A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

MARCH 3, 2026

The Lake County Board of County Commissioners met in regular session on Tuesday, March 3, 2026 at 9:00 a.m., in the County Commission Chambers, Lake County Administration Building, Tavares, Florida. Commissioners present at the meeting were: Leslie Campione, Chairman; Sean Parks, Vice Chairman; Anthony Sabatini (via Zoom); Kirby Smith; and Timothy Morris. Others present were: Jennifer Barker, County Manager; Melanie Marsh, County Attorney; Misty Spahn, Executive Office Manager, County Manager's Office; Mary Burns, Accounting Director; and Josh Pearson, Deputy Clerk.

INVOCATION AND PLEDGE

Commr. Campione welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Pastor Winston Simon, with Hope International Church in the City of Groveland, gave the Invocation and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Commr. Campione said that they were keeping United States (U.S.) soldiers and those involved with the situation with Iran in their hearts and prayers. She added that their hearts went out to families who had lost loved ones, and that they expressed their deep appreciation for the sacrifice that their loved ones made for the country.

AGENDA UPDATE

Ms. Jennifer Barker, County Manager, said that Tab 2 had been added as an addendum since the agenda was first published, and she requested to move it under the regular agenda. She specified that this was an update requested by the Board in the previous week regarding the County's wildfire assessment in the area. She then commented that Commissioner Sabatini was not able to join them in person, and she relayed her understanding that he was on Zoom and would be participating remotely; however, he would not be voting.

CITIZEN QUESTION AND COMMENT PERIOD

Mr. Banks Helfrich, a farmer from the Clay Road District in South Lake and a candidate for State House of Representatives District 25, said that a farm tip of the day was that it was time to put spring crops into the ground such as beans, peas, watermelon, squash, cucumbers and perennials. He then spoke about capitalism, and opined that happiness was found in service.

ANNEXATION REPORT

Mr. Mike Fitzgerald, Director for the Office of Planning and Zoning, said that the City of Eustis had notified Lake County that they intended on annexing 10 acres south of County Road (CR) 44A and east of CR 44, and that the current Lake County zoning was Urban Low (R-6) with a proposed City zoning of Suburban Corridor Design District. He explained that the City used form-based code, that the current Lake County future land use (FLU) was Urban Low, which was four units per acre, and that the proposed City FLU was General Commercial. He stated that the intent was to develop the property with a general commercial use, and he showed a comparison of what Lake County would allow currently, noting that the municipality had no density because they were doing general commercial. He displayed an aerial image of the property, pointing out that the city was abutting the property. He showed the zoning and land use maps, along with a

conceptual plan received from the City. He specified that there would be a few buildings, some areas for light storage, and a suburban corridor design with certain form-based code which applied to the buildings.

Commr. Campione indicated that she used to own this property.

PUBLIC HEARINGS: REZONING

Mr. Fitzgerald displayed the advertisements for that day's rezoning case on the overhead monitor in accordance with the Florida Statutes.

REZONING REGULAR AGENDA

Tab 1. Ordinance No. 2026-9
Rezoning Case # PZ2025-148
The Barn at Southern Oaks (CUP)
1. Conditional use permit (CUP) approval on approximately 21.49 +/- acres to allow an enclosed Wedding Venue/ Barn within the Agriculture District (A).

2. Waiver to the road access requirements pursuant to Appendix A, of the Lake County Transportation Planning, Design, and Construction Standards, to allow the proposed development to access the property from Le Grande Street, an unmaintained road.

THE BARN AT SOUTHERN OAKS (CUP)

Mr. Fitzgerald presented Tab 1, Rezoning Case # PZ2025-148, The Barn at Southern Oaks (CUP). He explained that the requested action was a conditional use permit (CUP) on approximately 21.49 acres to allow an enclosed wedding venue/barn within the Agriculture zoning district. He added that included in the CUP was a waiver to road access requirements to allow this wedding venue to be on a maintained but unimproved road. He recalled that the Planning and Zoning Board had voted unanimously to recommend approval, and said that the location was 40410 Le Grande Street in the unincorporated City of Umatilla area. He mentioned that the subject parcel had been granted an agricultural classification through the Lake County Property Appraiser, and was developed with a single family dwelling unit, a barn and an enclosed wedding venue which was accessible through a private easement. He relayed that a building permit had been issued on July 20, 2020 for an open pole barn for storage uses, and that it had been enclosed without a permit and was subsequently subject to a code enforcement violation. He elaborated that the applicant had agreed to enter into a settlement agreement and obtain a CUP to bring the wedding venue into compliance with the County's regulations. He said that water and sewer service was by an existing septic and well system, and that Lake County Fire Station 20 was located less than three miles from the subject property.

Commr. Campione asked the Board to disclose ex parte communication, but there was none.

Commr. Morris asked if they met the fire code.

Mr. Fitzgerald replied that if the CUP was approved, they would have to return to permit the enclosed wedding venue; furthermore, the County would evaluate the life safety plan at that point. He was unsure if they met this at the current time.

Ms. Jamie Blunt, representing the applicant, stated that the applicant was willing to be compliant with everything being asked of them.

Commr. Campione relayed her understanding that access was off Le Grande Street, and that this street fed onto CR 450 and into the City of Umatilla.

Ms. Blunt clarified that the applicant had been maintaining Le Grande Street since they purchased the property.

Commr. Campione asked how the code enforcement case came up.

Mr. Fitzgerald responded that the Office of Code Enforcement was complaint driven, and that they must have received a complaint about the events at the property, along with investigating and determining that the barn had been enclosed without a proper building permit.

Commr. Campione stated that receiving the permit and meeting fire code had to be done separately, and that this was not a bonafide agricultural use on the property; therefore, it was not exempt by Florida Statutes, and the applicant had to come to the Board.

Mr. Fitzgerald added that the definition of agritourism did not include the construction of new or additional structures or facilities intended for the general public; additionally, as soon as one started building a wedding venue and it became an assembly use under the building code, they had to permit this as such.

Commr. Campione indicated her understanding that the subject property had been posted with notices, though there were no objections.

Commr. Parks relayed his understanding that there would be up to 50 special events allowed per year, and he asked about the difference on this.

Mr. Fitzgerald replied that the order was allowing 50 weddings per calendar year, and that there was an allowance for special events which could be expected to draw 500 persons or greater; furthermore, they would take this through a special event process.

Ms. Melanie Marsh, County Attorney, clarified that it was a total of 50 events including weddings, special events and family events. She stated that the Board could possibly limit the number of special events.

Commr. Campione opined that special events could draw the attention of the surrounding community. She asked if the intent was to focus on weddings and those types of events.

Ms. Blunt relayed that there was no intention for special events and that the applicant had never had an event that large; furthermore, this was solely for weddings, baby showers, etc.

Commr. Campione opined that they could possibly eliminate the large special events.

Ms. Marsh commented that if they were not intending to have it as an allowed use, the County could change the CUP to say that special events, as defined by the County code, were specifically prohibited on this property.

Commr. Campione inquired about the typical size of a wedding there.

Ms. Blunt believed that it was between 125 and 175 people.

Commr. Smith said that on the application, the owner mentioned that they would have 10 to 15 ceremonies in a single year from 10 to 125 guests; however, the CUP was requesting 50 ceremonies.

Ms. Blunt clarified that this had been changed in the last meeting.

Commr. Smith asked about the current agribusiness.

Ms. Blunt was unsure, noting that they had cattle.

Commr. Smith expressed concerns for the road because it was unmaintained, and he pointed out that the CUP would have the owner maintaining the road. He asked what would happen if the owner failed to maintain it.

Ms. Marsh explained that it would be inspected annually because it was a CUP, and that the property owner would be notified if the road did not meet the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) Chapter 18 requirements. She elaborated that if they did not address the road, then it would be a code enforcement case and/or the County could seek revocation of the CUP.

Commr. Smith relayed his understanding that some unmaintained roads needed to have accessibility for fire and emergency medical services (EMS), and that some degraded to where it caused an issue for adjacent owners using the same road. He stated that he also had an issue with 50 events per year from 8:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. with up to 216 people.

Ms. Blunt said that they were not all at those timeframes.

Commr. Smith mentioned that it was allowed in the CUP.

Ms. Blunt remarked that the applicant had been maintaining the road with crushed concrete and asphalt since they had been there, opining that it was not a deteriorating road and that it was compacted. She added that the applicant had around 40 events in the previous year.

Commr. Smith said that in Section 3 of the ordinance, if the owner sold the property, then all of this would transfer to the new owner. He asked if the Board could strike this so that the CUP would become null and void if the owner sold the property.

Commr. Campione relayed her understanding that the new owner would be subject to the same conditions, and that it could be revoked if they did not adhere to this.

Commr. Smith stated that he would like to see the CUP be revoked if the owner sold it, noting that the owner would not be able to use this CUP to increase the purchase price of the property.

Commr. Campione inquired why this would be an issue, and questioned that if this family wanted to retire and sell a successful business, then why should they not receive the benefit of this.

Commr. Smith opined that this was a safety net and that there could be a possibility that the owner could receive the CUP and sell the property; furthermore, the County did not know who the next owner would be. He also expressed concern for the road exemption.

Commr. Campione asked how many other people used the road to reach their home.

Ms. Blunt indicated her understanding that there were at least two, and said that the applicant maintained the road past their driveway.

Commr. Campione opined that this was a gorgeous part of Lake County, and said that she could see why a wedding venue there would be something that people would enjoy using.

Commr. Smith opined that it should not be a commercial use.

Commr. Campione opined that she did not see wedding venues this way.

Ms. Blunt opined that if they did not have the barn, it would have still been allowed under agritourism, and that they were present because the applicant had enclosed the barn.

Commr. Smith commented that agritourism was originally started to have another inflow of funding in case the agribusiness did not sustain the property, though this had been changed in the Florida Legislature so that as long as one was in Agriculture zoning, they were able to have agribusiness. He opined that the original intent was not for a commercial business inside an Agriculture zoning.

Commr. Campione relayed her understanding that if one did not have the bonafide agriculture use and just had the Agriculture zoning, then this was not enough.

Ms. Marsh explained that one had to have a bonafide agricultural use, which was defined by statute. She added that the Property Appraiser typically made this determination before issuing an agricultural classification, and that this property had an agricultural classification for hay production and cattle; however, the County was seeing an issue with wedding venues trying to use agritourism to primarily be a wedding venue, noting that they still had to maintain a bonafide agricultural operation on the subject property. She opined that the property was likely not large enough to have a bonafide agricultural commercial operation, though since the Property Appraiser had given them this classification, the County would generally not challenge it. She reiterated that the applicant had to receive the CUP because they enclosed the barn and because the intent was a commercial use rather than an agricultural use with a side use of a ceremonial service.

Commr. Campione inquired that if the barn had already been enclosed and they had received the agricultural classification, then they would not be present on the current day; rather, it was the fact that it was modified.

Ms. Marsh replied that it depended, and that if the barn was enclosed only for purposes of agricultural storage, then they would not be present. She said that when it was converted to have public assembly, then they needed permits and to go through this process.

Commr. Campione asked if they ever had events which went from 8:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m.

Ms. Blunt denied that they had an all-day event.

Commr. Campione relayed her understanding that the hours were stated as such because they were unsure what time a wedding would be.

Commr. Morris inquired if the barn structure was built first and how long it had been there before they enclosed it.

Ms. Blunt relayed her understanding that the barn had been there and was enclosed in 2022 for an event.

Commr. Morris expressed concerns that this was not done the right way, as well as for the patrons there, indicating his understanding that many of these items were occurring in the county.

Commr. Campione opined that it was clear that they could not occupy and use the barn until they met all of the requirements for fire code and building.

Commr. Smith asked about the last time it was used, and Ms. Blunt was unsure. Commissioner Smith then recalled that in February or March 2025, the applicant was given 180 days to bring it into compliance; furthermore, rather than bringing it into compliance, they came through the CUP process.

Ms. Blunt clarified that the County had told them about the CUP.

Commr. Campione stated that she was not picking up that something nefarious was occurring, and opined that the applicant made some missteps and was trying to correct them.

Commr. Smith said that he was trying to protect their agriculture and some of the land around there, opining that if he bought 10 acres with Agriculture zoning, it would stay zoned Agriculture and have a bonafide agricultural business. He opined that this property did not have this, and that a new owner would have the ability to have an 8:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. event. He also reiterated his concerns for the road.

Commr. Parks opined that the Board tried to find a way to balance things, and that the concerns about the road and the hours of operation were legitimate. He indicated that he looked at it as a good thing that the county was so beautiful and that many people wanted to come there to do special events like this, though opined that there could be issues with this. He relayed that the County was supposed to ensure that this was not done in a way that was detrimental to the rest of the residents, and that if there were safeties built into the ordinance which could address this, then he was comfortable with it. He relayed his understanding that the road was going to be maintained and inspected, and mentioned that the CUP could be revoked if they did not meet the inspection. He stated that he wanted to ensure that there would not be any events of 500 people or more, and that he was agreeable with events up to 175 people as long as the other conditions were met.

Commr. Morris asked what the applicant would need to do to bring this into compliance with fire code.

Ms. Marsh clarified that the property owners had purchased this property in 2020, and that it had been vacant property. She added that since it was purchased, there was a 1,630 square foot home built in 2021, a 4,000 square foot accessory structure built around that time, an open porch, and a roughly 1,200 square foot utility building which was built in 2025; therefore, none of these structures existed on this property prior to the property owner purchasing it in 2020.

Chief Michael Vitta, Division Chief/Fire Marshal for the Office of Fire Rescue, indicated that his office would be looking at access and water supply, and that it would be subject to annual life safety inspections.

Commr. Morris inquired if this would be a sprinkler system.

Chief Vitta said that they would have to review the plans and see what the applicant had.

Commr. Campione recalled that noise was an issue at another venue, along with noise extending beyond hours of operation and parking happening offsite. She asked if there were other items that would distinguish that situation versus the current item.

Ms. Marsh commented that there were conditions in the proposed ordinance which addressed impacts they saw in other locations. She specified that the CUP stated that that they could not park outside the property, nor could they stage or stack vehicles along Le Grande Street to await entry to the property. She added that there was a detailed noise provision, and that they had to do a noise study and make any changes if the study identified issues. She relayed that they could not have amplified sound permitted outside of a fully enclosed structure after 10:00 p.m., and that amplified sound during an event which could be heard more than 25 feet from the property

line would be a violation of this ordinance. She related that amplified sound was defined in this ordinance with a plainly audible standard for law enforcement, and that some other issues they had with wedding venues in other areas of the county included adjacent neighbors basically having no silence because events were run each night. She said that conditions not included in the proposed ordinance which the Board had included in other CUPs for similar type uses included restricting one weekend per month to having no events, restrictions for no events such as on Thanksgiving and Christmas, reducing the number of events, or reducing the hours. She said that the Board had much leeway because assuming that there was a bonafide agricultural activity on the property, the statute allowed them to regulate offsite impacts of this type of event, including noise and traffic.

Commr. Campione asked that if issues arose, could the County go back into the ordinance when it came back for inspection and renewal.

Ms. Marsh replied that because it was a conditional zoning, they could do a County-initiated rezoning to bring it back if they continued to have code enforcement issues there, which would give them the option to revoke it or modify the conditions to address additional concerns.

Commr. Campione opined that this was important, and that good conditions had been provided. She reiterated that the applicant had to get through the permitting and fire code issues, and that they had much to do before they could begin having events.

Commr. Smith said that he would like to see the amount of people and events changed, along with the time.

Commr. Campione opined that one did not know what time of day a wedding would be, and that if they restricted this, then they would have interfered with the applicant's ability to accommodate this. She added that they did not have any complaints other than the one which had started this, that no one was in attendance for the meetings, and that the County had an out.

Commr. Morris said that he wanted to ensure that the road was large enough to accommodate a firetruck and ambulance, and he asked if this would be addressed with the CUP.

Ms. Marsh responded that the ordinance incorporated the fire standard for roads, which meant that the width must be 20 feet unobstructed, that the minimum height of any trees along the road must be at least 13 feet, six inches, and that the travel surface must be able to withstand live loads of fire apparatus in all weather conditions. She added that if the truck could not get there when the Office of Fire Rescue did its inspection, then the property owner would have to make those changes.

Ms. Blunt relayed that there was a previous incident at the property and that there had been two firetrucks, an ambulance and patrol cars there without any issues.

Commr. Parks asked the applicant to consider using Lake County vendors and suppliers.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

There being no one who wished to address the Board regarding this matter, the Chairman closed the public hearing.

On a motion by Commr. Parks, seconded by Commr. Morris and carried by a vote of 3-1, the Board approved Tab 1, Rezoning Case # PZ2025-148, The Barn at Southern Oaks (CUP), with the prohibition of special events as defined by Lake County code.

Commr. Smith voted no.

REGULAR AGENDA

WILDFIRE THREAT UPDATE

Chief David Kilbury, Public Safety Director, said that the county was in a better place than in the previous week due to rain, and that not much had changed in the geographic information systems (GIS) heat index for drought. He commented that the majority of the state, below State Road (SR) 60, was all above 500, and that the rain mainly stayed north of the City of Tampa. He relayed that for the county by county map for the Keetch-Byram Drought Index (KBDI) averages, Polk County, to the south of Lake County, was still above 500; however, Marion County had taken Lake County's numbers from the previous week. He recalled that Lake County had been at 22 percent above 500 and 65 percent below 500, and that currently Lake County was at 447 KBDI. He anticipated a two to four digit increase per day, and that overall they had 12 percent above 500 and had been looking at about 25 percent in the previous week; furthermore, around 75 percent of the county was below 500. He mentioned that Polk County was still drier than Lake County at 514, and that they had 22 percent above 600. He recalled that the Office of Fire Rescue had increased its brush response (BR) to a BR2, which sent an engine tanker, a battalion chief and a brush truck initially on the first response. He elaborated that with the KBDI dropping and the rains over the past weekend, they went back to a BR1, which was a single engine response; however, they could request additional resources. He reported that for the Withlacoochie District, the State of Florida currently had 18 tractor plows in the Central Florida region, along with two heavy tractor plows, 14 brush trucks, a drone team and two helicopters. He said that they would have a meeting on the following evening with an Australian company that Commissioner Parks had mentioned which Travis County, Texas was utilizing for artificial intelligence (AI) fire modeling predictive behavior. He relayed that it may be cost prohibitive and that it was around $1,500 per month plus an additional charge by acre, though this was worthy of exploring what they had to offer. He reviewed a list of the fires that Lake County had, and stated that the KBDI was just one component of what they were currently dealing with. He specified that there was much dead vegetation which had dried out on top of the duff layer, though it was not the magnitude that they had from hurricanes. He mentioned that on the previous day, the emergency manager hosted a meeting for all municipal agencies, the water district, and the Florida Forest Service (FFS), noting that the Federal Government had a drought index which was drastically different than the State's KBDI. He elaborated that the representatives from the State believed that some of the reason why it was not as accurate was due to the Federal Government shutdown, and that because the County relied on State resources, they looked to the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services (FDACS) for their KBDI numbers. He related that the northern portion of SR 19, just south of SR 40, had received slightly more precipitation than they had, though they were still dry in the southern regions of Lake County. He stated that there was low percentage

probability of rain throughout the current week, and that they had been under a burn ban at this time in the previous year. He reported that they were in a better place than in the previous week, and that they continued to monitor this.

Commr. Campione mentioned the possibility of adopting a change to the County's ordinance so that they could follow something more similar to Osceola County. She specified that this would allow the County Manager, the Fire Chief, staff and the FFS to look at all of the different factors rather than just the KBDI.

Chief Kilbury expressed support for this, opining that it would be a wise decision when it was not just the KBDI. He mentioned that when they had much dead debris from a freeze, it would give the opportunity with staff and their partners at the FFS to enact a burn ban if there were extreme wind conditions or red flag days; furthermore, it would also give the County Manager the ability to deactivate the burn ban. He opined that this was a good tool for the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) to keep the public and their properties safe.

Commr. Campione asked to advertise a proposed ordinance for the next BCC meeting.

Ms. Marsh indicated that this could be done and that it would come back for a public hearing.

Commr. Morris said that he would like to see Osceola County's ordinance.

Commr. Campione opined that it was a good ordinance, and that the County could make it slightly better for their needs. She added that she liked that it allowed the County Manager to deactivate a burn ban if things changed.

Chief Kilbury inquired if the Board would like a wildfire threat report at the following BCC meeting, and Commissioner Campione opined that this was a good idea.

Commr. Smith thanked Chief Kilbury and his team for the protection they were providing to county citizens.

Commr. Campione pointed out that there was much activity and that the general public did not necessarily hear about it unless it turned into something significant. She added that staff was responding to one or more fires almost every day.

Commr. Parks commented that the county was large in terms of area, and that staff had other things to do, along with addressing concerns with wildfires.

On a motion by Commr. Smith, seconded by Commr. Morris and carried unanimously by a vote of 4-0, the Board approved to advertise an ordinance allowing the County Manager and the Fire Chief, or his designee, to look at different factors and not just the KBDI.

COMMISSIONERS REPORTS

COMMISSIONER PARKS – VICE CHAIRMAN AND DISTRICT 2

SENATE BILL 208

Commr. Parks mentioned that the Florida Association of Counties (FAC) weekly meetings were open to the Commissioners to listen to, and that he had concerns about amendments to Senate Bill (SB) 208 which would prohibit rural boundary lines. He said that if this amendment passed, it would prohibit the County's Comprehensive Plan (Comp Plan) that they were putting forward with

a rural boundary line. He asked if the Board could express their opposition to the maker of the SB 208 amendment.

Commr. Smith said that he would have to read these items and understand it better before putting his name on anything; however, they could agendize this for the next meeting.

Ms. Marsh asked if they would want her to draft a resolution to bring back for that meeting.

Commr. Parks opined that with everything occurring with preemption, he was becoming more supportive of resolutions.

Ms. Marsh opined that a resolution carried more effect than individual letters from Commissioners.

Commr. Campione recalled that the County had been discussing coming to an agreement with the Cities whereby they would define the boundaries of where annexations would be; therefore, this was critical to everything that they had been spending time on.

Commr. Parks relayed that the Board could consider a resolution or a letter.

PROPERTY TAX CHANGES

Commr. Parks said that they did not know what was happening with property tax changes, and relayed his understanding that the House of Representatives proposal for an amendment was for it to all be in one year instead of being phased over 10 years. He opined that as the County went into the budget season, they needed to review scenarios for if something like this was to pass. He opined that if this was on the ballot, there could possibly be concern regarding the Board being viewed as campaigning for it; however, he opined that this would not be the case as long as it was presented as just a scenario and if the Board was not advocating for one or the other. He opined that the County should advertise that they would review these scenarios for education reasons, and have this be a workshop item so that people could attend and hear how these scenarios might play out.

Ms. Barker clarified that staff was going to do this anyway, and that there was currently no senate bill. She anticipated that this would happen during a special session, and she mentioned bringing back a discussion or workshop item around June 2026 because by then they should have a good idea of what was being proposed for the ballot.

COMMISSIONER SMITH – DISTRICT 3

THE SPRING GAMES

Commr. Smith stated that THE Spring Games were in full swing, and he mentioned the impact that this had for Lake County in tourism funding. He specified that in the current year they had 260 teams in Division II and Division III coming to Lake County, and that those teams included 18 players and two to three coaches; therefore, they were looking at about 5,200 participants who would be staying in Lake County hotels, going to restaurants, and purchasing fuel. He added that their fanbase would also be in attendance, and said that he could only see this growing with the assistance of the Greater Orlando Sports Commission (GO Sports).

Commr. Parks relayed that the Villanova University rowing team would spending the week training in the City of Clermont.

Commr. Smith opined that Lake County was hitting high gear with tourism, and that this was good for all of the residents, especially since they visited, spent their money, and then went home.

COMMISSIONER MORRIS – DISTRICT 5

STAFF LUNCHEON

Commr. Morris thanked the Office of Human Resources (HR) and Risk Management for putting on a great luncheon for staff.

ORLANDO ECONOMIC PARTNERSHIP EVENT

Commr. Morris mentioned that he had attended an Orlando Economic Partnership (OEP) event in the City of Orlando with staff, and that they were well respected and appreciated in that environment.

COMMISSIONER CAMPIONE – CHAIRMAN AND DISTRICT 4

LAKE-SUMTER MPO MEETING

Commr. Campione said that there was a great Lake-Sumter Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) meeting, and opined that it would be good to have all five County Commissioners there. She opined that it would show that Lake County was utilizing their seats on the Lake-Sumter MPO, and she relayed her understanding that they would be petitioning to add an additional seat for the Cities.

COMMISSIONER SMITH – DISTRICT 3

NATIONAL I WANT YOU TO BE HAPPY DAY

Commr. Smith commented that it was National I Want You to be Happy Day.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to be brought to the attention of the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 10:06 a.m.

_____

LESLIE CAMPIONE, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:

_____

GARY J COONEY, CLERK