A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

MAY 5, 2026

The Lake County Board of County Commissioners met in regular session on Tuesday, May 5, 2026 at 10:00 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; 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; Kristy Mullane, Chief Financial Officer; and Josh Pearson, Deputy Clerk.

INVOCATION AND PLEDGE

Commr. Campione welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Pastor Chase Allen, with First Baptist Church of Umatilla, gave the Invocation and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

AGENDA UPDATE

Ms. Jennifer Barker, County Manager, said that there were no updates to the agenda.

MINUTES APPROVAL

On a motion by Commr. Sabatini, seconded by Commr. Parks and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved the minutes for the BCC meetings of March 10, 2026 (Regular Meeting), March 24, 2026 (Regular Meeting) and March 25, 2026 (Special Meeting).

CITIZEN QUESTION AND COMMENT PERIOD

Commr. Campione remarked that anyone who had joined the meeting through Zoom using their phone may press *9 to virtually raise their hand, and that anyone participating on Zoom could click the raise hand button to identify that they wished to speak. She added that everyone would have three minutes to speak, and that after three minutes, an alarm would sound to let them know that their time was up.

Mr. Gary Sandberg, a resident of Lake County, opined that a rezoning case that he was present for occurred due to errors made by Lake County years prior, and said that he had incurred almost $4,000 in fees from Lake County to repair this error; therefore, he opined that it would be just if the County could determine a way to reimburse him.

Commr. Campione said that the Board would typically ask the County Manager to review the facts.

Ms. Barker confirmed that staff would look into it.

CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT AND COMPTROLLER'S CONSENT AGENDA

On a motion by Commr. Morris, seconded by Commr. Parks and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved the Clerk of the Circuit Court and Comptroller's Consent Agenda, Items 1 and 2, as follows:

List of Warrants

Notice is hereby provided of warrants paid prior to this meeting, pursuant to Chapter 136.06 (1) of the Florida Statutes, which shall be incorporated into the Minutes as attached Exhibit A and filed in the Board Support Division of the Clerk's Office.

Deer Island CDD FY 2027 Proposed Budget

Notice is hereby provided of having received the Deer Island Community Development District proposed budget for Fiscal Year 2027 in accordance with Section 190.008 (2)(b), Florida Statutes, for purposes of disclosure and information only.

COUNTY MANAGER'S CONSENT AGENDA

Commr. Campione relayed that there were speaker cards for Tabs 4 and 5.

On a motion by Commr. Parks, seconded by Commr. Smith and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved the Consent Agenda, Tabs 6 through 9, pulling Tabs 4 and 5 to the regular agenda, as follows:

INFRASTRUCTURE AND TRANSPORTATION SERVICES

Facilities Management

Recommend approval:

1. To apply for a Florida Division of Historical Resources Grant to replace the windows at the Historical Courthouse; and

2. Of Resolution 2026-47 in support of the window replacement project and to pledge matching County funds and authorize the County Manager to sign the application and, if awarded and accepted by the Board, award related grant documents.

The estimated fiscal impact is $1,100,000 – $550,000 (revenue/expenditure – grant funded) and $550,000 (expenditure – county match) if awarded.

Public Works

Recommend approval:

1. To adopt Resolution 2026-48 declaring the collapse of Lake Erie Road as a qualifying event under Section 255.20(1)(c)1, Florida Statutes, which exempts the repair and reconstruction of the road from the competitive bidding process otherwise required pursuant to that statute;

2. To increase the emergency expenditure limits of Contracts 25-743A-C for on-call emergency infrastructure repair services from $3,000,000 to not exceed $3,500,000; and

3. To authorize the Office of Procurement Services to execute all supporting documentation.

The estimated fiscal impact is unknown at this time as expenditures are emergency event-related. Most projects shall not exceed the FEMA acceptable funding limits per project. Expenditures will not exceed available funding in each Fiscal Year's Budget.

Recommend approval:

1. To adopt Resolution 2026-49 declaring the collapse of Abbey Hill Court as a qualifying event under Section 255.20(1)(c)1, Florida Statutes, which exempts the repair and reconstruction of the road from the competitive bidding process otherwise required pursuant to that statute;

2. To increase the emergency expenditure limits of Contracts 25-743A-C for on-call emergency infrastructure repair services from $3,500,000 to not exceed $4,500,000; and

3. To authorize the Office of Procurement Services to execute all supporting documentation.

The estimated fiscal impact is unknown at this time as expenditures are emergency event-related. Most projects shall not exceed the FEMA acceptable funding limits per project. Expenditures will not exceed available funding in each Fiscal Year's Budget.

PARKS AND WATER RESOURCES

Parks and Trails

Recommend approval:

1. Of Contract 26-406 with Earthscapes Unlimited, Inc. (Coleman, FL) to provide athletic field painting and marking services; and

2. To authorize the Office of Procurement Services to execute the agreement and all supporting documentation.

The estimated fiscal impact is $115,000 (expenditure) and is within, and will not exceed, the Fiscal Year 2026 Budget. Annual expenditures shall at no time exceed the available Fiscal Year Budgeted funds.

TAB 4: PARTIAL RELEASE OF DEED OF CONSERVATION EASEMENT

The Chairman opened the floor for public comment.

Ms. Cindy Newton, a resident of Commission District 4, said that this was an eminent domain issue for a conservation easement, part of which had already been released for this project. She did not think that any conservation easement should be released without public input, and relayed her understanding that this conservation easement was granted solely to offset or prevent adverse impacts to natural resources, fish, wildlife, and wetland functions, to be held in its natural condition.

There being no one else who wished to address the Board regarding this matter, the Chairman closed the floor for public comment.

Commr. Campione opined that conservation easements usually stayed and that this item was unique.

Ms. Melanie Marsh, County Attorney, explained that this pertained to the Central Florida Expressway Authority (CFX) and their Lake-Orange Connector, and she pointed out a yellow area on a map which was the additional area that CFX requested that the County release from the conservation easement; furthermore, the red area had already been released, and the green area was the remaining conservation easement. She said that this was part of an eminent domain action, and that if the Board chose not to release it, then they would go through the court process and ultimately the court would release it. She stated that the County typically worked with its governmental partners, especially on a road that would benefit the public. She relayed her understanding that CFX needed the additional area because they switched the location of the trail.

Commr. Parks confirmed this, and relayed that a road alignment could sometimes cross over an existing easement, noting that this could be challenged with eminent domain, or it could be done through the current process which would be much cheaper for the taxpayers than going through eminent domain. He added that there would be about 45 acres of land permanently dedicated for the Florida Wildlife Corridor as part of this project. He opined that everyone should consider what was the larger gain and the ecological lift, and that there would be a greater lift to the wildlife corridor through dedication of that additional property, noting that a trail would also be part of this.

Commr. Campione clarified that a court case to remove a conservation easement was not something that the County would regularly do, and that their general position had been to not release these. She commented that the trade off was that they would have the trail, as well as avoiding going to court over this and losing.

On a motion by Commr. Parks, seconded by Commr. Smith and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved a Partial Release of Deed of Conservation Easement Standard with Third-Party Beneficiary Rights related to an eminent domain case with Central Florida

Expressway Authority (CFX), Case No. 2023-CA-2713, and for the Chairman to execute the partial release.

TAB 5: TERMINATION AND RELEASE OF CONSERVATION EASEMENT

Ms. Marsh explained that this item was a request from Mr. Steve Smith, with New Beginnings of Central Florida, and that they were in the process of purchasing this property. She elaborated that New Beginnings had located in their title search a 1984 conservation easement which stated that it was an easement for use in agriculture and passive recreation. She did not believe, by looking at the survey, that the easement was where it was supposed to be, and she displayed the easement line. She commented that the parcel which New Beginnings was going to purchase was already fairly built out, and that there were some metal buildings and a covered concrete area within that easement, though nothing had been constructed in the wetlands. She relayed that the adjacent property, which was somewhat encumbered by this easement, was also fairly built out, and that both of these properties were within the city limits of Groveland. She related that New Beginnings was requesting to release this easement to clear title and so they could complete their purchase and utilize this property. She relayed her understanding that they were going to use it as a thrift store to support their transitional housing operations.

The Chairman opened the floor for public comment.

Ms. Newton opined that no conservation easement should go without public input. She asked why it was allowed to be built on from 1987 to 2003, and why the solution was to eliminate the entire easement when part of it had been built on. She opined that there should be more procedures in place to bring these items to attention before something was put on them.

There being no one else who wished to address the Board regarding this matter, the Chairman closed the floor for public comment.

On a motion by Commr. Sabatini, seconded by Commr. Smith and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved a Termination and Release of Conservation Easement recorded in OR Book 820, Page 360, for property that is now in the City of Groveland.

FISCAL YEAR 2027 FIRE ASSESSMENT STUDY PRESENTATION

Ms. Jaime Stewart, Director for the Office of Management and Budget, said that for 20 years, the fire assessment study had been performed annually by a consultant and examined the utilization of the fire services and annual assessment rates; additionally, Benesch had provided analysis of the fire assessment rate and was present to review their findings.

Ms. Nilgun Kamp, with Benesch, explained that the technical study documented the assessable budget, reviewed the distribution of incidents by land use, and documented the property units by land use. She stated that these update calculations included 10 years of incident data and looked at the frequency and resource utilization. She added that it incorporated updated property units, and that it started with the requested fiscal year (FY) 2027 budget and subtracted any expenses related to advanced life support (ALS) services and dedicated revenues, as well as adding to any expenses related to having an assessment program, to come up with the assessable portion. She remarked that the County's current rates were based on a study completed in FY 2024 which was based on the FY 2025 budget, and that since then, both the requested and assessable budgets

increased about 28 percent; therefore, if nothing changed, all rates would increase by about 28 percent. She displayed the distribution of resources by land use and pointed out some minor fluctuations with the largest being a decrease in hotel/motel by about 10 percent, noting that the rest changed from around zero to five percent. She commented that they used the distribution of resources to distribute the assessable budget to each land use, and she mentioned that anytime it was around 28 percent was due to a budget increase, and when it was different, it was a combination of budget and change in resource utilization. She said that for property units, there were increases in residential, a decrease in vacant land, and nonresidential units seemed to be roughly stable. She commented that the rates were calculated by taking the allocated budget to each land use and dividing it by the number of property units, noting that residential resulted in a rate of $498, which was an increase from the current rate of $415. She added that hotel/motel/recreational vehicle (RV) parks would go from $124 to $140, and that vacant land would increase from $143 to $168. She recalled that the 2025 study incorporated tiering, and that they updated those calculations as well, noting that this basically allocated 70 percent of the residential budget equally among all land uses, and then 30 percent of the budget was distributed based on the size of units with smaller units paying less than larger units. She stated that this calculation resulted in a range of about $400 for homes less than 800 square feet, to $636 for homes which were 2,500 square feet or larger. She mentioned that in the previous year the Board had adopted a lower rate for the small home sizes, and that the remainder of the tiers had been charged the same rate of $415; therefore, these revised calculations indicated an increase of roughly 10 percent to 53 percent. She related that they used the same type of methodology to update the nonresidential rate calculations, and that those results for commercial rates was almost $0.70 per square foot and around $0.53 per square foot for industrial/warehouse; additionally, it was approximately $1.12 per square foot for institutional. She commented that nonresidential rates were based on multiple tiers, and she showed an example based on a 15,000 square foot building, noting that commercial and institutional would increase by about 30 percent and that the increase in industrial was larger because it had been bought down by the County. She showed a chart with a comparison of select land uses, and said that a 2,000 square foot residential home would potentially increase from $415 to $517, noting that increases mostly ranged from 13 percent to around 30 percent, with the exception of industrial/warehouse due to the decision to buy it down in the past.

Ms. Stewart relayed that on June 23, 2026, there would be the resolution containing the assessment seen on the truth in millage (TRIM) notices, and that on September 8, 2026, there would be a public hearing to adopt the assessment rates. She commented that the recommended rate remained the same as in the previously adopted fiscal year in all categories, and she requested to accept the study as presented.

On a motion by Commr. Sabatini, seconded by Commr. Parks and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved the FY 2027 Fire Assessment Study.

PUBLIC HEARINGS: REZONING

REZONING CONSENT AGENDA

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

There being no one who wished to address the Board regarding any cases on the Rezoning Consent Agenda, the Chairman closed the public hearing.

Commr. Campione said that she had visited the blueberry farm for Tab 3, opining that the property was great and had a beautiful wedding venue. She opined that there was nice synergy between the farm and the venue, and that it was an asset to the community because it was remaining in agriculture.

On a motion by Commr. Parks, seconded by Commr. Morris and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved the Rezoning Consent Agenda, Tabs 1 through 3, as follows:

Tab 1. Ordinance No. 2026-18
Rezoning Case # PZ2025-110
Sandberg Property (FLUM)
Amend the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) to change the Future Land Use Category (FLUC) on approximately 1 +/- acres from Urban High and Regional Commercial to Urban High, a small-scale Future Land Use amendment.

Tab 2. Ordinance No. 2026-19
Rezoning Case # PZ2025-110
Sandberg Property (RZ)
Rezone approximately 1 +/- acres from Neighborhood Commercial (C-1) and Rural Residential (R-1) to Rural Residential (R-1).

Tab 3. Ordinance No. 2026-20
Rezoning Case # PZ2025-394
Blueberry Farms (CUP)
Conditional use permit (CUP) approval on approximately 16.08 +/- acres to allow an enclosed Wedding Venue in the farm's existing packing house within the Agriculture (A) District.

REZONING REGULAR AGENDA

Tab 4.
Rezoning Case # PZ2025-130
Cedar Creek Rural Conservation Subdivision
Bonus pursuant to Land Development Regulations (LDR) Chapter XVII, Section 17.05.00.

Tab 5.
Rezoning Case # PZ2023-262
Iglesia Cristiana Pentecostal (RZ)
Rezone approximately 2.63 +/- gross acres from Agriculture District (A) to Community Facility District (CFD) to accommodate development of a place of worship.

CEDAR CREEK RURAL CONSERVATION SUBDIVISION

Mr. Mike Fitzgerald, Director for the Office of Planning and Zoning, presented Tab 4. Rezoning Case # PZ2025-130, Cedar Creek Rural Conservation Subdivision. He recalled that this item came before the Board at the April 7, 2026 meeting, and had been continued to the current day for additional information to be provided by the applicant. He explained that the applicant was requesting an optional bonus density on 119.4 acres located north of Number 2 Road and west of Mission Resort + Club. He said that the existing zoning was Agriculture and that the future

land use (FLU) was Rural Transition, and that the applicant was proposing 10 acres of additional open space over what the LDR would allow, which entitled them to the consideration for 20 additional units; however, they were only requesting 11 additional units, noting that they had 86 units by right. He stated that the applicant had entered into an agreement with the Town of Howey-in-the-Hills for water and sewer service, along with voluntary annexation.

Commr. Campione asked the Board to disclose any ex parte communication. She relayed that she had spoken to members of the community, particularly Mr. John Blodgett, a neighbor of the subject property, as well as members of the development team.

Commr. Parks disclosed that he had spoken to members of the community, Mr. Blodgett, the applicant, and Mr. Sean O'Keefe, Howey-in-the-Hills Town Manager.

Commr. Smith said that he had spoken to the applicant and some residents, and that he had received an email from the Town of Howey-in-the-Hills.

Commr. Sabatini and Commr. Morris indicated that they did not have ex parte communication.

Mr. Alex Stringfellow, representing the applicant, recalled that the requested information included the following: details on the conservation land management plan; feasibility of a roundabout at their entry location on Number 2 Road; and a concern about density and annexation with the future potential for adjacency to the Town of Howey-in-the-Hills. He indicated that a conservation land management plan was in the Board's packet, and he reviewed an image which highlighted the different types of ecosystems that they were looking to preserve. He then remarked that the Public Works Department came up with two alternatives including 120 foot and 100 foot inscribed circle diameter (ICD) roundabouts, and he showed an image of the 100 foot scenario, noting that they were willing to commit to provide this roundabout. He stated that there was a preexisting utility agreement with the Town of Howey-in-the-Hills, noting that they were required to annex to connect to services and that removing themselves from this would require Town action; therefore, it fell outside the applicant's power to control this. He commented that they could record in perpetuity all open space and green areas via deed restriction so that if anything would necessitate annexation, the open space would be protected by a legal instrument that the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) would have to enact any changes to in the future, noting that it would be in favor of the County. He recalled concerns from Mr. Blodgett regarding how close the homes were to Number 2 Road, and said that currently their first lot sat about 296 feet from the right of way edge of the new proposed roundabout; additionally, they were willing to shift the front lots to the back of the site and increase the buffer to 500 feet minimum, noting that this would be five times the required amount, as well as hold it in perpetuity in a conservation easement and follow the land management plan.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

Mr. Blodgett expressed concerns for Number 2 Road, opining that it was a substandard road and did not have the width for life safety. He questioned if the Town of Howey-in-the-Hills could comment about possibly not annexing until the road was addressed, and he indicated

concerns for annexing properties on a substandard road. He also said that he would like this to remain more rural looking.

Commr. Campione recalled that she had visited the area and said that she had a clearer perspective on the road width, and she expressed concerns that widening the road could possibly increase traffic and speeding with more opportunities for the rural nature of this area to change. She indicated concerns that widening the road potentially would not help with saving the area in a way that she opined that it should be saved.

Ms. Brittany Lerch, a resident on Bloomfield Avenue, opined that residents' number one priority was safety, and that they would also like to save the rural character of the area. She did not see how they could provide bonus density when the road was not up to code for fire and emergency vehicles, and she asked that if it was just developed as Rural Transition, would they be annexed by lot or was the whole property able to be annexed immediately. She expressed concerns for the 40 acres past the development which were for sale, and for houses being put on that property. She also indicated concerns for further developments, for Number 2 Road being treated as a collector road when it could not handle that type of traffic, for the safety of the road, and for adding around 100 more families.

Ms. Newton relayed that there were three ponds on the map, and she asked about what would happen to them with the changes that Mr. Stringfellow was making. She then indicated that one of the largest issues regarding density from people she had talked to was areas with one unit per five acres going down with a tiered system of three dwelling units per acre with more open space, or one unit per acre with 50 percent open space. She opined that this was a 400 percent increase in density to get 50 percent open space, that they were currently looking at providing slightly more open space and going up to a 520 percent in density, and that this needed to be reviewed.

Mr. O'Keefe remarked that the Cedar Creek proposal, as currently structured, was part of a coordinated framework between the developer and the Town of Howey-in-the-Hills, and that there was already a fully executed agreement providing for voluntary annexation, Town utility service and full developer funding of all infrastructure with those systems conveyed to the Town at no cost. He said that this meant the Town would have service responsibility, governance and long-term maintenance defined from the outset with no financial obligation on the part of the County. He commented that currently being discussed was whether this framework should be set aside for an exchange of roughly 11 units, and that this was the wrong tradeoff from the Town's perspective. He questioned if they wanted to keep a coordinated infrastructure-backed agreement, or replace it with a less certain outcome with a marginal increase in density. He opined that if the agreement was abandoned, there would be a loss of alignment between those who were serving and governing this project, and that they risked creating a fragmented development with less clarity and long-term service responsibility when they already had a low risk coordinated and negotiated agreement. He stated that he had spoken with the County Manager regarding the need for a maintenance map along Number 2 Road, and opined that they needed to clearly establish the question of right of way and maintenance responsibility to properly locate utilities; however, this

was a solvable issue. He also mentioned that Mr. Blodgett, the adjacent property owner to the east of the proposed development, had recently submitted a proposal to the County for a small scale commercial resort, opining that this was a great project and would fit nicely with the area; furthermore, the Town would also be open to annexation of that project and serving it with necessary utilities under the same framework as Cedar Creek. He opined that Cedar Creek met the Town's standard of coordinated growth and respect to the rural protection area (RPA) with infrastructure and governance aligned.

Commr. Campione asked that if they were not doing a rural conservation design subdivision or asking for bonuses, could the Town still provide them water.

Mr. O'Keefe pointed out that they were within the interlocal service boundary agreement (ISBA) and could be served by the Town.

Commr. Campione relayed her understanding that the Town did not have to require annexation.

Mr. O'Keefe confirmed this, and he opined that anywhere with density, the question of mutual aid arose. He opined that if they were adding significant blocks of density and the obligation fell on the Town to help protect those areas with police provisioning, and if they were not receiving the ad valorem taxes which funded this, then this created obligations on them; therefore, where there was an increase in density, it made sense to bring it into the town, opining that this was similar with utility service.

Commr. Campione opined that many Cities did one-offs, and she asked if the Legislature changed it so that they did not receive a premium or surplus.

Mr. O'Keefe relayed his understanding that 25 percent had been left.

Commr. Campione opined that it facilitated these situations where people received the benefit of a water connection and some extra funding was received, but they did not have to urbanize or change the character of an area. She said that she was trying to come up with a solution, opining that the community did not want to be urbanized and that this was an area which should not be urbanized. She also recalled that the Town had indicated a willingness to honor the RPA, and she requested a map to review the RPA in relation to this project.

Mr. O'Keefe said that the RPA began to the west of the westernmost border of this project, and that this project was outside the RPA.

Commr. Campione relayed that a concern she kept hearing was that this could open up property to the west to be annexed by the Town, and she asked why these types of items could not be included in an agreement that would also address how this property was served.

Mr. O'Keefe opined that they could, and relayed that staff had been discussing modifying the ISBA and whether the joint planning agreement (JPA) would fit into this. He stated that the Town would not be looking at these noncontiguous developments, except that they had already received County approval; furthermore, the Town opined that if they were in the ISBA and the Town could serve them, then the Town should serve them.

Commr. Campione reiterated that this project was on a road that everyone was trying to protect, and opined that Number 2 Road benefited the town because it made it more desirable;

therefore, she opined that staying out of that area was a win. She questioned why the Town would not be agreeable to providing water but not annexing the project. She opined that for the number of lots and the police service which could potentially be needed, this was more like a mutual aid item.

Mr. O'Keefe reviewed the properties between the town limits and this project, opining that the Beuchers would develop their property on Number 2 Road at some point; additionally, the Town had seen other proposals from people living on the road between Cedar Creek and the town limits.

Commr. Campione asked why providing water could not be included in ISBA negotiations or an agreement that the Town would be willing to serve this project without annexation. She opined that even if the Beucher property was annexed, that was the kind of annexation which would require much Town services; however, she opined that the subject project was not. She opined that they had the potential to address a road situation with the roundabout, and that it would slow truck traffic and truck traffic would not want to go there. She opined that it would have traffic calming effects, and that there was a dangerous curve there. She relayed her understanding that the issue was with annexation.

Commr. Parks expressed support for JPAs and working in good faith for both of their interests, and he reiterated the concern that if the project was annexed, then it would possibly become urbanized. He recalled a proposal that the open space would be put in an easement so that they would essentially be locked into the number of 97 units, and he inquired about what Mr. O'Keefe thought of this. He also asked about the original plan which came to the Town.

Mr. O'Keefe indicated his understanding that it was around 170 units, and that it was reduced quickly. He added that he did not see the Town wanting to push development of land which had been set aside for protection, and that the conservation easement made sense to him.

Commr. Parks proposed certificates of occupancy (COs) possibly not being issued until that segment of the road was improved from the roundabout over.

Mr. O'Keefe relayed his understanding that determining the right of way required the County to do the maintenance map, and said that he was hesitant to agree to a scenario where the Town had no control to move the needle, noting that it was not in the Town's domain to push for the maintenance map to be done or to discover right of way on their own. He clarified that he was not against the idea of locking in entitlements or an inability to annex into the RPA. He mentioned that Town and County staff had already been working together to discuss updating the ISBA or bringing in a JPA with the idea of looking at potential annexation paths along the County Road (CR) 48 corridor north into Yalaha if the Town would ever serve that area with utilities by request, noting that he saw some developments having failing water systems. He mentioned excluding the RPA from annexation by the Town.

Commr. Campione questioned why they could not do an addendum to the existing ISBA to address this situation.

Mr. O'Keefe opined that they were on this path with staff to identify particular parcels to include and exclude, and that the RPA had consistently been an exclusion zone for anything by

the Town. He reiterated that Cedar Creek would be the westernmost limit of anything the Town did.

Commr. Campione asked about the maintenance map, relaying that she had seen signs there where people did not want maintenance because they did not want to have their property taken; therefore, they mowed and took care of it. She said that she was against maintenance maps being used as a way to take property that should have to be paid for. She stated that she did not understand the need for the road to be so improved and widened from this point back to the town from the standpoint of if they were going to keep everything rural from that point.

Mr. O'Keefe opined that they would at least need the maintenance map to allow for the laying of the water line on the side of the road, regardless of what was done to the road itself.

Commr. Campione asked if this might be the ability to get an easement to place the water line.

Mr. O'Keefe confirmed this, and remarked that the County had been maintaining the road from decades prior.

Commr. Parks questioned if they would be encouraging development if they improved the road, though opined that they had to do something to make it slightly safer because there were trucks, regardless of how many people were living there.

Commr. Campione opined that the roundabout could help significantly because it would slow traffic down and some people may not go that way.

Mr. O'Keefe opined that there were practical things that could make CR 48 more appealing when going that same route.

Commr. Smith said that the subject property was in a transitional zone where they could do one unit per five acres, or three acres or one acre depending on the open space, and that the developer was requesting a bonus of 11 lots to go above this. He asked if the Town would be requiring the bonus to install infrastructure, or if they would annex and agree to the one unit per acre land designation.

Mr. O'Keefe replied that the Town had no particular choice of one number versus the other, and that the developer would have to determine if it would be worth it to fund a mile of pipe divided among a number of homes.

Commr. Smith relayed his understanding that the Town was not requiring the extra 11 lots to annex, and Mr. O'Keefe confirmed this.

Commr. Campione indicated her understanding that if the Town provided water, they would include in the agreement for this that they would have the right to annex, regardless of the lot number.

Mr. O'Keefe stated that it had been the understanding of the Town that annexation and utility provision was a path that made sense.

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

Commr. Smith stated that the land was purchased under the current zoning, and opined that the applicant should follow the rules for Rural Transition.

Commr. Campione opined that this did not solve the issue.

Commr. Smith opined that the issue was that the applicant was trying to go above Rural Transition, and that the bonus was that one was able to live in Lake County.

Commr. Campione opined that the roundabout would help the community significantly.

Commr. Smith recalled that the Board had denied items in other areas which had included sidewalks. He said that the County was asking Cities to preserve rural land, and he expressed support for the County sticking to their zoning requirements.

Commr. Sabatini made a motion to deny this item.

Commr. Smith seconded the motion.

Commr. Parks asked about the straight zoning scenario, and he pointed out that the Board had passed the rural conservation subdivision criteria, opining that the density bonus was included for a good reason. He hoped that the County would change all of its codes in the next month, and said that this could come up. He relayed that the density bonus had been put in place as an incentive to problem solve for, and that if they did a straight zoning scenario, they would likely not get the roundabout or the extra 13 percent open space that had some connectivity or management plans, noting that no management plan would be required. He also expressed concerns for how they were continuously set up in City versus County scenarios.

Mr. Fitzgerald explained that for a rural conservation subdivision, the applicant would be allowed 86 units by right, approved at a staff level, noting that they were permitted additional bonus density based on additional open space. He recalled that the applicant could request up to 20 units based the 10 acres they were providing, though they were only requesting 11. He commented that outside of a rural conservation subdivision, the existing zoning was Agriculture, which had a road frontage of 150 feet; therefore, it would up to the revised concept plan for the applicant to determine how many lots they could fit with the road frontage and up to one unit per five acres, three acres or one acre depending on the open space. He relayed his understanding that it would reduce the number of lots if they went with a straight Agriculture use at 150 foot minimum road frontage.

Commr. Parks inquired about the management of open space requirements through straight zoning.

Commr. Campione clarified that it was still a rural conservation subdivision design, just not with the bonus.

Mr. Fitzgerald reiterated that they could do a base density of one unit per five acres, one unit per three acres with 35 percent open space, or one unit per acre with 50 percent open space.

Commr. Parks asked about the number of units if they netted what they could not use as open space.

Mr. Stringfellow responded that they had roughly 85 upland acres, and that they could have a comparable density, noting that they would make the lots slightly shallower; furthermore, if they were not requesting the rural conservation subdivision, the management plan would not be required. He added that there were likely 25 additional requirements in the code currently to meet the criteria of the rural conservation subdivision standard.

Commr. Campione summarized that there were added protections in exchange for having it be a rural conservation subdivision design versus underlying zoning.

Mr. Fitzgerald relayed his understanding that for Commissioner Parks' question, the lot widths were proposed at a combination of 65 and 75 feet, and that even if they were 75 feet wide and had to be 150 feet, they would reduce the number of lots in half into around the 40 lot range.

Commr. Campione said that they could spread this out over the whole property.

Mr. Stringfellow added that they would take the additional 10 acres provided for the bonus and apply them back into the lots; therefore, it would not be a direct half cut, though it would be less.

Commr. Smith asked if there was any rule in the rural conservation subdivision plan that the applicant had to take the bonus density, and Mr. Fitzgerald denied this.

Mr. Stringfellow relayed that the bonus allowed them to finance the additional roundabout improvement that was not a rural conservation subdivision requirement. He opined that this was a valuable safety need, and that they could provide infrastructure for a rational transition to what was west of them.

Commr. Smith relayed his understanding that the applicant would have about 40 or 50 homes if they went straight zoning, and that if they went with the rural conservation subdivision design, they could utilize one unit per acre. He opined that this was the bonus, and that the applicant could either do the rural conservation subdivision design, minus the 11 lots, to get one unit per acre, or that they could have half of this.

Commr. Morris asked about the roundabout.

Commr. Smith opined that some people there wanted a roundabout and some did not, and that road improvements could add more traffic.

Commr. Parks clarified that he was trying to change the conversation as a whole, opining that it was easy to say that everything should be one unit per five acres or one acre. He elaborated that there was more if they were concerned about wildlife, ecological services and the way the County was going to look 30 years in the future, opining that there was connectivity which mattered. He opined that one unit per one or five acres on 40 acres with no management was much different than open space managed in perpetuity.

Commr. Smith agreed, and opined that this was why the applicant would have to use a rural conservation subdivision design to get all of the lots at one unit per acre.

Commr. Campione asked that if this motion passed and the 11 extra units were denied, would Commissioner Smith support a straight rural conservation subdivision design.

Commr. Smith confirmed this if it was one unit per acre. He clarified that his issue was that the request was above the one unit per acre zoning.

Commr. Campione inquired if Mr. O'Keefe would, in good faith, commit that the Town of Howey-in-the-Hills would agree not to annex further beyond the rural protection line on the left side of this property, as well as include this in an agreement.

Mr. O'Keefe confirmed this.

Commr. Campione relayed that the roundabout would come down to whether it could be funded or not, and that this would be a decision on the developer. She opined that it would be a great asset for safety and symbolize where rural protection started, and she implored the developer to still consider doing this. She opined that the County had a couple things accomplished if they could get past this motion and look at a straight rural conservation subdivision so that they could have a management plan on the property that was not contained within lots.

Mr. Fitzgerald relayed his understanding that the applicant had the right to move forward with a rural conservation subdivision, based on the County's regulations, with staff approval.

Ms. Marsh said that this was correct; however, if the Board denied this item, it would have to be done without the additional units.

Commr. Parks indicated his understanding that the roundabout would be excluded.

Commr. Smith opined that the applicant would possibly want to have the roundabout to make their property look better to sell it at a higher price.

Commr. Campione said that she was strictly looking at Number 2 Road and the time that the County spent trying to come up with a solution for the road and residents there, and that this was where she was coming from, rather than helping the applicant market their property better. She also implored Commissioner Smith to put his focus on safety.

Commr. Smith relayed that he had attended many meetings on Number 2 Road, and that he understood the issues and the other ideas.

Commr. Parks inquired if the roundabout and additional open space were off the table without the density bonuses.

Mr. Stringfellow opined that it was not easy or inexpensive to put a roundabout on Number 2 Road, and that it would be at least in excess of $500,000 to their team, along with the time required to determine the complications of that design. He said that when taking away 10 or 11 units, which was roughly $500,000, the math was not particularly good; however, they could review this, and there may be an opportunity to determine something with impact fee credits, noting that this could potentially be an agreement brought back to the Board at a later date.

Commr. Parks asked if Mr. Stringfellow wanted to wait until he could tell the Board definitively.

Mr. Stringfellow relayed that the applicant's worst case scenario was the base density, which would not come back before the Board, noting that they would have to determine design solutions in an administrative fashion. He added that in the best case scenario, they would agree to deed restrict and put a conservation easement on 61 percent of their land, as well as agree to improve Number 2 Road with a roundabout.

Commr. Campione recalled that Mr. Stringfellow had said that they would have an easement in place so that if this was eventually annexed into the Town of Howey-in-the-Hills, no more lots could be added. She opined that one of the Board's concerns was that eventually, the Town could annex it and all of the open space could be turned into lots.

Commr. Smith asked if this was an opportunity to do a public/private partnership and share costs for the roundabout.

Ms. Marsh responded that this would be the agreement regarding impact fees.

Mr. Stringfellow indicated that the applicant could go with the base density of the rural conservation subdivision, and then work with staff and return with an impact fee agreement for the Board to review.

Commr. Smith proposed that they work with staff to come up with a cost sharing opportunity to have a roundabout on Number 2 Road.

Commr. Campione relayed her understanding that the County could possibly include the easement in the negotiations with the Town regarding the ISBA so that this project would not be increased in density in the future, at such time as the Town annexed it. She clarified that when the Board voted in favor of the motion, they were not voting against the applicant doing these good things, and that the Board was signaling to the Town that they hoped that this property would be included in the ISBA as a property which would not be increased in density.

On a motion by Commr. Sabatini, seconded by Commr. Smith and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board denied Tab 4, Rezoning Case #RZ-17-21-4, Cedar Creek Rural Conservation Subdivision.

IGLESIA CRISTIANA PENTECOSTAL (RZ)

Mr. Fitzgerald presented Tab 5, Rezoning Case # PZ2023-262, Iglesia Cristiana Pentecostal (RZ). He explained that the requested action was to rezone approximately 2.63 gross acres from Agriculture to Community Facility District (CFD) to accommodate development of a place of worship. He said that the Planning and Zoning Board had voted unanimously to recommend approval, and that the location was 13131 CR 561A. He commented that the concept plan depicted a 7,337 square foot single story house of worship, and that utilizing an estimated chair count of 150, the concept plan also depicted 75 parking spaces and three handicap accessible parking spaces. He commented that the maximum impervious surface ratio (ISR) for a project like this would be 35 percent, and that currently the site plan showed 48 percent; therefore, staff would work with the applicant on alternatives to ensure that the cap of 35 percent ISR was met. He said that the application had been provided to the City of Minneola to review, and that the City had no objections. He stated that the adjacent properties included vacant land, residential and agricultural uses, and that for water and sewer, the City had provided documentation indicating that potable and sewer were not available to the subject property, noting that the septic tank system and well shall be consistent with the Florida Department of Health (FDOH). He remarked that Lake County Fire Station 85 was located less than five miles from the subject property, and that transportation review of this proposal was considered to be de minimis.

Mr. Abdul Alkadry, a civil engineer representing the applicant, said that the applicant did some revisions to the site plan which had not been submitted to staff yet. He specified that it was revised to adjust the impervious surface, and that they were using some grass parking instead of asphalt pavement, noting that the buffers had also been indicated.

Commr. Parks asked if this site plan would be reflective of trying to meet the ISR.

Mr. Fitzgerald commented that if this item was approved, staff would work with the applicant for alternatives on the ISR, such as stabilized grass parking.

Commr. Parks inquired if there was a waiver for setbacks.

Mr. Fitzgerald said that there would be a 10 foot wide landscape buffer required on the northern, eastern and western perimeter, and that this would be the setback for the property.

Commr. Parks asked if there was a landscape plan.

Mr. Fitzgerald stated that they did not currently have one, and that this would be addressed at the time of site plan.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

Mr. Doug Ramsay, a neighbor of the subject property, said that his property was a certified Florida tree farm, and that the subject property owner had stated that the trees to the east of their property provided a buffer in that direction; however, his tree farm had been in existence for decades and came up in the next five years to be harvested, noting that this would expose his domicile and several neighboring properties with direct line of sight and sound to where the proposed building was supposed to be. He also indicated that there were gopher tortoises on neighboring properties, and opined that there were gopher tortoises on the subject property as well. He expressed concerns for light pollution from the building and the parking lot being excessive for a rural neighborhood, and commented that there was a 10 foot buffer between their property lines, opining that it was similar to sitting a multiple story building in their backyard. He opined that there were issues with water and sewage, and he was unsure why the City of Minneola commented on this since it was not part of the city. He opined that there were issues with safety on CR 561A, and he indicated concerns for the traffic and noise that this request would produce in a rural neighborhood.

Pastor Ernest Portalatin, representing the applicant, asked the Board to approve this item, noting that they were doing a buffer and could also put tree lines on that area to help reduce noise or lighting.

Mr. Michael Stenzel, a resident on Cynthia Lane, opined that they wanted to change agricultural land to municipal land in an area with predominantly five or more acre lots. He opined that this item was making an exception for only a 10 foot buffer, relaying his understanding that agriculture land was a 25 foot buffer. He indicated his understanding that if they took 25 feet on both sides of the property, they would only have 40 feet to build on; therefore, he opined that it was unbuildable in its current state. He added that the property went uphill, and he expressed concerns for water coming down the hill. He relayed his understanding that to build on the property, the applicant would have to raise this up, which could cause mitigation issues to property owners on each side. He was also unsure why the City of Minneola would be involved, and he suggested that if the Board approved it, to put right and left turn lanes on CR 561A; however, he opined that if they had to put a right turn lane in, they would be encroaching on the neighbor's property to do this. He also mentioned that there were bicyclists there.

Mr. Daryl Woodhouse, a resident representing Mr. Luis Bidrogo, a neighbor of the subject property, opined that this property was too narrow to do what the applicant wanted. He relayed his understanding that they were down to 80 feet wide with the buffers, and that they had to encroach where there was an easement that had access to the property to the north. He relayed his

understanding that they were then down to a buildable footprint of around 70 feet, opining that it was not conducive to have this traffic, parking and footprint of a building in that area. He opined that the property was designed for a residential agricultural property, and that the request was not the highest and best use of that property; rather, he opined that it would decrease the highest and best use of the properties surrounding it.

Mr. Bidrogo asked the Board to deny the application, expressing concerns for the proposed site plan in a rural environment. He opined that lighting would affect animals, and that the property would be high, noting that there was a 35 degree incline. He opined that they would have to raise the property by eight to 10 feet to make it level, and that the obligation would apply to a 75 foot high building. He questioned how large the building would be on top of a mountain and all of the houses around it, and he expressed concerns for this being his view. He said that he did not know who would be walking into the property, and he expressed concerns for safety and drainage. He asked the Board not to change the use of land without having this information upfront.

Mr. Mike Lorden waived his comments in opposition.

Mr. Vic Pacheco, a neighbor of the subject property, opined that the property was narrow, and relayed his understanding that there was 80 to 90 feet of elevation in height. He expressed concerns for stormwater and potential flooding issues, and opined that this did not fit in their rural setting.

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

Mr. Alkadry clarified that the 10 foot buffer would be landscaped with trees, and that there was a way to have zero spillage of lighting across the property line by using refractors on the lights. He commented that this would be done during the permitting phase of the project, and that they had reduced the impervious surface area significantly; therefore, all the water would be handled onsite.

Commr. Parks said that he had visited the site, and opined that churches were appropriate in a pastoral setting, though it depended on what lot it was and how it could be built. He opined that there were many constraints with this, noting that an easement had to go up to the top for access, and he questioned how quickly the 10 foot border could be filled with landscaping, assuming 10 feet was enough. He opined that it was too narrow for a church, and that lighting would still be seen. He commented that it was very steep, and that he had serious concerns with the use and the way it was laid out on this narrow lot; therefore, he could not support it.

Commr. Sabatini agreed, and he expressed concerns for the narrowness of the lot, the constraints of the road and the elements of sprawl it created. He mentioned that he would like for it to stay agriculture, and opined that there were other opportunities to grow a church.

Commr. Campione recalled that the Board had been supportive of churches, though opined that the constraints of this property were glaring. She opined that the width and change of elevation made it difficult, and said that the Board tried to find ways to balance the interests and look out for each side of a situation; however, they did not have items such as larger buffers and landscaping

already in place with the current item. She opined that this was not a good location in light of the constraints of the property.

On a motion by Commr. Parks, seconded by Commr. Sabatini and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board denied Tab 5, Rezoning Case # PZ2023-262, Iglesia Cristiana Pentecostal (RZ).

REGULAR AGENDA

GRANT AGREEMENT LANGUAGE FOR COMPLIANCE WITH FEDERAL IMMIGRATION LAW

Commr. Sabatini said that the County did grant applications with commitments and stipulations, and that this was an item which indicated that any grant application requesting funding would comply with Federal law. He specified that there was already a Federal law indicating that unless a State said otherwise, all local governments could not give any benefits to anyone who had not been determined to be a legal resident; therefore, this item would include language to say that anyone seeking to receive grants from the County would ensure that they were conferring benefits upon American citizens.

Ms. Marsh stated that if the Board wanted staff to add this to all of their grant contracts and applications, they could do this.

Commr. Smith asked if there were any issues.

Ms. Marsh denied this, clarifying that the County was just adding Federal law to its language. She added that the County already had multiple pages of State of Florida and Federal statutes that they included in their contracts.

On a motion by Commr. Sabatini, seconded by Commr. Parks and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved to include language in the County's grant agreements from 8 USC 1621 to establish a procedure for determining compliance with the Federal Immigration Law.

SUNNYSIDE OAKS DEVELOPMENT PRESENTATION

Commr. Campione remarked that this item regarded an annexation into the City of Leesburg, and that the Lake County Public Works Department had been reviewing a safety situation and trying to come up with a scenario to address safety. She said that the people who lived in the neighborhood and had large trailers were concerned if they would be able to navigate this roundabout.

Mr. Jeff Earhart, Engineering and Operations Director for the Public Works Department, said that this item was near the City of Leesburg between Lake Harris and Lake Griffin. He showed an image of Sunnyside Oaks on a map, specifying that it was south of United States (U.S.) Highway 441 and east of State Road (SR) 44. He stated that this had been approved by the Leesburg City Commission in 2022, and that it was around 30 acres with approximately 83 houses. He commented that it was near Sunnyside Drive and Fern Drive, and he displayed a plan for the subdivision, noting that there was a proposed roundabout that the County had put there. He explained that it came in at an odd angle so that the roundabout would calm traffic and be a safer intersection, and that based on the displayed map, the road was somewhat on the property to the southwest; therefore, the roundabout would move it off the property. He said that staff reviewed

a variety of different vehicles that could possibly go through this, including a 50-foot long RV, a semitruck, and a truck with a trailer that was 50 feet long, noting that they wanted to discourage large semitrucks but allow residents with RVs and trailers to be able to get through. He confirmed that they could all get through and did not have to use the truck apron, and that it should facilitate the movement of vehicles safely, as well as slow them down and allow RVs and campers to come in both the east/west and north/south directions. He relayed that roundabouts had fewer conflict points than traffic signals or stop signs, and that conflicts would be less severe as they would likely be side hits rather than T-bone accidents. He also mentioned pedestrian benefits and traffic calming, and relayed his understanding that the County had right of way for this already with the developer being prepared to construct it.

Commr. Smith asked who was funding the roundabout, and Mr. Earhart replied that it was the developer.

Commr. Campione expressed appreciation to staff for doing these simulations and ensuring that they could accommodate trucks and trailers. She added that the curb would be soft.

Mr. Earhart mentioned that there would be a truck apron in the center, though residents would not have to utilize this. He also indicated that construction would likely start in the next month.

ORDINANCE REGARDING CABLE COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Marsh said that this item went along with the affidavit for the homeowners associations (HOAs), noting that each time the Board added a new regulation, they repealed an old one. She explained that the County had been prohibited from doing cable communication franchises for many years, though this had never been cleaned up from the code; therefore, it would be removed from the code. She said that there were a couple of provisions which staff would move into Section 18-3, which was right of way utilization permits, and that this item would be brought back for a public hearing.

On a motion by Commr. Sabatini, seconded by Commr. Smith and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved to advertise an ordinance repealing Chapter 6.5, Lake County Code, entitled Cable Communications, and amending Section 18-3, Lake County Code, entitled Right-of-Way Utilization Permits.

APPOINTMENT TO THE ELDER AFFAIRS COORDINATING COUNCIL

Commr. Parks opined that Mr. David Hopkins had outstanding character and would work hard on this council.

Commr. Campione said that the group was working on several items, including trying to create a resource that was easy for people to navigate and understand so that they could find out what was available in Lake County regarding services, as opposed to commercial-type uses. She thanked Mr. Hopkins for wanting to apply.

On a motion by Commr. Sabatini, seconded by Commr. Parks and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved to appoint Mr. David Hopkins to the Elder Affairs Coordinating Council as a District 1 member (Seat 2) with a term ending January 31, 2028, and applicable waiver.

APPOINTMENTS TO THE CHILDREN'S SERVICES COUNCIL

On a motion by Commr. Sabatini, seconded by Commr. Smith and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved to appoint members to the Children's Services Council and applicable waivers, as follows: Ms. Lori Gravitt as a District 1 member (Seat 1) with a term ending May 14, 2028; Ms. Juana Delacruz as a District 2 member (Seat 1) with a term ending May 14, 2028; Mr. John Herrell as a District 3 member (Seat 1) with a term ending May 14, 2028, with conflict waiver; Mr. Byron E. Thompson as a District 4 member (Seat 1) with a term ending May 14, 2028, with conflict waiver; Ms. Kayla Tufts as a District 5 member (Seat 1) with an interim term ending May 14, 2026, and with reappointment for the next two-year term ending May 14, 2028; Ms. Courtney Domingue as a member at large (Seat 1) with a term ending May 14, 2028; Mr. Angel Coba as a member at large (Seat 2) with an interim term ending May 14, 2026, and with reappointment for the next two-year term ending May 14, 2028; and Ms. Malika Ramrattan as a member at large (Seat 2) with a term ending May 14, 2027.

COMMISSIONERS REPORTS

COMMISSIONER PARKS – VICE CHAIRMAN AND DISTRICT 2

SECOND VICE PRESIDENT FOR FAC

Commr. Parks relayed that he was possibly considering another run at the Second Vice President for the Florida Association of Counties (FAC), noting that he would need to know that no one on the Board objected to this; additionally, a letter would have to come from the Board Chairman to FAC indicating that the Board discussed this and was agreeable.

CELEBRATION OF LIFE FOR MS. NADINE FOLEY

Commr. Parks related that he attended Ms. Nadine Foley's celebration of life, and that he had expressed condolences from the BCC. He said that Ms. Foley was a great woman for Lake County who not only supported him early on, but also supported many conservation issues, including being involved with Trout Lake Nature Center. He opined that it was a beautiful ceremony.

THANKING LAKE COUNTY HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Commr. Parks thanked the Lake County Historical Society for the celebration of history on the previous Saturday. He opined that they did a great job, and stated that he liked what they were doing to encourage people to visit the Historic Courthouse.

COMMISSIONER SMITH – DISTRICT 3

BUDGET WORKSHOP

Commr. Smith thanked staff for their work in preparation for the previous day's budget workshop, and he wished that there were more individuals from the public in attendance for the budget workshops, noting that he would be doing his best to promote this.

LAW ENFORCEMENT MEMORIAL

Commr. Smith commented that the Lake County Law Enforcement Memorial had been on the current day, and that it was an honor to attend. He opined that Commissioner Campione had done a wonderful job presenting a proclamation with a good speech; furthermore, their hearts went out to the families of the fallen officers throughout Lake County.

COMMISSIONER CAMPIONE – CHAIRMAN AND DISTRICT 4

LAW ENFORCEMENT MEMORIAL

Commr. Campione thanked Commissioner Smith for his comments regarding the Law Enforcement Memorial, opining that the Lake County Sheriff's Office (LCSO) did a great job. She said that she felt for the families who had been in attendance, and that it was wonderful to be able to come together as a community and acknowledge the great sacrifice that their loved ones and the families made. She hoped that the County could possibly modify the following year's proclamation and address the families at the service.

BACK THE BLUE WALK

Commr. Campione said that on the following Saturday at Wooten Park, there would be a Back the Blue walk. She added that this had been an event for seven years, and that it was a great opportunity to show support for local law enforcement.

COUNTY ATTORNEY

GAS TAX BALLOT LANGUAGE

Ms. Marsh related that regarding the gas tax ballot language which had been discussed on the previous day to be brought back at the end of May 2026, the Supervisor of Elections did not need it until August 2026; therefore, she would ask the Board to give her more leeway to do this, noting that she would bring this back to the Board at a future date.

COMMISSIONER SMITH – DISTRICT 3

NATIONAL ASTRONAUT DAY

Commr. Smith said that it was National Astronaut Day.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to be brought to the attention of the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 12:16 p.m.

_____

LESLIE CAMPIONE, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:

_____

GARY J COONEY, CLERK