

MINUTES OF MEETING
REUNION EAST
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

The Regular Meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Reunion East Community Development District was held on Thursday, March 16, 2017 at 2:00 p.m. at the Heritage Crossing Community Center, 7715 Heritage Crossing Way, Reunion, Florida.

Present and constituting a quorum were:

Carlton Grant	Chairman
Mark Greenstein	Vice-Chairman
Steven Goldstein	Assistant Treasurer
John Dryburgh	Assistant Secretary
Don Harding	Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

George Flint	District Manager
Andrew d'Adesky	District Counsel
Steve Boyd	District Engineer
Alan Scheerer	Field Manager

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

Roll Call

Mr. Flint called the meeting to order, and roll call was taken.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS

Public Comment Period

There not being any, the next item as followed.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS

Approval of the Minutes of the February 9, 2017 Meeting

Mr. Flint: Are there any additions, deletions, or corrections to those minutes?

On MOTION by Mr. Harding, seconded by Mr. Dryburgh, with all in favor, the minutes of the February 9, 2017 meeting were approved.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

**Discussion of Estoppel Request from
Armstrong Reunion, LLC**

Mr. d'Adesky: We received an Estoppel Request from Armstrong Reunion, LLC which is an entity that we entered into an agreement with several years ago. Since Publix bought out Armstrong, they are just looking to receive an Estoppel that states our compliance with the maintenance agreement that they recorded. Their obligations under the maintenance agreement are limited to maintaining that retaining wall that is across the street. I drove by it today and it looks fine, I did not see any structural deficiencies with the retaining wall. That is really the only ongoing maintenance responsibility they have. I don't see any issue with giving them an Estoppel. We can just say that they are in compliance and also write in there a reminder that they have the ongoing maintenance responsibility for the retaining wall. Other than that, they are in compliance, the rest of the stuff is maintained by us.

Mr. Goldstein: So, we will have no responsibility for the retaining wall?

Mr. d'Adesky: No, it will still be their ongoing responsibility.

Mr. Flint: When they began developing that commercial parcel and they had to put retaining walls in, the position that the CDD took at the time said that we were maintaining the landscaping but we weren't going to take on any responsibility for the retaining wall. There was an agreement entered into where they took on the obligation to the extent that if there was ever an issue with the retaining wall they were responsible for that. Now because of the sale, they are calling it an Estoppel which is a little unusual because it is not a typical Estoppel, they are asking for a letter basically saying the current owner is in compliance with that agreement. From our perspective, they are. Issuing this letter doesn't really impact the discussion about future cost sharing. We are not compromising.

Mr. Greenstein: There is a premature cutoff in Osceola. I saw a very close call. There is a driveway pad that they cut in for future use, they did not measure the amount of the roadway going up that hill. If you take your eyes off the road for a split second, expecting you are going to be going straight up a ramp, you will barrel into reflective posts because it goes nowhere.

Mr. Harding: Haven't we done that twice?

Mr. d'Adesky: I've taken that turn also.

Mr. Greenstein: I've heard so many people that have done that.

Mr. d'Adesky: It looks like an entrance, especially at night.

Mr. Greenstein: Are we vulnerable in that area?

Mr. d'Adesky: That is the County's responsibility, and it is their duty to control that intersection.

Mr. Greenstein: From an engineering standpoint, we should have done this years ago, unless they are going to do something with that like open it up. They have to close it on the right.

Mr. Harding: It is my understanding that it is going to be an active entrance at some point, although if plans change and it is no longer going to be an entrance it needs to be taken out.

Mr. Greenstein: It has been there for a long time. I only brought it up because I almost saw an accident happen.

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein, seconded by Mr. Harding, with all in favor, the Estoppel Request to Armstrong Reunion, LLC was approved.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Consideration of Transfer of Environmental Resource Permits

Mr. Boyd: In your agenda package, there is a specific notice from the Water Management District about a permit that needs to be transferred to the operating entity. That facility is the maintenance facility, and it drains to a dry bottom pond adjacent to County road 532. It was actually built by the District as a drainage facility for the pond and a future development track. This is one of several permits we received notices about from the Water Management District. They claim to be missing paperwork certifying that the project is complete and that the CDD now maintains the facilities. Several years ago, when these facilities were actually completed, the CDD did start assuming maintenance responsibilities for those. The issue is, the District says they are missing the paperwork that says that is the case. I'm confident that these have all been completed and are in order. We are going to go through them one by one and get the District any paperwork that they are missing. The next meeting I'll be bringing the Board a list of permits that need followed up on.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Staff Reports

A. Attorney

Mr. d'Adesky: We don't have too much to report on, obviously, there has been nothing occurred from the trustee regarding the negotiations of settlement. I know that we intended to talk about the right-of-way maintenance and I will say that I did have a look and did some research. I was informed of this ahead of time, and did look at the Interlocal Agreement, a local agreement that we have with the County involving right-of-way maintenance. It was backdated to the establishment of the CDD, so it expires in 5 years and we would have to renegotiate it then. It does contain a 60 day out. So, if we ever wanted to pull out of it we would give 60 day notice and pull out if we want to. The County could require us to pull up everything we have there currently and lay down sod. It is a very old agreement and simply written. It doesn't contemplate pulling out from a portion of it, it is either all out or all in. That is the status of the Interlocal as of date. I sent a message to Boyd, the DRI has been rescinded.

Mr. Boyd: The DRI has not been rescinded.

Mr. d'Adesky: It has not, okay. But, that is the agreement we have in place

Mr. Goldstein: According to what Alan was telling me, to maintain that median and both sides of Road 532 is roughly \$170,000 a year. The CDD and homeowners are paying for that. What I would propose if there is a way to do it, is to go out to the other developments and other property owners along Road 532 and say "pay your fair share." The center median is almost \$104,000, the north Reunion side is \$41,000, and the south Reunion side is \$27,000. The other suggestion, made by a homeowner, if no one is going to contribute we should just pay for the maintenance of the property in front of the entrance way and somehow segregate that off. I think it is something we should be concerned with, since we are spending all that money.

Mr. Harding: We irrigate that too, is that cost in there?

Mr. Scheerer: No, that is just the landscape cost.

Mr. Harding: We irrigate that too?

Mr. Scheerer: Yes, all of it.

Mr. Harding: The reason I'm asking is because the irrigation is a real problem. We are flooding the road every night. I see people swerving to not get into the water, and that could cause a major accident. We would be liable because we are spraying it right across road in the middle of the night, every night.

Mr. Scheerer: It shouldn't be sprayed in the middle of the road every night. I'm not saying that the system is perfect. These are mechanical rotors and sometimes they get off track.

Yellowstone does go through the system, it is not intentional for the rotors to be aimed at the road.

Mr. Harding: It is going east from I-4, and it is near the Fire Station.

Mr. Greenstein: That's something we can work with Yellowstone on?

Mr. Scheerer: Yes, their guys do regular wet checks here in the community. I've experienced the same thing even during the day.

Mr. Goldstein: As far as maintaining that property out there, granted I would hate to see it go bad, how does it benefit us Reunion owners? I understand why the developer wanted an attraction for Reunion coming up 532, but what purpose does it serve the owners?

Mr. Dryburgh: One thing you need to consider when you start talking about cutting your expenses is that no one else is going to step up to it. You have a direct impact on the value of your house. First time someone sees Championsgate and it is well maintained with nice cut grass and plants, then they see Reunion's landscaping is overrun, overgrown, not maintained or watered properly, they will have an attitude about Reunion. They will think Reunion has financial problems and I'm not sure that's how you want to go.

Mr. Grant: I agree with that.

Mr. Dryburgh: You either have to get cooperation or suck it up and pay it.

Mr. Harding: Isn't it shared between the Districts?

Mr. Scheerer: Yes, it is a shared cost between the East and West Reunion. Jan and I had discussed this, pending Board direction and where to go with this. We did think if we were going to pursue this we could start a conversation with the County and talk with them about trying to get some of those users tied in and participating.

Mr. Dryburgh: The key would be to get the County on board with this. We can't directly approach this property and Polk County and get anywhere. If we got with Osceola County and maybe during the development approval process that issue can be addressed and we can look at cost sharing.

Mr. Harding: There are already people in the process of developing on that road right now. You're saying there is nothing we can do about those guys?

Mr. Scheerer: No, we're just saying it would need to be done through the County.

Mr. Harding: Is that Polk County?

Mr. Goldstein: Yes, that's Polk County.

Mr. Scheerer: Our interlocal is with Osceola County so they are the entity that would be replacing the portions of that in a local agreement.

Mr. Greenstein: Just for clarity, I agree with what Mr. Dryburgh stated so well. I think the 532 was beautified by the developer to provide that well-kept, above normal standard look that makes a difference when people come in. It's like the streetscape for Reunion includes the 532 median and that's why it was developed that way.

Mr. Goldstein: That's all the way from I4 to Old Lake Wilson Road, both sides of the road and the median.

Mr. Greenstein: I understand that. From 532 to I4 to the wetlands, close to where the Landscape Contract building is, that area there will probably be commercially developed. That is almost expendable. When it does finally get developed, it will not be part of Reunion even though it is Reunion East CDD. Whether we reduce the area, the length of 532, that we cover through this arrangement, we can look at that. I do agree now that the Polk side is being developed, even though the area on the corner Polk side that has our landscaping is Osceola County. The actual line is about 20 feet in. That is why they have the agreement on the other matter because the roadway is Osceola.

Mr. Scheerer: The other agreement was recorded in the Polk County.

Mr. Goldstein: If we do anything, I think we should take the action with the County to solicit the other developments and homeowners along 532 from I4 to Old Lake Wilson to see if we can get them to contribute.

Mr. Scheerer: I think that is the best course of action.

Mr. Goldstein: Then we can go from there. It is covered by our interlocal agreement by the East and West. It is a shared cost, it isn't just the East that's paying for it. That's not the key point though, it's that we have viable development going on and benefiting from what we have done. If we can go to the County and get them to approach the other entities and get some financial relief that would be great. We could also look at narrowing the scope of what we are doing based upon the future development of the fire department property.

Mr. Scheerer: We don't need any action.

B. Engineer

Mr. Boyd: I have two items. One is a follow up on a brief report I provided for the Reunion signal. I've been promised plans in about three weeks. We did confirm that the existing development to left of here has an access on 532 that does not have a signal associated with it.

Mr. Harding: What do you mean?

Mr. Boyd: They have an entrance, but they don't have a signal.

Mr. Harding: Is there a gap where they are making a left-hand turn?

Mr. Boyd: They are adding one.

Mr. Harding: So, they are turning in front of all that traffic going 60 miles an hour. It doesn't sound like they are thinking long term.

Mr. Flint: At the West meeting, we were led to believe that they are going forth to the County with a proposal for signalization of that intersection. What Steve found out was that they're not going to the County. They just went to the County for designation of the turn lane. As you said, it is very close to the I4 intersection. When you are coming east from I4, you go around 1/8th of a mile, and it lines up with the cutoff for the fire department. There's an opening in the median so they just want to control the turning.

Mr. Boyd: Whether it is signalized or not is a decision for the County. It is based on traffic numbers, if the numbers warrant a signal then they will require a signal. If the traffic numbers show the signal is not warranted, they won't allow one. What we want from the exercise here, the signal at Reunion is now warranted. Originally, it wasn't warranted. The warrant numbers are based on how many trips are coming in and out of the development, not how many trips are coming down the primary road. If Osceola County is going to require a signal at that location, the trips they count require it. I questioned the County Engineer about it and the engineer said a signal is not proposed at that location.

Mr. Greenstein: If they start building those units, you get 300 to 600 people in there, they are going to start having issues.

Mr. Harding: When we put one in you're going to have an issue anyway because signals are going to be backing up.

Mr. Greenstein: They'll be synchronized with Old Lake Wilson Road.

Mr. Harding: I just see a disaster coming in the next few years.

Mr. Boyd: The other item I have to report on, last month you asked me to investigate feasibility of a gatehouse at the end gated entrance. I've got a sketch here. Dimensionally, it does appear that a gatehouse would work. If it were positioned right in front of the gate. The one problem with that, is if someone were to get to the gate, and not be allowed access, there's no way to turn around at that point. There is no room to put one further back where they could make the U-turn.

Mr. Dryburgh: We do that at the back gate now, there's no place to do a U-turn.

Mr. Scheerer: There's a turn around, just like this one, and the gatehouse is after that turnaround.

Mr. Boyd: Also, you can man and monitor a gate, but access can't be denied.

Mr. Harding: We know that.

Mr. Boyd: From that standpoint, this would still be functional. You would have the ability to monitor and control the gate from this location. If this is going to be manned, there is a sewer in the road that is not too far away. We use a packaged pump station that would pump to a 1½ or 2-inch line that would pump to that manhole. That's fairly simple, and there is a water line on the other side of the road so you could get a water line to it fairly simply. If a gatehouse were to be configured as shown, it could be done.

Mr. Goldstein: The cost?

Mr. Boyd: To get utilities to it you're looking around \$25,000 to \$30,000. I don't know the cost of the gate house because it is an architectural element, but I would assume that would be at least \$50,000 to build the structure. Another several thousand to tie it into the gate electronically. You're looking at around a \$75,000 budget for the entire project.

Mr. Goldstein: Of course, you have the recurring costs.

Mr. Scheerer: I would say closer to \$100,000.

Mr. Harding: When do we need someone there? We need them in the morning hours and at night. What time at night do we need someone there, 11:00 p.m., 1:00 a.m.?

Mr. Dryburgh: Probably midnight.

Mr. Goldstein: Well why don't we get it costed out.

Mr. Boyd: We'll need to get an architect to draw that up for us.

Mr. Harding: Could we look at the prospect of having better signage when people drive up to the gate?

Mr. Goldstein: Alan and I toured that yesterday, and we are talking about putting a fairly large sign there telling people this is residence only and main gate entrance.

Mr. Harding: It needs to say permanent residence or property owners.

Mr. Boyd: We're going to get a proposal for the architect. Steve can do the civil part of it, tying it into the sewer.

Mr. Dryburgh: You would handle the electric.

Mr. Goldstein: In the meantime, we could put the sign up.

Mr. Scheerer: Yes, we will work on the sign. We will draw something up and make sure everybody is okay with it and then we will have the sign installed. Do we want 1 or 2 there?

Mr. Goldstein: One big one. We need to put it where you can't miss it.

Mr. Scheerer: I'll get that all together.

Mr. Greenstein: The guardhouse on Spline, how would the proposed building compare to that?

Mr. Harding: I would envision it being that size or even smaller.

Mr. Scheerer: That's a pretty big building, probably twice the size of a guard shack.

Mr. Goldstein: It's an adequate size.

Mr. Greenstein: It has to blend in with the other guard shacks.

Mr. Harding: We could get some technology that actually takes pictures of license plates as the cars go through. Let's add some security in there where even if a guy is not there, a guard at the other location could check it.

Mr. Goldstein: The technology we have here is already in place, other than being able to open the gates.

Mr. Scheerer: All the gates are recorded now.

Mr. Harding: I think a lot of people don't see the signs, because I never see that sign.

Mr. Greenstein: The signs are bad. That sign has to be at least 6 or 7 years old.

Mr. Flint: We will get a proposal, at the April meeting we will bring back a proposal from the architect and a work authorization for the engineer. We will have that approved in April.

C. District Manager's Report

i. Action Items List

Mr. Flint: There is nothing new on the irrigation turnover. I haven't received a recent update from LRA. Signalization, Steve provided an update on that. The horse stables, with the help of the POA we sent out the survey per the Board's direction at the last meeting. There are no results back yet to share with the Board. We will put that on the April agenda and we can talk about the survey results.

Mr. Goldstein: I wonder if we could have the resort put something out to the members making sure they respond to the survey.

Mr. Scheerer: We can do that.

Mr. Flint: We will send a follow up with a due date on it. There are no updates on the spa at Heritage Crossing. If the Board is not interested in moving forward with this we can take it off the action items list.

Mr. Harding: I'm okay with that.

Mr. Goldstein: We need security more than we need a spa.

Mr. Flint: Okay, item 5 we have handled for the time being. Item 6 we just talked about, we will come back at the April meeting with work authorization for the engineer and a proposal from the architect.

Mr. Harding: Going back to the horse stables, a couple residents mentioned that many of the condo owners don't have the ability to wash their cars. They were wondering if we could throw that on as an option.

Mr. Greenstein: On the survey under other, they can write in carwash.

Mr. Flint: I'm going to add the allocation of the 532 landscape cost to the action items list. On google earth, Alan inventoried all the signs. Each one of these yellow pins is a sign and you can click on the pin and it pulls up a picture of the sign.

Mr. Greenstein: Can you give us the link?

Mr. Flint: I'll email it to you.

Mr. Scheerer: There's one on the corner I missed, it was in between the inside and outside of the CDD property. Those are all the signs within Reunion from the main entrance.

Mr. Goldstein: A number of the signs are resort signs, some are very good and professional signs. Some of the other ones are kind of unprofessional. I want the resort to probably replace those with a more professional type sign. I think a lot of the homeowners are complaining about that.

Mr. Scheerer: If you look at a Reunion directional sign, a lot of these signs are two sided signs that give direction throughout the community. There's some like these "New Home Available" signs.

Mr. Goldstein: The restaurant sign could be replaced by the other.

Mr. Grant: I would be more than happy to pay to upgrade those.

Mr. Goldstein: In our signage policy, we've said we will allow people 60 days for the signs. The signs cannot be advertisements, they can only be directional. But what do we do as far as putting a note out to some of the other major entities.

Mr. Flint: We are still talking about the POA adopting a sign standard.

Mr. Goldstein: So just wait for that to happen?

Mr. Flint: I exchanged some emails with David earlier today and he's hoping that within the next 30 days the POA will adopt that sign standard. Once that sign standard is adopted, the CDD can point to that as being the standard that we want on CDD property. When we're reviewing the inventory of signage, we've got the design standard and our policy. We can issue out letters to the people that own the signs and let them know they need to be upgraded because the design is not consistent or they need to be removed because they are not directional.

Mr. Harding: The condos have open house signs on the street today over there. They pulled the signs on the home side but couldn't touch the ones on the terraces side because technically that is not their property.

Mr. Flint: If they're on private property then it's a POA issue.

Mr. Greenstein: As part of the POA review, because I am on the Architectural Control Board, at our last meeting with the feature builders we gave them the heads up about the signage policy review. There are standards for signs from a real estate perspective in the covenants and guidelines package for the feature builders. We were looking at that and told them that we were going to reissue them. It's all tying together.

Mr. Goldstein: To that point, Mark, the last time I talked to David he was waiting for the guidelines from you?

Mr. Greenstein: Correct.

Mr. Boyd: It would be best for the CDD and the Master Association to get the current information rather than the outdated information.

Mr. Dryburgh: One last signage issue, we were talking about having a sign out on of the median of 532 or on the opposite side, indicating Reunion Resort this way. I guess we have to talk to the County in regards to that.

Mr. Scheerer: We would need to create the sign and show them what size it would be and what it would look like, and where we would put it. Then we would need to submit for a sign application. If there's a concept anyone has in mind or how you would like to see it, we could probably work with Steve on that.

ii. Approval of the Check Register

Mr. Flint: We can discuss any questions about the check register for the month of February.

On MOTION by Mr. Harding, seconded by Mr. Goldstein, with all in favor, the Check Register for the month of February was approved.

iii. Balance Sheet and Income Statement

Mr. Flint: If there are any questions we can discuss them now.

iv. Status of Direct Bill Assessments

Mr. Flint: If there are any questions we can discuss them now.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Other Business

Mr. Flint: Any other business?

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Supervisor's Request

There not being any, the next item as followed.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Next Meeting Date

April 13, 2017 at 2:30 p.m.

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Adjournment

There being no further business,

On MOTION by Mr. Greenstein, seconded by Mr. Grant, with all in favor, the meeting was adjourned at 3:06 p.m.

Secretary/Assistant Secretary

Chairman/Vice Chairman