonds would be paid off in the future and they would privatize the roads. However, the CDD could never privatize the roads and the CDD would continue to be responsible for maintenance and must have a fund set aside for maintenance. Ms. Adams confirmed that the roads were owned by the Reunion East CDD and they were required to have public roadways.

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein seconded by Ms. Wispelwey with all in favor Resolution 2023-09 Imposing Special Assessments and Certifying an Assessment Roll was adopted.

# FIFTH 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. Adams reported that the Board had this item on several agenda, but had not yet adopted the resolution, which authorized District Counsel to prepare the form of agreement with All County Paving Inc. (All County). Attached to the resolution, was the Road Resurfacing Project Bid Form, which included the detailed scope. At last month's meeting, the Chairman recommended having a field evaluation of the proposed speed table locations and as a result, the Board directed the District Engineer and Field Manager to mark these locations, so that Board Members could review them and provide feedback to the District Engineer. Mr. Curley noted that changes were made. Mr.

Scheerer indicated that the larger change was in areas where there were drain inlets, so the speed tables were moved in one direction or another. There was also a request for additional speed tables. Ms. Hobbs preferred to have radar signs on the roads where speed tables were requested, to get a better understanding if there was an issue. Mr. Scheerer confirmed that radar signs were on Reunion Boulevard, Excitement Drive by The Terraces, but not on interior roads like Radiant Street and Euston Drive. However, funding was allocated in the FY 2025 budget for new radar signs, and the radar display signs could be relocated at the direction of the Board.

Ms. Davis felt that the speed table placement looked good, especially the water park, but there needed to be re-stripping and felt that three speed tables on Grand Traverse Parkway, was overkill. She was more concerned about Excitement Drive by the straightaway, due to the amount of speeding and drivers cutting the curve and going onto oncoming traffic, before Corolla Court. Ms. Wispelwey preferred moving the speed table down further or having a second one between Corolla Court and Old Lake Wilson Road, which was what they discussed at the last meeting. Ms. Hobbs liked the speed table by the golf cart crossing. Mr. Dryburgh asked if there was a radar sign gathering information on vehicle speeds. Mr. Scheerer confirmed that there was a radar sign coming from Old Lake Wilson Road. However, the last time there was an evaluation, there was not a speeding issue, with the exception of Tradition Boulevard in Reunion West. He offered to pull the data for the radar sign on Excitement Drive by The Terraces and asked if the Board wanted him to relocate the second radar sign to Radiant Street. Mr. Dryburgh recommended obtaining the data now and then coming back to the Board with the information.

Ms. Adams recalled that the initial plan was to look at the segments of roadway that were only scheduled for milling and resurfacing and determine whether speed humps should be installed at that time. However, based on direction from the Board, other areas were identified as priorities for traffic calming, which were the proposed locations on the map. The Board had the option of focusing on the areas that were being milled and resurfaced and waiting five years for the next milling and resurfacing, to address those other areas for traffic calming. But if it was a priority, the Board could direct speed tables to be installed at the same time as the other roadwork. Ms. Wispelwey felt that they were ready now. Mr. Greenstein recalled that he requested that the locations be marked, because Board Members were having difficulty visualizing the locations and believed that installing speed tables independent of a resurfacing should be on the table, because the work could be completed by All County while they were onsite and the cost would be less. Ms.

Adams agreed they would save on mobilization but there is a per unit speed table cost. Mr. Dryburgh questioned what would happen if they installed a speed table and then resurfaced the road five years later. Mr. Curley would find out. Ms. Davis pointed out that both locations for speed tables on Excitement Drive were sinking, due to heavy construction and a tree that was impacting the road. Ms. Adams indicated these were all pavement management issues, but at this time, staff needed direction from the Board on the resolution, scope and whether staff should pursue the agreement. There was Board consensus for Mr. Curley to update the maps, highlighting the areas that were scheduled for milling and resurfacing.

Ms. Adams asked the Board to confirm they wanted additional data on vehicle speeding, what areas were scheduled for milling and resurfacing, and what would happen to a speed table that was installed when a road was milled and resurfaced five years later? Mr. Dryburgh questioned the amount of each speed table. Ms. Adams indicated that each speed table was \$9,800, according to the bid documents. Ms. Davis questioned why there was a speed table on Reunion Boulevard, by the S-curve, as no one was living on either side of the golf course and the preserve. Ms. Wispelwey explained that it was there because it was a straightaway. Mr. Greenstein pointed out that whatever they did not accomplish in this first go around, they would do the second time around. Mr. Dryburgh was in favor of approving the work now, with the understanding that additional information would be provided. Ms. Adams requested that the Board adopt the resolution with the scope and speed table locations as presented and any changes would be considered when there was additional information.

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein seconded by Ms. Davis with all in favor Resolution 2024-05 Approving Entering into a Contract with All County Paving Inc. to Provide Paving and Related Services was adopted.

#### SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

# **Consideration of Sign Installation Request from The Crescent at Reunion**

Ms. Adams reported that a new project was underway at the Reunion East CDD, The Crescent at Reunion and the developer submitted a request for directional signage. Feedback was provided by the Board, to have white posts with the decorative caps, an arched sign, to be consistent with other Reunion signs and have the Reunion palm motif, to create a sense of cohesiveness throughout the community. That feedback, as well as the adopted Reunion East CDD

Sign Policy, was provided to the developer and they submitted a new layout and design, which was included in the agenda package, along with the proposed sign locations. Three of the locations were in the Reunion East CDD. If the Board approved the installation of these signs, a License Agreement would be prepared by District Counsel, whereby the CDD would be providing the land, but the vendor would be responsible for installation, maintenance and indemnifying the District for any adverse impact. The Reunion West CDD Board wanted this CDD Board to move in tandem with the Reunion East CDD and delegated final approval to Mr. Greenstein, knowing that he would be at this meeting. Mr. Greenstein confirmed that the Reunion West CDD Board wanted a joint decision, noting The Resort signage had a green background with white palms and The Crescent had a green palm with a white background. Ms. Adams recalled that both motifs were depicted throughout the District. Mr. Greenstein was in favor of The Crescent signage, as it was temporary. Mr. Dryburgh questioned the number of lots. Ms. Adams would confirm the number of units and provide later in the meeting and requested that any approval be subject to District Counsel preparing the form of agreement with all of the protections for the District. Ms. Trucco asked if the Board wanted the term in the agreement to be two years or have an effective date after they do their walk through. Mr. Dryburgh preferred to have a term. Ms. Trucco would include a two-year term, with a 30-day termination provision.

On MOTION by Ms. Hobbs seconded by Mr. Greenstein with all in favor approving the sign installation request from The Crescent at Reunion as stated above was approved.

#### SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

### **Adoption of District Goals and Objectives**

Ms. Adams recalled at a prior meeting, District Counsel discussed HB 7013, which was passed in the last Legislative session, requiring CDDs to adopt annual goals and objectives by October 1<sup>st</sup> and subsequent reporting requirements in December of 2025, on whether or not the District met those goals and objectives. The District management team reviewed the new law and all of the requirements and provided recommended goals and objectives, in accordance with the new law, which was included in the agenda package. The specifications that the Statutes required were: 1) Community Communication and Engagement, 2) Infrastructure and Facilities Maintenance and 3) Financial Transparency and Accountability. A Reporting Form for those goals and objectives was also provided, and the District management team suggested goals such as

public meetings compliance under Community Communication and Engagement, for at least three regular Board of Supervisor meetings per year. Since this was a new Law that the CDD was required to comply with, the District management team recognized that Districts would not want to create additional expenses, at this time and made the goals and objectives as generic as possible. However, if the Board wanted to come up with other goals, she recommended doing so in FY 2026. Mr. Greenstein recalled that the Reunion West CDD Board made some changes. Ms. Adams indicated instead of holding three regular Board meetings per year, the Reunion West CDD Board changed it to six meetings per year. There was Board consensus to hold six meetings per year. Ms. Adams pointed out the other change was related to the Annual Financial Audit per statutory requirements, under Goal 3.3, to stated that the audit would be in compliance and there were no findings. Ms. Wispelwey was concerned about that change. Mr. Greenstein pointed out that the purpose was to have a realistic goal that had flexibility and not to get a perfect score.

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein seconded by Ms. Davis with all in favor the District's goals and objectives were approved as amended, to hold six Board meetings per year.

**EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS** 

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Ratification of Agreement with Life Fitness, LLC for Exercise Equipment Ratification of Agreement with Advantage Roofing, Inc. for Seven Eagles Railing Ratification of Agreement with Access Control Systems, LLC. for Cloud Services

Ms. Adams presented agreements from Life Fitness, LLC for exercise equipment, from Advantage Roofing for the Seven Eagles railing and from Access Control Systems, LLC. for cloud services, which were included in the agenda package. The proposals for Life Fitness and Advantage Roofing were already approved by the Board, but a form of agreement was not presented at the time that the proposal was approved. The agreement for Access Control Systems was entered into, because the District was required to upgrade the system. Mr. Scheerer explained that several months ago, there was a software change to upgrade from an RS to PDK system, which required a cloud-based hosting system. With this type of system, Mr. Vargas' team could remove and upload information to each gate. For six locations, the monthly cost was \$72, which would be allocated in next year's budget. Mr. Dryburgh pointed out that the gate was still not operating

correctly. Mr. Scheerer confirmed that all of the gates were working as planned, but during the migration of the information, some information had not been transferred, resulting in a transponder not working at one gate, but working at other gates. Emails were sent to homeowners, informing them to contact security if they had an issue with their transponders. Mr. Dryburgh pointed out that his transponder did not work today. Ms. Adams believed that there may have been an overall system issue and was informed by Mr. Greenstein, about a typo on the Guardian Access Solutions proposal, which stated, "Cloud fees for five (6) access points." Ms. Trucco noted a typo in the agreement, which she would correct.

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein seconded by Mr. Dryburgh with all in favor the Agreements with Life Fitness, LLC. for exercise equipment, with Advantage Roofing, Inc. for the Seven Eagles railing and with Access Control Systems, LLC. for cloud services were ratified.

#### **ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

## **Staff Reports**

### A. Attorney

Ms. Trucco reported that other than drafting the agreements that the Board just ratified, the only other item that they were working on since the last Board meeting, was to track down the plat for the Reunion Village guardhouse, in order for GMS to get access control installed. It was taking some time to obtain it, as it needed to be conveyed to the CDD according to the county, which they were requesting from the Master HOA. They were tracking it and would provide an update at the next meeting.

#### B. Engineer

Mr. Curley reported that a proposal was received for the Spine Road gate installation and was meeting next week with Guardian Access System to review everything that they needed and discuss how everything would tie in together. Mr. Greenstein asked if this was the contractor that was completing the directional bore. Mr. Scheerer confirmed that one proposal was for a directional bore and the second quote would have a different scope. They received the mechanical permit but had not heard anything regarding the electrical permit.

### C. Field Manager Updates

Mr. Scheerer reported that the bridge collapsed on Old Lake Wilson Road and thanked the security team for stepping up, as Florida Highway Patrol had to divert traffic from the Spine Road gate. They were directing cars at the intersection of Spine Road and Tradition Boulevard, to go out to Sinclair Road, instead of having them come through all of Reunion. The fountain refurbishment was proceeding. The contractor was onsite today with the blaster, which had baking soda to try to remove any of the grit and grind. They already ran all of the plumbing and were waiting for the electrical and plumbing inspections. The pad was poured and the pumps were placed on them. Staff would continue to monitor it. After the fountain refurbishment was completed, there would be landscaping refurbishments at the Seven Eagles flagpole. Yellowstone was looking at some new ideas for interior landscaping, as there were older Boxwoods, Azaleas and Roses that were starting to fail. Ms. Wispelwey noted that the new landscaping looked good. Mr. Scheerer was working with Ms. Adams on the janitorial bids. A quote was received from Gallagher Construction for the sidewalk project, which was more than anticipated and was a per square foot price, not linear foot price and it was not broken out between the two CDDs. Staff estimated \$354,000 for both Reunion East and West for just the priority sidewalks and Gallagher proposed \$396,000. However, it included grading and sodding. Mr. Scheerer pointed out that staff estimated \$21 per linear foot and Gallagher estimated \$22 per square foot.

Ms. Wispelwey questioned the value of The Stables. Ms. Adams reported that the appraiser reported he was almost ready to circulate a draft. Mr. Greenstein recalled replacing the flooring in the Fitness Center at the same time that the equipment would be replaced, so that they could reconfigure the room and questioned what type of flooring was being installed. Mr. Scheerer indicated it would be rubber felt, which were in most commercial Fitness Centers. Mr. Greenstein questioned what was dented. Mr. Scheerer explained that the vinyl flooring was dented from people dropping 50-pound dumbbells onto it. Only one area was being saw cut out, which was in front of the mirror in the dumbbell section. The price was reasonable from a company that installed flooring in another CDD in Orlando and did a good job. The material was ordered and would be stored when it was delivered. When the fitness equipment was removed, the Gym would be closed for at least 48 hours, in order to remove the existing flooring, glue it, and allow the glue to set. Then everything would be replaced and rearranged accordingly. Mr. Greenstein recalled that the last time the facility was closed, it was for 72 hours. Mr. Scheerer reported that the equipment was ordered and was 8 to 12 weeks out and the installation would be coordinated within a time frame

where there not many people visiting. Ms. Hobbs requested that the HOA send out a notice and post a notice on the Gym. Mr. Scheerer indicated as soon as they had the exact date, signage would be posted at the entry gate to the pool and on the Gym door. Ms. Davis suggested posting a notice in *Out & About*, which was sent to all members. Mr. Greenstein pointed out that every property owner should have an email filed with Artemis, as they had the highest level of communication.

Mr. Dryburgh questioned why there were some unassigned action items, such as the Old Lake Wilson Road Improvement Project. Ms. Adams explained that the links were provided for monitoring purposes, as the Action Items List was available to the public. Ms. Adams pointed out that Osceola County updated their website. Ms. Davis questioned whether the Old Lake Wilson Trail that goes from Excitement Drive, along the golf course to the green, was golf course property. Ms. Wispelwey stated not according to The Resort. Mr. Scheerer asked if it was a golf cart path. Ms. Wispelwey confirmed that it was a walking path. Mr. Greenstein noted it needed to be repaired, as there was broken concrete, which was deteriorating, due to standing water. The golf course made improvements in a number of areas, but not this area, as it was not impacting play. Mr. Scheerer confirmed that this path was owned by KORR, the CDD only owned a small portion by the exit gate and the golf course owned the sidewalk and the cart path.

# D. District Manager's Report

#### i. Action Items List

Ms. Adams presented the Action Items List, which was included in the agenda package. Most of these items were discussed. In response to Mr. Dryburgh's question about the number of units in the Crescent Project, it was reported two years ago, when the project was in the planning stages, there were 102 planned units.

### ii. Approval of Check Register

Ms. Adams presented the Check Register from June 1, 2024 through June 30, 2024 in the amount of \$177,834.16, which was included in the agenda package, along with a detailed register.

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

#### iii. Balance Sheet and Income Statement

Ms. Adams presented the Unaudited Financial Statements through June 30, 2024, which was included in the agenda package. It was for informational purposes and no Board action was required. The District was fully collected on their assessments, as of the end of June. However, a small amount was pending on the direct billed assessments, which has now been received. On the prorated budget compared to the actual spending to date, in instances where they were running over budget for administrative expenses, for projects that the Board approved, they were addressed for FY 2025. For maintenance shared expenses, there were some overages that have been monitored and were being corrected with the FY 2025 budget.

#### iv. Replacement and Maintenance Plan

Ms. Adams presented the R&M Plan, which was included in the agenda package and was for informational purposes. This was the Project List for FY 2025 and was comprised of items that were included in the Reserve Study, based on replacement dates of infrastructure and assets that the District owned. It included items previously approved by the Board, but not yet paid for, some of which were underway. The Project List for FY 2025 was discussed at last month's meeting and based on Board direction, several items were deferred to future fiscal years. The estimate from Mr. Scheerer on the sidewalk installations for vacant lots, was received subsequent to the public of the budget and once received, this line item would be adjusted.

#### v. Approval of Fiscal Year 2025 Meeting Dates

Ms. Adams presented the Fiscal Year 2025 meeting schedule, which was consistent with the prior year's meeting schedule, on the second Thursday of each month at 1:00 p.m. at the HCCC.

On MOTION by Ms. Hobbs seconded by Mr. Greenstein with all in favor the Fiscal Year 2025 meeting schedule as presented was approved.

#### E. Security Report

Ms. Adams introduced Ms. Zory Ramos, of Reunion Security, who provided the June Security Report. As a courtesy, the Reunion West POA Security Report was also provided. No Board action was required and it was for informational purposes. Mr. Greenstein asked if the security upgrade was completed and if anyone contacted security. Ms. Ramos confirmed that the upgrade was completed and that no one called the office. Mr. Greenstein appreciated Ms. Ramos

Reunion East CDD Regular Meeting August 15, 2024 Page 14 of 14

and Mr. Victor Vargas informing the Board when something was occurring and felt that they were doing a good job. However, there needed to be better communication with residents, as many people were upset when they could not get through the Spine Road gate, but it was temporary and more people were upset when their Proximity Cards and RFID transponders did not work and they had to wait 15 to 20 seconds for the guard to open the gate.

#### TWELFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

**Other Business** 

There being no comments, the next item followed.

#### THIRTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

**Supervisor's Requests** 

There being no comments, the next item followed.

#### FOURTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Next Meeting Date: September 12, 2024

The next meeting was scheduled for September 12, 2024 at 1:00 p.m.

#### FIFTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Adjournment

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

Signed by:

3F3E5FA5C67E43B...

Secretary/Assistant Secretary

DocuSigned by

Chairman/Vice Chairman