A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

MAY 19, 2026

The Lake County Board of County Commissioners met in regular session on Tuesday, May 19, 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; 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; Gary J. Cooney, Clerk of the Circuit Court and Comptroller; Kristy Mullane, Chief Financial Officer; and Stephanie Cash, Deputy Clerk.

INVOCATION AND PLEDGE

Commr. Campione welcomed everyone to the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) meeting.

Pastor Jim Mory, with Union Congregational Church in the City of Tavares, gave the Invocation and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

AGENDA UPDATE

Ms. Jennifer Barker, County Manager, mentioned that updates included the following: on Tab 19, a subordination of utility interests document was added; there was a request to pull Tab 28; on Tab 30, a revised interested party comments document was added to include a missing page, the Collier County ordinance was added, and a revised proposed ordinance was added; and on Tab 32, an errata sheet was added.

Commr. Morris inquired why Tab 28 was being pulled.

Ms. Barker explained that there were questions on Tab 28 regarding the procurement process for the playground equipment at the North Lake Regional Park, and that they would bring it back at a later time with more information.

EMPLOYEE AWARDS

Ms. Jeannine Nelson, Associate Director for the Office of Human Resources and Risk Management, announced that they would be recognizing employees who had reached significant milestones in their careers with Lake County, as follows:

FIVE YEARS
William Ondulich, Office of Building Services Director
Office of Building Services

Matthew Polinder, Senior Plans Examiner
Office of Building Services

Jessica Carr, Emergency Dispatch Lead
Office of Fire Rescue – Emergency Dispatch

Oisin McKenna, Computer Technician I
IT – Service Desk

TEN YEARS
Jeremy Rodriguez, Public Works Permitting Technician I
Public Works Department – Stormwater

TWENTY YEARS
Anthony Besciani, Firefighter/EMT
Office of Fire Rescue

John Yang, Telecommunications Supervisor
IT – Telecommunications

TWENTY-FIVE YEARS
Mark Peck, Maintenance Technician II
Office of Facilities Maintenance

RETIREMENT
Eric Welhaven, Office Manager
Office of County Probation

ANNUAL COMPREHENSIVE FINANCIAL REPORT PRESENTATION

Mr. Gary Cooney, Lake County Clerk of the Circuit Court and Comptroller, recognized the following employees for their hard work on the external audit preparation for the Annual Comprehensive Financial Report (ACFR) and the Popular Annual Financial Report (PAFR): Ms. Kristy Mullane, Chief Financial Officer; Ms. Mary Burns, Accounting Director; Mr. Kevin McDonald, Budget Director; Ms. Cyndi Richardson; Ms. Yadira Perez; and Ms. Nila Baker. He commented that the Clerk's Office had received the Certificate for Achievement for the Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) for the past 44 years, and that they also received the award for Outstanding Reporting for the PAFR for the past 15 years. He added that the Board and the Clerk's Office participated in the GFOA Distinguished Budget Award program, that the Board had received this award for 19 years, and that the Clerk's Office had received this award for 34 years. He also recognized Ms. Kelly LaFollette, Information Outreach Manager, for assistance with the cover design on the ACFR and the PAFR, noting that they would be available on the Clerk's Office website. He commented that Mr. Joel Knopp, a Partner with Forvis Mazars LLP, was in attendance on the current day and would present the report.

Mr. Knopp mentioned that there was a separate communication letter provided in the agenda, which included auditor responsibilities, management responsibilities, and internal controls related to the audit. He related that the County implemented a new accounting standard for Fiscal Year (FY) 2025 related to compensated absences, and that even though there was a restatement, it was not material to the financial statements related to that liability. He remarked that no audit adjustments were identified, which indicated good internal controls over financial reporting by the Clerk's Office staff, and that there were no significant issues, concerns, or disagreements during the audit, opining that a very smooth audit process was normal for the Clerk's Office. He commented that under the deliverables, there were audit reports throughout the document, and that their opinion on the financial statements was on pages 13 through 15. He elaborated that they issued an unmodified opinion, which was a clean opinion, and that the numbers were presented in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles. He stated that the compliance report was towards the back of the document, and that there was a report related to major Federal and State grants. He explained that there were four Federal programs that were tested as well as four State programs with a significant amount of compliance and internal control testing, and that the County came out clean, as there were no significant deficiencies or material weaknesses. He

remarked that there was a report on internal controls over financial reporting and compliance under government audit standards, and that this was also a clean report with no significant deficiencies or material weaknesses. He commented that the last two documents related to reports required by the Auditor General, including a management letter and an accountant's report related to the County's compliance with investment policy and E-911 fees, and that those were also clean reports, which indicated good internal controls and processes in place. He pointed out that a few financial highlights included the following: the total net position at the countywide level increased approximately $100 million, which considered the long-term capital assets of the County as well as the long-term liabilities; there was a negative unrestricted net position amount relating to the pension and liabilities of the County, which was consistent and not unusual for Florida governments; the General Fund, which was the key operating fund of the County, had level results for the year with a net change in fund balance of $1 million; the unassigned General Fund balance decreased to about 18 percent of total expenditures for the year, which was over the goal the County set of seven to 12 percent, noting that this was a good position at the end of FY 2025; the County budgeted conservatively and received $17 million over projection in revenues, which was $10 million less than what was budgeted from an expenditure standpoint overall, noting that this was a favorable budget variance for the year; and proprietary funds, which was from the landfill and internal service funds, stayed steady and actually improved slightly in results for the year. He indicated appreciation to Mr. Cooney and staff for a job well done throughout the audit.

Commr. Parks expressed appreciation to Mr. Knopp, Mr. Cooney, and staff, and opined that it was a great day for local civics when this was done every year. He opined that the importance was underappreciated, and noted that even though Mr. Cooney was elected to serve the Clerk's Office, he was also willing to oversee the ACFR process for the County. He indicated appreciation for the net position improving for the County, as the Board had expressed the desire to build up reserves, noting that even though some of it was lost due to a hurricane, he was hopeful that the County would get some of it back from the Federal Government.

Commr. Campione expressed appreciation to Mr. Cooney, opining that the Clerk's Office did great work. She said that she recommended the PAFR to anyone in the public, opining that it gave a great overview of how all the County departments worked, as well as the Constitutional Officers, and how they all worked together off a budget that was overseen by the Clerk's Office. She stated that this had been checked out, and that the County was doing things the way they were supposed to be done, noting that the Clerk's Office conducted audits throughout the year to ensure all funds were lining up in the different departments and being spent on the items they were budgeted for.

Mr. Cooney opined that Ms. Barker did a great job for the County, and noted that she had been the budget director for many years and understood how that worked. He commented that the Clerk's Office mostly did consulting for the audit, and that the County staff responded very well, noting that they could do initial consulting if they were changing processes to ensure that those internal controls were in place from the beginning. He asked the Board to approve the ACFR that had been presented for the current year.

On a motion by Commr. Morris, seconded by Commr. Parks and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved the ACFR as presented.

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 meeting of April 7, 2026 (Regular Meeting) as presented.

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. Banks Helfrich, a farmer from the Clay Road District, stated that his farm tip of the day was that it was time to plant summer crops, such as watermelons, okra, sweet potatoes, peanuts, and luffas, noting that luffas could be eaten when green; additionally, when luffas were old, they could be dried out, skinned, and used for exfoliating in the shower. He commented that there was a seven-acre farm in the City of Clermont area that had 15 different gardens with three farmers working the farm, and that they participated in crop sharing, which was sharing crops amongst themselves or given away to the community. He mentioned that the 15 farms included the following: an 88-tree fruit bearing orchard; a vineyard of 15 different grape plants, which yielded about 60 pounds of muscadine grapes per year; a raised bed garden; a vegetable garden; an herb garden; a flower garden; a tea garden; two shade gardens; a pineapple patch; and a wild blackberry patch. He relayed that this farm opened its gates once a month to the public to come and experience a two-hour tour, which included picking and tasting whatever was in season, and noted that since there were no pesticides or herbicides, there may be insects on the plants. He remarked that the concept of this farm was to teach others how to grow their own food, and that plants, trees, and seeds were given away to attendees, opining that this was the best way to bring down grocery costs. He commented that this farm was borrowed from the master gardener's children and grandchildren and was named the Giving Farm, noting that he lived on this farm.

Mr. Vance Jochim, a resident of Lake County, opined that the Board needed to establish a committee to investigate how to use artificial intelligence (AI) to improve operations and streamline administration, and said that there was much information for and against using AI, noting that he had done a study on school districts that were improving their operations using AI, such as saving about four hours per week for administrative personnel. He opined that the County should cap budget growth and set a 10 percent reduction in the department budgets until there were some results from the use of this new tool, and said that even though it could be challenging to learn, he had been using it on a daily basis. He also commented that there was a new all-Muslim development being proposed in the City of Tavares, and noted that three of them had already been banned in the State of Texas because of concerns. He also opined that the County's new agenda management software, which incorporated AI, was very confusing to use even though it included

much information about accessibility, and he suggested that the user interface and design be reviewed.

PROCLAMATION 2026-36: DESIGNATING MAY 17-23, 2026 AS NATIONAL EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES WEEK

On a motion by Commr. Sabatini, seconded by Commr. Parks and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved Proclamation 2026-36 designating May 17-23, 2026, as National Emergency Medical Services Week.

On a motion by Commr. Sabatini, seconded by Commr. Parks and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved National Older Americans Month Proclamation 2026-43.

On a motion by Commr. Sabatini, seconded by Commr. Parks and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved Proclamation 2026-44 honoring the Small Business Development Center at the University of Central Florida for receiving the U.S. Small Business Administration's Small Business Development Center of the Year award.

On a motion by Commr. Smith, seconded by Commr. Sabatini and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved Proclamation 2026-42 recognizing the Arching Oaks Art and Culture Center of Florida Budokan.

Chief David Kilbury, Public Safety Director, stated that he would like to recognize their Emergency Medical Services (EMS) professionals, and indicated appreciation to the over 500 men and women who provided that first response service in Lake County. He introduced the current paramedic class in attendance, and commented that Lake County was doing something that no one else in the State of Florida was doing currently, which was pulling about 20 emergency medical technicians (EMTs) off the street and putting them through an inhouse paramedic class. He pointed out that this was their second class, and said that he was proud of them. He related that they had received the Cardiac Arrest Registry to Enhance Survival (CARES) registry, and that they had above average National and State level cardiac arrest survivals. He opined that this was only possible through the Board's dedication and commitment, and expressed his appreciation for that.

Commr. Campione read and presented Proclamation 2026-36 to Chief Kilbury.

PROCLAMATION 2026-43: NATIONAL OLDER AMERICANS MONTH

Commr. Campione introduced Ms. Cheryl Rumbley, who was the chair of the Elder Affairs Coordinating Council, and then she read and presented Proclamation 2026-43 to Ms. Rumbley.

Ms. Rumbley indicated appreciation to the BCC for their support of the Elder Affairs Coordinating Council and for recognizing the older Americans in their community, and mentioned that the number of people over 65 years was about 18 percent of the population nationally, 21.6 percent in the State of Florida, and 26.8 percent in Lake County, opining that this was a large number of individuals who were very active and still participating and contributing to the community. She related that the Elder Affairs Coordinating Council held an annual Senior Expo, which would be in October 2026, to provide information to that part of the community on healthcare and services that were helpful to them.

PROCLAMATION 2026-44: HONORING THE SBDC AT UCF

Ms. Meg Brew, Director for the Office of Economic Development, said that it was her pleasure to recognize the Small Business Development Center (SBDC) at the University of Central Florida (UCF) for receiving a proclamation honoring them as the United States (U.S.) Small Business Association (SBA) SBDC of the year out of the entire country, and noted that the local SBDC served all of Lake County with offices in the Cities of Groveland and Eustis and had been an invaluable partner to the business community. She elaborated that their team provided one-on-one consulting, training, and guidance that helped small businesses start, grow, and thrive, and that over the prior year, they had supported thousands of local entrepreneurs, helped secure significant capital investment, and strengthened the economic vitality of this community. She mentioned that this recognition reflected their outstanding performance and deep commitment to servicing the people and businesses of Lake County, noting that they were grateful for their partnership and proud to celebrate this achievement.

Commr. Campione read and presented Proclamation 2026-44 to Mr. Jose Molfino, Area Manager of the SBDC at UCF's office in Lake County.

Mr. Molfino expressed appreciation to the BCC and staff, noting that Ms. Brew and Ms. Kathleen Dial, Executive Director for Development Services, offered key support to their program. He said that it was an honor to accept this proclamation on behalf of the Florida SBDC at UCF, and that even though being recognized by the SBA as the SBDC of the year was an incredible milestone, it was not reached alone, as it was a direct result of a powerful and enduring partnership. He elaborated that since 2012, the Central Florida SBDC and the Lake County Office of Economic Development had worked hand-in-hand to build a resilient entrepreneur ecosystem, and opined that small businesses were the backbone of Lake County. He mentioned that currently, this county was home to about 8,800 employer establishments and over 39,000 non-employer businesses, and that even though small businesses were just a segment of the economy, they accounted for the vast majority of local enterprises and employed a massive percentage of the local workforce. He remarked that over the prior 14 years, their collaboration had yielded historic results, and that together they had guided and supported 1,913 unique businesses and delivered over 23,000 hours of no-cost confidential consulting to area entrepreneurs, which meant measurable prosperity for the community. He said that historically, every $1 invested by local governments in the SBDC programs around the country generated approximately $50 in return to the local economy, and estimated that with Lake County's consistent and visionary investment, this partnership had created an economic impact of $1 million in Lake County since 2012. He opined that this national award belonged to Lake County as much as it belonged to the SBDC, and indicated appreciation for believing in their mission, investing in entrepreneurs, and partnering with them for 14 years, noting that they looked forward to helping Lake County's small businesses thrive for many more years to come.

PROCLAMATION 2026-42 RECOGNIZING THE ARCHING OAKS ART AND CULTURE CENTER OF FLORIDA BUDOKAN

Commr. Smith opined that this was a wonderful program and a wonderful organization.

Commr. Campione mentioned that Commissioner Smith had highlighted the Arching Oaks Art and Culture Center of Florida Budokan in a Board Short and had been out there, opining that people could learn about something they did not know was happening in Lake County. She read and presented Proclamation 2026-42 to Mr. Sabastian Velilla, President of the Arching Oaks Art and Culture Center, and noted that the City of Eustis was instrumental in facilitating the Japan Festival Eustis. She opined that it was fabulous and well-attended, and that if it continued, it would grow.

Commr. Smith opined that this proclamation was recognition for Japanese art as well as culture, which was about community, and said that this was taught within their facility. He expressed appreciation to what they had done for the City of Eustis and for Lake County as a whole, and for bringing the Japanese cultural spirit to Lake County, which was family oriented and nature driven.

Mr. Velilla indicated appreciation for the proclamation, and said that it meant a great deal to their students, volunteers, families, and cultural partners. He stated that they were proud to serve Lake County and to help build bridges in friendship, education, and cultural understanding between Lake County, Japan, and by extension, the State of Florida.

CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT AND COMPTROLLER'S CONSENT AGENDA

On a motion by Commr. Sabatini, 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 through 4, 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.

Founders Ridge Community Development District Proposed Budget for Fiscal Year 2027

Notice is hereby provided of having received the Founders Ridge 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.

City of Eustis CRA Financial Statements for FY 2025

Notice is hereby provided of having received the City of Eustis CRA Financial Statements and Independent Auditor's Report for FY 2025.

Town of Lady Lake Ordinances

Notice is hereby provided of having received the following items from the Town of Lady Lake: Ordinance 2026-02; Ordinance 2026-03; Ordinance 2026-04; and Ordinance 2026-05.

COUNTY MANAGER'S CONSENT AGENDA

Commr. Parks mentioned that he would like to pull Tab 24 to the regular agenda.

Ms. Barker commented that Tab 28 was pulled.

Commr. Sabatini asked to pull Tabs 7, 9, and 15 for comments.

On a motion by Commr. Sabatini, seconded by Commr. Morris and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved the Consent Agenda, Tabs 8 through 27, pulling Tab 28 to come back at a later time, and pulling Tabs 7, 9, 15, and 24 to the regular agenda as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

Management and Budget

Recommend approval of the Veterans Treatment Intervention Program Agreement that provides financial support to Lake County for aid in felony and/or misdemeanor pretrial or post-adjudicatory veteran treatment intervention programs. This is a cost reimbursement agreement based on actual expenses incurred by the County. The County will be reimbursed on a monthly basis by the State of Florida for the actual service-related expenditures.

The estimated total fiscal impact is not to exceed $109,654 (revenue) and will be included in the Fiscal Year 2027 Budget request.

PUBLIC SAFETY

Fire Rescue

Recommend approval of a funding agreement between the County and Sheriff to equally fund the Senior CAD GIS Coordinator position. The fiscal impact is $57,765 (expenditure) and $57,765 (expenditure - Lake County Sheriff's Office reimbursement).

Recommend approval:

1. To utilize Contract 19-0707 with Ten-8 Fire and Safety, LLC (Bradenton, FL) for the purchase of one Pierce commercial pumper and one Pierce custom pumper; and

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

The fiscal impact is $2,270,517 (expenditure) and is within, and will not exceed, the Fiscal Year 2026 Budget. Commission District 2 and 4.

Recommend approval of the Interlocal Agreement Regarding the Ambulance and Emergency Medical Services MSTU Increment Revenues with the City of Leesburg. The fiscal impact is $281,198 (reduction of expenditures).

COMMUNITY SERVICES

Housing and Community Services

Recommend approval of the First Amendment to a HOME Investment Partnership American Rescue Plan Program (HOME-ARP) Subrecipient Agreement between Lake County and Find, Feed & Restore, Inc., for an Affordable Housing Project for Fiscal Year 2026.

There is no fiscal impact for this First Amendment. The original HOME-ARP Subrecipient Agreement was for $850,000 (revenue/expenditure - grant funded) and is within, and will not exceed, the Fiscal Year 2026 Budget. Commission District 5.

Library Services

Recommend approval to designate Tammy Parrott as the Single Administrative Head of the Lake County Library System and authorize the Chairman to execute Florida Department of State, Division of Library and Information Services Form DLIS/SA01, State Aid to Libraries Grant Certification of Credentials - Single Library Administrative Head.

Transit Services

Recommend approval:

1. To accept the Florida Department of Transportation under the Section 5310 Capital Grant Agreement for Fiscal Year 2026;

2. To procure vehicles under the State's bid list through FDOT's Transit Research Inspection Procurement Services (TRIPS) Program;

3. To adopt Unanticipated Revenue Resolution 2026-51 (URR) to accept and appropriate $828,138 for the Florida Department of Transportation's Section 5310 Capital Grant Agreement; and

4. Of a budget transfer in the amount of $92,016 from Transit Reserves for Operations to Machinery and Equipment.

The fiscal impact is $920,154 - $828,138 (revenue/expenditure - grant funded) and $92,016 (expenditure - county match).

Recommend approval to accept the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) under the Section 5310 Small Urban Operating Grant Agreement for Fiscal Year 2026.

The fiscal impact is $800,000 - $400,000 (revenue/expenditure - grant funded) and $400,000 (expenditure - county match) and is within the Fiscal Year 2026 Budget.

INFRASTRUCTURE AND TRANSPORTATION SERVICES

Public Works

Recommend approval:

1. To proceed to closing on a road easement dedication from Blake's Ridge (DR-25024), which is in the City of Leesburg; and

2. To authorize the Chairman to execute any required closing documents.

The estimated fiscal impact is $1,500 (expenditure) and is within, and will not exceed, the Fiscal Year 2026 Budget. Commission District 5.

Recommend approval:

1. To proceed to close on right-of-way and easement dedication from Daniel Z. Wise Trustee for the Hooks Street Extension Project, which is in the City of Clermont;

2. Approval of a Subordination of Utility Interests Agreement substantially similar to the form attached with Lake Apopka Natural Gas District, with County Attorney review and approval of the final form; and

3. To authorize the Chairman to execute any necessary closing documents.

The estimated fiscal impact is $800 (expenditure) and is within, and will not exceed, the Fiscal Year 2026 Budget. Commission District 2.

Recommend approval:

1. To proceed to close on right-of-way and easement dedication from Waterbrooke Homeowner's Association, Inc. for the Hooks Street Extension Project, which is in the City of Clermont; and

2. To authorize the Chairman to execute any required closing documents.

The estimated fiscal impact is $800 (expenditure) and is within, and will not exceed, the Fiscal Year 2026 Budget. Commission District 2.

Recommend approval:

1. To proceed to close on the deeded right-of-way purchase for Hartwood Pines Homeowners Association, LLC., for the Hartwood Marsh Road Widening Project, which is in the City of Clermont; and

2. To authorize the Chairman to execute any required closing documents.

The estimated fiscal impact is $1,500 (expenditure) and is within, and will not exceed, the Fiscal Year 2026 Budget. Commission District 2.

Recommend approval:

1. To proceed to close on the deeded Right-of-Way dedication for Florida Discount Self Storage No 4, LLC. for the Hartwood Marsh Road Widening Project, which is in the City of Clermont; and

2. To authorize the Chairman to execute any required closing documents.

The estimated fiscal impact is $800 (expenditure) and is within, and will not exceed, the Fiscal Year 2026 Budget. Commission District 2.

Recommend approval to accept public Right of Way and Easement Deeds that have been secured in conjunction with development, roadway, lot splits, and stormwater projects.

The fiscal impact is $308.60 (expenditure) and is within, and will not exceed, the Fiscal Year 2026 Budget.

Recommend approval:

1. To adopt Resolution 2026-52 declaring the failure of CR 44 Haynes Creek Bridge (Bridge Number 114079) 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 $4,500,000 to not exceed $6,000,000; 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 adoption of Resolution 2026-53 to install all-way stop signs and all-way plaques on Radio Road at Treadway School Road, in the Leesburg Area.

The estimated fiscal impact is $5,000 (expenditure) and is within, and will not exceed, the Fiscal Year 2026 Budget. Commission District 3 and 5.

Recommend approval:

1. To adopt Resolution 2026-54 for Vision Zero/Target Zero Goal and Framework;

2. Of the Lake County Safety Action Plan; and

3. Of the submission of a Safe Streets for All Implementation Grant application; and

4. To authorize the County Manager to execute associated documents.

The fiscal impact cannot be determined at this time.

TAB 7: PROCLAMATION 2026-33 TOBACCO-FREE PARKS MONTH

Commr. Sabatini remarked that even though he understood the Board's interest in passing a Tobacco-Free Parks Month proclamation, he did not want to vote for this because he liked smoking cigars in the parks, and noted that he was proud that Lake County had the largest tobacco farm in the state and the largest winery in the state. He opined that people needed to be responsible with their tobacco use; however, he did not support banning tobacco from the parks.

On a motion by Commr. Smith, seconded by Commr. Parks and carried by a vote of 4-1, the Board approved Proclamation 2026-33 designating June 2026 as Tobacco - Free Parks Month in Lake County.

Commr. Sabatini voted no.

TAB 9: WORKERS' COMPENSATION CLAIM SETTLEMENT

Commr. Sabatini wondered why this claim would be settled at this amount, and said that even though he would defer to staff on any litigation settlement, he would like to hear the details.

Ms. Barker relayed that this was a former Office of Fire Rescue employee that was injured during a training exercise, and that rather than going to court, they tried to settle when necessary. She commented that it would save the total expenditures for the County, and that they came to a mutual agreement of a settlement of $45,000, which would close this case for the Worker's Compensation claim.

On a motion by Commr. Sabatini, seconded by Commr. Morris and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved a Workers' Compensation Claim Settlement for a former employee who sustained an injury on April 17, 2024, in the amount of $45,000 (expenditure).

TAB 15: UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TRACK & FIELD MARKETING

Commr. Sabatini indicated his understanding that the County deferred to the Office of Tourism on what the focus of expenditures should be; however, he opined that there were certain activities that should be emphasized more, such as sports fishing. He opined that even though he was not against funding the United States of America Track and Field (USATF) organization, the expenditure of $450,000 was quite high, and he asked to hear more about this or to have a workshop about it.

Ms. Barker explained that this was a promotional marketing sponsorship similar to the sponsorship with Star Athletics, and that the $450,000 was a $150,000 marketing expense per year over a three-year period, which included the Discover Lake County logo being displayed at the various track and field events throughout the day and commercial promotion on the various streaming sites or national broadcasts.

Commr. Smith commented that this had been vetted for several months through the Tourist Development Council (TDC), and that it was for promotional activities to bring tourism to Lake County where visitors came to spend their funding. He pointed out that it included much commercial time and national exposure throughout the country, and that the TDC voted unanimously for it. He opined that it was a good program, and that even though it seemed significant, if one looked at the marketing advantage that Lake County received from this on social media and national advertisements, it was a good fit.

Ms. Melanie Marsh, County Attorney, remarked that there was a portion of this funding that statutorily had to be used for marketing, and that all of that funding could not be used for physical improvements, noting that at least one cent of each dollar that Lake County collected in Tourist Development Tax (TDT) had to be used towards marketing.

Commr. Morris expressed concern that the County was committing to three years, and opined that if something went wrong in 2026, then the County could not get out of this in 2027 and 2028.

Commr. Smith related that the whole purpose was to lead up to the Olympic Games, which would be held in the State of California, and that Lake County was positioning itself for local events.

Commr. Morris opined that even though this was great, the County was committing funding over three years instead of reviewing it in the following year to see if it had value.

Commr. Sabatini made a motion to amend the proposal to one year, but the motion died due to the lack of a second.

Commr. Smith relayed his understanding that this could not be done because the agreement that was signed was for a three-year contract, and related that Lake County had competed with Orange and Seminole Counties for this.

Ms. Barker explained that in many instances to be competitive, a multi-year agreement had to be offered; otherwise, they would look elsewhere.

Commr. Sabatini opined that the County needed to settle on a certain brand and just focus on a couple of things, such as sports fishing, and that even though he would vote for this on the

current day, the County needed to make a decision. He opined that if the County was going to spend funds on tourism and advertising to receive more return on investment (ROI), then a choice should be made, such as an embrace of nature focused on Lake County's unique natural assets, and that the County should just focus on that. He opined that since everything was a trade-off, funding given to the USATF was funding taken from bass fishing, parks, waterways, or the ridgeline; however, since this has been vetted, then he would support it.

Commr. Smith commented that Lake County held more bass tournaments than anywhere in the state, including 20 to 30 bass tournaments per year, and that the TDC was a large supporter of Major League Fishing (MLF). He mentioned that triathlons were also done at Lake Louisa State Park, and that people were utilizing the trails. He related that Lake County was trying to create an active tourism destination, and that if people liked activities that were outside and had to do with body movement, then they could come to Lake County to enjoy them, noting that this was their focus. He opined that they were making good progress on that, and he encouraged the Board to attend a TDC meeting to see what was being done through the Greater Orlando Sports Commission (GO Sports) and Madden Media. He pointed out that there were many professionals on the TDC who took Lake County to heart and who reviewed those opportunities to ensure that there was an ROI, and that nothing came to the BCC without scrutiny from the TDC. He stated that there had been times when there were proposals that he felt were not good enough and had to be revamped before coming back, and that this item was one of those cases, noting that this had been negotiated and much work had gone into this. He also commented that the County was interested in agritourism as well, and that Lake County had much to offer there.

Commr. Sabatini opined that the funding could be dedicated to just two or three areas, such as increasing the bass tournaments.

Commr. Smith mentioned that Ms. Brew could supply the numbers on what Lake County spent on bass fishing, opining that it was significant.

Commr. Parks expressed appreciation to Commissioner Sabatini for wanting to promote Lake County's natural assets, and assumed that this item had been vetted against the County's strategic plan, opining that it should fit within the plan.

Commr. Campione opined that when the County had a workshop on tourism every year and received a presentation by professionals, it helped to see the proportion of funds being spent, and that even though she appreciated the idea of having just one brand, there was much to offer in Lake County; furthermore, she opined that the County was doing a great job offering multiple opportunities under the umbrella of the brand "Real Florida, Real Close." She opined that sports was a large generator for young people as well as for people going to the National Training Center, which had been a key part of that, and said that she the saw the Olympics as an opportunity to highlight the facilities in Lake County, the great weather, and the opportunities for training.

On a motion by Commr. Smith, seconded by Commr. Parks and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved to provide Tourist Development Tax funding for marketing/promotional fees and related expenses for Discover Lake County to be designated as a proud partner of the USATF, and to authorize the Chair to execute the Marketing Agreement.

TAB 24: NORTH HANCOCK ROAD WIDENING

Commr. Parks mentioned that this item involved a significant amount of funding for a large road project in south Lake County, and asked for a quick overview. He pointed out that this involved the North Hancock Road widening for about $7.7 million, and indicated his understanding that this could have cost more, noting that since the County already had the right of way dedicated, there were no right of way costs.

Ms. Barker elaborated that this item was for the actual construction of the widening for North Hancock Road from Florida's Turnpike to County Road (CR) 561A, including turn lanes and traffic signals, and that the County had been working with developers in the prior few months to have them construct the traffic improvements. She explained that the developers were already mobilized and could do this cheaper and quicker than the County could, and that in exchange, the County offered transportation impact fee credits or cash repayment. She remarked that it would cost about $7.7 million for these improvements, and that if the County was going to construct this, then it was estimated to cost about $8.5 to $12 million for the same improvements.

Commr. Parks mentioned that the County was focusing on reducing the costs of building roads, and opined that this item was worth celebrating because the County had just saved about $1 million on building a road. He commented that finding ways to reduce costs had been discussed at a previous workshop several months prior, and that it was being done.

Commr. Campione pointed out that $4,267,000 would be given to the developer in impact fee credits based on the impact fees owed, and that $3.5 million would be paid to the developer in cash from the South Lake District impact fees. She opined that people wanted developers to pay their way, and mentioned that this was an example of a developer building a road using their impact fee funding and additional funds.

Commr. Parks added that they were doing it cheaper, and opined that if the County could do this more often, then there would be more of these items on the agenda. He opined that in years to come, the Board could discuss how millions of dollars were being saved, as it was very expensive to build roads.

Ms. Barker commented that the current Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) rate to widen a two-lane road to a four-lane road was about $5.7 million per mile.

Commr. Campione remarked that there was not a turn lane to go north onto U.S. Highway 27 from CR 561A, and that if the northbound traffic could go north, then the southbound traffic could move up; however, traffic was stacking all the way back to the overpass. She questioned if the County could review this in conjunction with the work that was being done there.

Commr. Parks opined that there were areas that needed turn lanes, and that this would reduce traffic.

Ms. Barker mentioned that she knew the intersection, and that staff could review that.

Commr. Campione opined that if traffic could be moved into two separate lanes, then the time sitting there could be reduced to one or two cycles to go south or north.

On a motion by Commr. Morris, seconded by Commr. Parks and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved an Amendment to the Roadway Improvement Agreement with

Jen Florida 30, LLC regarding North Hancock Road Widening, and to authorize the Office of Procurement Services to execute all supporting documentation.

ANNEXATION REPORT

Mr. Mike Fitzgerald, Director for the Office of Planning and Zoning, stated that the first annexation was for the City of Fruitland Park and included the following: it was 14.86 acres; the location was south of Myrtle Lake Avenue and west of CR 468; the current Lake County zoning was Rural Residential (R-1) and Residential Professional (RP); the proposed City zoning was Planned Unit Development (PUD); the current Lake County future land use (FLU) was Urban Medium; and the proposed City FLU was Multi-Family Low Density. He mentioned that this was a voluntary annexation, and that the applicant was proposing a development of 22 duplexes totaling 44 dwelling units, noting that since there were two existing units on the property currently, the total would be 46 dwelling units. He commented that County staff had reviewed this and determined the following: additional right of way dedication along Myrtle Lake Avenue would be required; construction of a sidewalk along the road frontage of Myrtle Lake Avenue would be required; a traffic impact analysis would be required to be submitted when they began construction if approved; internal pedestrian and bicycle connectivity was recommended through the development and onto CR 468; and Lake County stormwater design standards would be required on ponds that would outfall or affect surrounding unincorporated lands or County roads.

Commr. Morris opined that this looked like infill with the City of Fruitland Park on one side. He said that he agreed with comments by staff, and thought that the County just needed to monitor it, noting that he did not have an issue with this annexation.

Commr. Campione relayed her understanding that it was a reduction in density from the County FLU.

Mr. Fitzgerald remarked that the next annexation was also in the City of Fruitland Park and included the following: it was 95.3 acres; the location was north of CR 466A and west of Micro Racetrack Road; the current Lake County zoning was Agriculture; the proposed City zoning was PUD; the current Lake County FLU was Rural; and the proposed City FLU was Multi-Family Low Density. He commented that the application was proposing the development of a single-family residential subdivision with a total of 344 units at a density of 3.61 units per one net acre to be developed in three phases, and that an annexation request for the same parcel was previously reviewed by County staff and presented to the BCC on November 4, 2025. He mentioned that the BCC drafted an objection letter dated December 8, 2025, which was sent to the City of Fruitland Park, and that the City denied the first annexation request with a proposed density of 4.3 units per acre; however, the developer made changes to the concept plan to decrease the density and submitted a new annexation request.

Commr. Campione remarked that according to the aerial, there was a parcel that connected to Micro Racetrack Road so that the development could have two entrances with the other access to CR 466A.

Commr. Morris expressed concern about Micro Racetrack Road, and inquired if the developer had done anything else besides reducing the number of homes.

Mr. Fitzgerald indicated that they had not.

Commr. Smith asked if this was in a transitional zone, or if it was straight Agriculture.

Mr. Fitzgerald answered that this was in a rural area with the current zoning of Agriculture, and that it was abutting the City of Fruitland Park, noting that it abutted The Villages on the west.

Commr. Smith commented that he would support a letter.

Commr. Morris agreed, and mentioned that he had spoken to the Mayor of Fruitland Park in the previous week about the CR 466A project development and environmental (PD&E) study, noting that he was in favor of writing a letter of opposition.

Commr. Sabatini opined that it should be a strongly worded letter of opposition.

Commr. Campione opined that the previous letter could be the starting point, and that it should include that there were issues remaining about taking rural land off the County FLU map as well as transportation issues.

Commr. Morris stated that the transportation issues were evident in the PD&E study, such as where to put traffic lights or a roundabout, opining that this development would compound those issues.

Commr. Smith commented that Micro Racetrack Road was a small road.

Commr. Sabatini opined that this development was a terrible idea.

On a motion by Commr. Sabatini, seconded by Commr. Smith and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved to send a letter of opposition to the City of Fruitland Park regarding the Vita Serena Development.

Mr. Fitzgerald related that the last annexation was in the City of Groveland and included the following: it was 6.24 acres; the location was south of Republic Drive and east of Democracy Street; the current County zoning was Light Industrial; and the proposed City zoning was City of Groveland Light Industrial. He mentioned that the applicant was proposing the development of 5,000 square feet of office space, 95,000 square feet of warehouse space, and 42 parking spaces, noting that this was going from industrial to industrial.

Commr. Campione opined that this looked like something that was supposed to be there.

Commr. Parks pointed out that it was in the commerce park.

Commr. Campione added that it was in a strategic corridor that was targeted for light industrial, including industrial warehousing, distribution, and manufacturing, and said that she did not see any objection from the Board.

PUBLIC HEARING: SECOND AMENDMENT TO THE JPA BETWEEN THE CITY OF GROVELAND AND LAKE COUNTY

Ms. Marsh recalled that in May 2025, the Board approved the Joint Planning Agreement (JPA) with the City of Groveland, and that there was a provision that terms had to be agreed on for a road transfer agreement within the first six months, or the agreement would become null and void. She pointed out that the Board extended that time before the six months expired because the County and the City of Groveland staff were still working on that agreement, and that even though they were still working on this agreement, they hoped to present some final documents to the City

Council; however, in the meantime, they were asking for an additional six-month extension to December 31, 2026 for the overall JPA.

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.

Commr. Parks opined that the road agreement was getting close, and that there was good progress at the previous meeting.

Commr. Morris questioned if it was just the roads that could not be agreed on.

Commr. Parks replied that there was a detailed list of roads, and that they were going through them. He opined that there was slow progress identifying those, and that there were some intense meetings going through road by road. He indicated appreciation to Ms. Marsh, and opined that she had been very patient.

Commr. Campione opined that there had been a great meeting on the prior day with the municipalities, and that they were trying to work out the details. She relayed her understanding that regarding the City of Groveland JPA, there was discussion about roads, including road transfers and who was going to maintain the roads, and she wondered if the County should also be having discussions about what agreements were needed within those areas, such as funding agreements on the front end from the Cities working with developers within their jurisdictions as part of an approval for development.

Commr. Parks opined that this was a great question because these were existing roads.

Ms. Marsh mentioned that this was one of the reasons why this was taking longer, and said that there were two specific roads that the County had offered funding for improvements that were not necessarily needed currently but may be needed later. She remarked that the City of Groveland had taken this into consideration, and that there had been comprehensive conversations about several of the roads in that area, which was why they were taking more time to do this document.

Commr. Parks commented that there was a model for that, and that road funding agreements were in place in Wellness Way, noting that the County was taking a similar tack with the City of Groveland.

On a motion by Commr. Sabatini, seconded by Commr. Smith and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved the second amendment to the JPA between the City of Groveland and Lake County.

PUBLIC HEARING: ORDINANCE 2026-22 CABLE COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Marsh placed the proposed ordinance on the floor for reading by title only as follows:

AN ORDINANCE OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF LAKE COUNTY, FLORIDA; REPEALING CHAPTER 6.5, LAKE COUNTY CODE, ENTITLED CABLE COMMUNICATIONS; AMENDING CHAPTER 18, SECTION 18-3, LAKE COUNTY CODE, ENTITLED RIGHT-OF-WAY UTILIZATION PERMIT; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; PROVIDING FOR INCLUSION IN THE CODE; PROVIDING FOR FILING WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Ms. Marsh asked that the Board repeal this section because it was tied to the following ordinance, which was the Homeowners Association (HOA) affidavit, and that according to policy, whenever a new ordinance was adopted, an old ordinance should be repealed.

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. Sabatini, seconded by Commr. Smith and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved Ordinance 2026-22 repealing Chapter 6.5, Lake County Code, entitled Cable Communications, and amending Section 18-3, Lake County Code, entitled Right-of-Way Utilization Permits.

PUBLIC HEARING: ORDINANCE 2026-23 ZONING PERMITS

Ms. Marsh placed the proposed ordinance on the floor for reading by title only as follows:

AN ORDINANCE OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF LAKE COUNTY, FLORIDA; AMENDING SECTION 14.14.02, LAKE COUNTY CODE, APPENDIX E, LAND DEVELOPMENT, ENTITLED ZONING PERMITS, TO REQUIRE THE SUBMISSION OF AN AFFIDAVIT CONFIRMING COMPLIANCE WITH MANDATORY HOA OR OTHER RESTRICTIVE COVENANTS WITH EACH ZONING PERMIT APPLICATION; PROVIDING FOR INCLUSION IN THE CODE; PROVIDING FOR FILING WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Commr. Smith opined that this was very important, and suggested that since Commissioner Campione brought it up, she could pass the gavel and make the motion.

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.

Commr. Campione passed the gavel to Commissioner Parks.

Commr. Smith related that if one lived in an HOA, they would have to sign something declaring it.

Commr. Campione elaborated that if one was bringing in an application for a permit, they had to verify that they had done what was required by the HOA so that they would not get into a situation where they obtained a permit to build something that did not comply with HOA rules, opining that this could possibly keep them out of court.

Ms. Marsh clarified that there were a couple of minor changes from the Planning and Zoning Board, and she asked that these be incorporated in the motion.

Commr. Parks opined that this was a great ordinance because there was a large issue between the County permitting and the HOAs.

On a motion by Commr. Campione, seconded by Commr. Smith and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved Ordinance 2026-23 amending Section 14.14.02, Lake County Code, Appendix E, Land Development Regulations, entitled Zoning Permits, to require a Homeowners Association Compliance Affidavit with Zoning Permit Applications.

Commr. Parks passed the gavel back to Commissioner Campione.

RECESS AND REASSEMBLY

The Chairman called a recess at 10:22 a.m. for seven minutes.

PUBLIC HEARING: ORDINANCE 2026-21 BILL OF RIGHTS SANCTUARY COUNTY

Commr. Campione opined that this was a complicated issue, and that there was some confusion over the word "sanctuary" in the proposed ordinance, noting that she would like to remove it because of that confusion and the negative connotations that occurred over the prior several years over this word. She stated that she was not in favor of anything that suggested ignoring the rule of law as acceptable, and that the concept of stating that law-abiding citizens had a sanctuary with regard to the Bill of Rights was first adopted by Collier County in response to the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) mandates that did not comport with individual freedoms. She commented that the concept was rooted in recognition of the Bill of Rights as a document that recognized the inalienable individual rights and the rights as Americans, and that this was not a situation of ignoring duly adopted laws by the proper branch of government, as it was a recognition of the exercise of individual rights. She opined that concern had resurfaced with the most recent virus, which once again could be used to force mandates on local governments and individuals, and she asked if Lake County had local officials that would stand up for individual rights established by the U.S. Constitution or if they would enforce oppressive mandates should that situation arise. She pointed out that the Lake County Sheriff had local prosecutorial authority already as the chief law enforcement officer in Lake County, as all Sheriffs had throughout the state, and that they made legal judgements as they upheld their oaths to the U.S. and Florida Constitutions. She opined that one could argue that either an ordinance, such as this, was superfluous and was not needed, or that it further protected individual rights as stated in the Constitution; however, she opined that it could come down to who the local officials were and if they were going to stand up for their constitutional rights whether there was an ordinance in place or not. She mentioned that the proposal being discussed on the current day was never intended to be used as a mechanism to ignore the rule of law in situations where the law was clear as to which branch or level of government had sufficient authority to impose regulations. She stated that all of this would be discussed on the current day, and that this was the purpose of having a public hearing when the County considered adopting an ordinance. She opined that it was exciting that they were having a discussion about the Constitution and the Bill of Rights at a BCC meeting, and that it was a valuable exercise no matter the outcome; furthermore, there could be ongoing discussions about how to ensure that Americans had their rights protected by local governments. She remarked that she had been the BCC Chairman several years prior during COVID-19, and that Lake County had been kept open and free, by keeping the parks and waterways open, noting that the County had not mandated masks. She pointed out that there were officials in Lake County that were strong proponents of protecting the rights of citizens under the U.S. and Florida Constitutions.

Ms. Marsh placed the proposed ordinance on the floor for reading by title only as follows:

AN ORDINANCE OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF LAKE COUNTY, FLORIDA; CREATING SECTION 2-6, LAKE COUNTY CODE, TO BE ENTITLED BILL OF RIGHTS SANCTUARY COUNTY; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY;

PROVIDING FOR INCLUSION IN THE CODE; PROVIDING FOR FILING WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Ms. Marsh related that the Board approved this for advertising on April 28, 2026; however, at that meeting, there was an interested party that requested additional changes, and that the ordinance in the current agenda had blue text for the additional changes that were requested after the ordinance had been approved for advertising. She commented that what was in red was what the Board approved for advertising, and that the Board could accept, reject, or make additional changes as necessary.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

Mr. Rick Carlins, a resident of Lake County, asked the Board to exercise the authority it already had in a way that strengthened the rule and protection of the citizens of Lake County. He opined that the Bill of Rights ordinance was about clarity, duty, and preparedness, and that it recognized three simple truths, including the following: all political power was inherent in the people, noting that the government existed to secure their rights; the BCC possessed lawful home rule authority to act in the interest of the citizens' health, safety, and welfare; and the Lake County Sheriff, who was an independent Constitutional Officer, had sworn an oath to defend those rights, often in situations where guidance and support from County policy were critical. He said that some points about this ordinance included the following: it did not create conflict with higher authority; it did not nullify any federal law; it operated squarely within the established constitutional principles, such as the anti-commandeering doctrine, which affirmed that local governments could not be forced to use their resources to enforce actions that violated constitutional rights; it provided clarity before crisis arose; it ensured that County resources were not used in ways that violated constitutional rights; it provided the Lake County Sheriff with clear policy support when difficult decisions had to be made; it provided citizens with a structured lawful pathway to raise concerns; it gave Lake County a mechanism to review, respond, and act when rights were at risk; the strongest version of this ordinance recognized the principle deeply rooted in the constitutional system, noting that the government closest to the people had the duty to stand between its citizens and unconstitutional actions, which was known as interposition; it was not an act of defiance; it was lawful responsibility carried out through policy, coordination, and when necessary, the courts, opining that this version of the ordinance did so responsibly; it did not rely on rhetoric; it did not create unnecessary legal risk; it created a clear framework for action; it called for a constitutional compliance committee for oversight; it included a measured system of accountability and due process; and it transformed constitutional principles into operational governance. He opined that this was not about politics, but that it was about the authority and responsibility to the people of Lake County. He opined that the question before the Board was not whether rights mattered, but whether the County would have a clear lawful framework in place before those rights were tested, and that they respectfully asked that the Board adopt the strongest version of this ordinance, which would declare the Board's commitment and equip them to do so. He then played videos of Ms. Ann Vandersteel, a conservative speaker, and Collier County Commissioner Chris Hall.

Ms. Vandersteel commented in the video that she was a concerned citizen who believed in the foundational principles that built this nation, including God-given rights, and that she urged the Board to adopt a Bill of Rights sanctuary designation for Lake County similar to what Collier County had done as a constitutional reaffirmation. She related that the Bill of Rights was not a suggestion nor was it conditional, and that it was a binding recognition that citizens' rights, such as freedom of speech, religion, due process, and the right to keep and bear arms, did not come from the government, but from the Creator. She opined that the government's role was to protect those rights and not to reinterpret or restrict them based on shifting political winds, and that across the country there had been increasing encroachments on these liberties, including limitations on speech, mandates that could override personal medical decisions, and policies that challenged parental authority. She opined that the balance between government power and individual liberty was tipping in the wrong direction, and that by declaring Lake County a Bill of Rights sanctuary, the Board would be prioritizing the highest law of the land and sending a clear message that Lake County would stand firmly in defense of its citizens' constitutional protections. She commented that Collier County recognized that local governments had the authority and duty to act as a buffer between the citizens and political overreach, and that Lake County had the same opportunity to lead with courage and clarity. She opined that this designation would also strengthen trust between the people and the local government, as it told the residents that the BCC was not only administrators but guardians of liberty, willing to stand when it mattered most. She opined that this was about principle and preserving the freedoms that generations before fought and died to secure, ensuring that those same freedoms were still intact for the future. She asked the Board to be proactive and stand for the Constitution, for the constituents, and for the rights that made them free.

Commr. Hall said in the video that he encouraged Lake County to go forward with a Bill of Rights ordinance and to give the Lake County Sheriff the support he needed to enforce constitutional law, opining that nothing changed with this ordinance unless something changed. He opined that even though he did not worry about the current administration, not long ago, there had been an administration that convinced them of the need to pass this ordinance, and that they had experienced great success from it in Collier County.

Mr. Bill Mitchell, Director of the Constitutional Sheriffs and Peace Officers Association (CSPOA) for the State of Florida, expressed appreciation to Lake County, opining that the Board projected excellence and the desire to be good stewards of the County. He mentioned that when he had spoken to the Lake County Sheriff about the ordinance, the Sheriff had indicated that their rights came from God, that he had sworn an oath to protect them, and that if this ordinance helped with that, then he was in favor of it. He opined that the ordinance was not a policy choice, as it was a decision about how Lake County would fulfill the constitutional duty to its citizens when it mattered most, and that the core of this decision included the following: protecting the rights of citizens; providing clarity and support for the Sheriff and Lake County officials; and ensuring Lake County was prepared before a constitutional conflict arose. He remarked that each version of the ordinance reflected a different level of commitment to those responsibilities, including the

following: some versions were symbolic; some were functional but limited; and one was fully operational, enforceable, and sustainable. He stated that they had an enhanced Lake County version, which took all of the Collier County elements that had proven to be very successful and added some pieces to it, opining that it was a national leadership model for other Counties. He reiterated that the ordinance was designed to protect citizens from unconstitutional government actions, provide clear legal footing for County officials and the Sheriff, prevent misuse of County resources, and ensure preparedness before a crisis occurred. He commented that the process that led to the ordinance's development included the following: the first ordinance of its kind was created in Collier County in response to the unprecedented government overreach that occurred during the 2020 COVID-19 crisis when many Americans believed that their constitutional rights were ignored or violated; many Counties passed constitutional resolutions modeled after the early second amendment sanctuary efforts, as was done in Lake County; because these were resolutions, they were largely symbolic, as they carried no binding enforcement authority and provided no meaningful accountability for violations; Collier County recognized the need for real constitutional protections at a local level; County leaders with the help of constitutional legal counsel developed an enforceable ordinance designed to establish clear mechanisms for constitutional enforcement, oversight, and accountability; and the ordinance was first adopted as a resolution and later enacted as a County ordinance in 2023, as it had greater legal effect and practical application. He stated that as a result, the Collier County model had become one of the most recognized and influential constitutional County ordinances in the nation serving as a framework for Counties seeking stronger local protections for individual liberty and constitutional governments, and that when they approached Lake County with the recommendation to adopt a similar ordinance, the goal was to strengthen the County's ability to locally uphold constitutional protection and support the Sheriff in fulfilling his constitutional responsibilities. He mentioned that the Collier County ordinance was provided to the Lake County Attorney to review and to adapt a version that Lake County could potentially adopt, and that this became the original Lake County ordinance. He relayed that after reviewing that draft, they conducted a comprehensive side-by-side evaluation comparing it to the original Collier County model, and that during that process, additional improvements, legal refinements, and structural enhancements were identified resulting in four separate ordinance models for comparison. He remarked that to properly evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of each of the ordinances, they analyzed them using nine key factors, which included the following: immediate action, which would allow County officials or the Sheriff to respond quickly to alleged unconstitutional actions without waiting for a lengthy court proceeding; strengthened authority for the Sheriff, which was the degree to which the ordinance supported and clarified the Sheriff's constitutional role and enforcement discretion; citizen access, which was how easily citizens could file complaints, petition government, trigger review, or participate in accountability processes; an enforcement mechanism, which determined if the ordinance contained enforceable tools, such as prohibitions, penalties, review processes, or corrective actions; legal risk, which was the likelihood the ordinance could face successful legal challenge based upon constitutional or statutory concerns; oversight structure, which created a formal body or process to review constitutional

concerns and government actions; an accountability system, which established consequences, training requirements, penalties, or corrective measures for violations; an interposition doctrine, which was where the ordinance explicitly recognized the County's constitutional duty to lawfully stand between citizens and unconstitutional government overreach; and long-term sustainability, which was how practical, enforceable, durable, and politically sustainable the ordinance was over time. He opined that in the first two ordinance drafts most of those items were not addressed adequately and included the following: it was legally cautious with a structured judicial process; it had strong constitutional findings; it required prior court rulings; it restricted citizen participation; there was no enforcement system; and there was no accountability structure. He opined that those versions were primarily symbolic, as a resolution would be, and did not bring forward processes that would help structure the County's response to any type of unconstitutional action by the State or Federal Government. He commented that they had submitted a strengthened version to the County, and opined that even though it still had some issues, it addressed some of the issues that the original documents had, which included the following: it allowed for good faith constitutional analysis; the County did not have to go to a court system for approval; an analysis of the County Commission could determine if it was constitutional using the County Attorney and other resources, which was the model Collier County came up with, noting that Collier County passed another ordinance based on the first one supporting people's Fourth Amendment right to health care choices, such as not having to submit to medical procedures or wearing masks; it had limited enforcement tools; there was no oversight committee; it had a limited accountability system; and even though it was balanced and functional, it was incomplete. He mentioned that the Collier County model had no legal challenges for the prior three years and no issues utilizing the ordinance even without the enhancements he was proposing, and that it included the following: it had strong enforcement language; included penalties; strong assertion of local authority; one weakness was that it used legally aggressive language, such as "null and void" instead of "interposition"; greater legal exposure; and no formal oversight or due process system, as it was implied and not outlined. He commented that Commissioner Campione had expressed concerns about code enforcement issues and processes to deal with issues, and noted that the enhanced version included the following: real enforcement mechanisms; immediate protective authority; a constitutional compliance committee, noting that he had brought a recommendation of how to create a constitutional compliance committee that would cost the County little to no funding; structured accountability system; property framed interposition doctrine; broader constitutional protections; strong legal balancing; one weakness was that it was more administratively complex because of the constitutional compliance committee; and it required political and administrative commitment. He opined that Lake County was very committed to being a model, and that he was bringing this ordinance before the Board so that it would have all the information needed to make the best choice of how to best protect Lake County.

Ms. Marsh indicated her understanding that the enhanced version had not been given to the County yet, and that she had a copy of what was handed out at the previous meeting, noting

that the changes in front of the Board were based on that document; however, if there was another version, it had not been provided to her or the Board.

Mr. Mitchell opined that the enhanced Lake County version might be compared to the one that was supplied.

Commr. Campione suggested that staff could make copies of the documents provided on the current day.

Mr. Mitchell mentioned that there would be five different appendices.

Mr. Chuck Benoit, a resident of the City of Clermont, stated that he was in favor of the ordinance. He opined that the County Sheriff was the most powerful law enforcement officer in the nation because he was the only elected law enforcement officer, and that their community stood behind the Sheriff's efforts to protect the citizens from unconstitutional activity coming from anywhere. He opined that their constitutional rights could be attacked out of nowhere, including the following: health rights during COVID-19; the right to peacefully assemble at an abortion clinic; the right to bear arms; and the threat of Sharia Law in local government. He opined that people could be caught unaware and pushed backwards, and that this ordinance said that those in Lake County were prepared to protect their constitutional rights wherever the attack came from. He hoped that the Board would be proactive and acknowledge that the U.S. Constitution was being attacked, opining that the residents deserved to have their rights fully protected at this level.

Mr. Bryan Kennedy, a resident of Sumter County, indicated appreciation to the Board for considering this ordinance, opining that it took courage to do that. He stated that about 250 years prior, a group of people came together to present a document and gave citizens the Bill of Rights that limited government powers, noting that powers not granted to the government were to be granted to the states and to the people. He opined that in recent history, there had been some government overreach, and that this ordinance would give the BCC and the Lake County Sheriff another tool to use to help enforce the Bill of Rights; therefore, he asked the Board to pass this ordinance.

Pastor Greg Wilmore, a resident of the City of Leesburg, opined that it was important to protect the Bill of Rights, and that since the Federal and State governments could sometimes be tyrannical, this ordinance on the County level would give the people a last layer of protection against the others, safeguarding their civil liberties. He expressed his understanding that Collier, Brevard, and other Counties may have adopted ordinances like this, and asked that the Board would pass this ordinance.

Dr. Richard Bosshardt, a resident of Lake County, remarked that even though he was sympathetic to the spirit of the ordinance, he was concerned about the implication that this may have, and said that he was opposed to the ordinance. He mentioned that since he was not a legal scholar, he asked AI to give a summary of the potential objections and concerns about it, and noted that AI was used in the production of the ordinance itself. He pointed out that there was an enhanced version of the ordinance that had not been previously available, and recalled that at the Federal level, there was a famous statement made that they had to pass a law to see what was in it, which he hoped would not be done on the current day. He opined that the ordinance could place

the County in direct conflict with Federal law and the supremacy clause of the U.S. Constitution, and that by refusing to recognize or enforce certain Federal laws, the County and its officials may expose themselves to lawsuits or Federal enforcement action. He questioned who determined what laws were legitimate and what were not, and opined that this ordinance overstepped the legal authority of the County government by attempting to nullify Federal laws or executive orders, which was not a power granted to local governments by the U.S. Constitution. He opined that this ordinance defined unlawful acts very broadly and did not specify who determined what was unconstitutional, and that if the County could pick and choose what was going to be enforced, it raised a very bad precedence. He opined that by prohibiting County officials from cooperating with Federal authorities in certain matters, the ordinance could hinder law enforcement collaboration and affect public safety. He opined that there were many concerns in Lake County, such as issues with development and water quality, that were important for the Board to oversee, and opined that it would be better to do a performative statement. He wondered why there were resolutions and proclamations if they had no power, and opined that there may be better ways to address this issue. He mentioned that he was very proud of Lake County and the State of Florida for distinguishing themselves during COVID-19 by how it was handled, including protecting civil liberties, and questioned if Lake County wanted to align itself with communities and states around the country that were attempting to nullify Federal law. He commented that he was very cognizant of the constant tension between Federal, State, and local government, opining that it would always be there. He relayed his understanding that the issue that brought this ordinance to the fore was the unprecedented COVID-19 management, which he opined nobody wanted to see repeated again; however, he opined that the County was not going to prevent this type of mismanagement from reoccurring by passing local ordinances, which he opined should be done at a federal level. He pointed out that there were situations where the Federal Government was critical, such as national pandemic management, and opined that even though there should be a complete transformation of how to handle those things, a small County would not be able to make that large of an impact with a county ordinance. He opined that this could detract from the attention of local issues, and noted that if it were up to him, he would vote against it.

Commr. Campione opined that one should be careful with AI, and that according to her research, AI information had a slant to it that could be contrary to one's value system.

Mr. Kristofer Jurski, a resident of the Town of Montverde, commented that he supported this ordinance, and that he had decided to make Lake County home because he wanted to live in a community that supported veterans. He opined that since Memorial Day was coming up, people should think about those who entered the military, pledged their support, took that oath, and paid the ultimate sacrifice for people's rights, and that they should support the Constitution. He opined that the ordinance was a marker for future generations, and said that he was proud of how the residents survived through the COVID-19 pandemic and proud of the elected officials; however, he opined that if this was not written down, then future generations might take advantage of those situations. He opined that the Board should pass a strong ordinance, such as the enhanced version presented by Mr. Mitchell, to protect future generations.

Mr. Jason Tomashek, a resident of the City of Clermont, relayed that he supported this ordinance, and expressed concerns about what happened during the COVID-19 pandemic, such as people being made to wear masks that were made in China to protect them from a disease made in China. He indicated appreciation to the Board for protecting the County's wildlife habitat, and asked that the Board would voice opposition to any future AI datacenters.

Ms. June Lang, a resident of Lake County, mentioned that she did much research when she moved and chose Lake County for its constitutional positions, and that even though Lake County may not always have a wonderful Board or Sheriff, there was a Bill of Rights, opining that there needed to be a firm foundation going forward.

Mr. Thomas Hansing, a resident of the Town of Fruitland Park, stated that the Constitution was the supreme law of the land, and that the first 10 amendments were put in place to clearly define and protect their God given rights from government overreach. He pointed out that when the founders formed the government, the intent was to create checks and balances to prevent government overreach, and opined that this ordinance met that intent and qualified as a check and balance; therefore, he urged the Board to vote in favor of this ordinance.

Mr. Liam Nestler, a resident of the City of Leesburg, encouraged the Board to vote in favor of the enhanced version of the ordinance, and opined that even though there were only a few Counties engaging in this kind of an ordinance, it could catch on. He opined that they were engaged in a war for their rights, and expressed concerns about Sharia Law and Socialism being promoted across the country. He opined that this ordinance would give citizens a voice to prevent government from taking their rights, and that even though there may be legal ramifications in the future, the ordinance stated that Lake County would stick with the Bill of Rights. He opined that this ordinance would not promote opposition to Federal law, but that it would provide opposition to any laws that were passed by the Federal Government that were unconstitutional. He opined that if local citizens did not speak out against tyranny, they would lose their rights, such as what had happened around the country during COVID-19, and that it could happen in Lake County. He said that he did not want this to happen, and asked the Board to vote in favor of the ordinance.

Mr. Edward Prosienski, a resident of the Town of Lady Lake, expressed appreciation to the Board for their diligent work and financial responsibility to the taxpayers of Lake County. He mentioned that he was an Army veteran and swore an oath to support and defend the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic, and that he would bear true faith and allegiance to the same, noting that he continued to serve his country and his community and would honor that oath for the rest of his life. He pointed out that the U.S. Constitution was the law of the land and the bedrock foundation of the country, and that in its long history people were careful not to make laws that would violate its doctrines; however, he opined that something changed. He indicated concerns about laws not made to uphold the Constitution, opining that some people thought that their ideas were better than the founding fathers'. He expressed concerns about rights and laws being trampled and discarded during COVID-19, opining that there was nothing they could do about it. He opined that this ordinance would give the Sheriff the power needed to stop the

overreach and abuse of their constitutional rights and protect their most basic rights, and asked the Board to pass this ordinance.

Ms. Benita Nestler, a resident of the City of Leesburg, stated that men and women died so that she could be there and voice her opinion, and she asked the Board to pass the ordinance, opining that people needed to stand and protect their rights.

Ms. Marie Dubois, a resident of the Town of Howey-in-the-Hills related that she agreed with most of what had been said in favor of this ordinance, and opined that even though the Board did great job during COVID-19, the same individuals might not always be on the Board; additionally, there would not always be a Governor Ron DeSantis. She opined that Lake County needed this ordinance, and that they owed it to the men who signed the declaration saying that they were going pledge their lives, fortunes, and sacred honor.

Mr. Andy Dubois, a resident of the Town of Howey-in-the-Hills, commented that he strongly supported the passage of a Bill of Rights ordinance.

Ms. Gail Carlins, a resident of the Town of Fruitland Park, opined that one of the great things about local government was accessibility, and that it was important to discuss what was important to the citizens of Lake County. She mentioned that even though the video with Mr. Alex Newman, a great patriot, would not play, he and Ms. Vandersteel were in strong support of an ordinance such as this. She indicated concerns about the COVID-19 vaccine and the protocols that were in place, opining that if this ordinance had been in place, the doctors might have been able to do more. She asked the Board to approve the enhanced version of the ordinance.

Ms. Laura Conyers, a resident of Lake County, expressed appreciation to the Board and to those patriots in attendance. She opined that there had been many times when people did nothing about something that could protect the country, the county, and the cities of Lake County, and that if nothing was done, then something bad could be done. She asked the Board to stand in favor of this ordinance and approve it.

Ms. Connie Hurlburt, a resident of Lake County, encourage the Board to vote for the enhanced version of the ordinance. She read a social media post that said that the Supreme Court had refused to hear a case about mandates, and indicated concern that if a State health official had reasonable belief that a vaccine could save lives, then they could mandate the vaccine no matter how deadly it was. She opined that the State may have to make some legislation, and that the Board could also protect them.

Mr. Aaron Baker, a resident of the Sorrento area, commented that his concern was with a future BCC, and expressed concerns about the COVID-19 mandates. He indicated appreciation to the Board for the work being done, and opined that the goal was to protect future generations as well as this generation. He opined that people were rarely afforded the ability to correct an injustice that was perpetrated on most of the country, and that elected officials at every level of government had the responsibility to protect the rights of the citizens being served, noting that this was what he was asking the Board to do.

Mr. Alex Whicher, a resident of Lake County, stated that he was in favor of the ordinance.

Mr. Frank Couch, a resident of Lake County, remarked that he was in favor of the ordinance.

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

Commr. Campione pointed out that the ordinance that was advertised could use the title "Bill of Rights Protection County" instead of "Bill of Rights Sanctuary County," opining that the word "sanctuary" could cause confusion. She stated that the message was about the Bill of Rights and about individual rights being inalienable rights, and expressed concerns about the COVID-19 pandemic, opining that if there had been an ordinance of this kind in place, it could have been relied on. She pointed out that the ordinance highlighted the Bill of Rights as something that was inherent to Americans, which she opined was important and valuable, and that it brought something to the table. She commented that she stood by the ordinance that was advertised because she liked the process which said that if the Board reasonably believed that something was unconstitutional, then action could be taken to seek a court of law to establish it; however, in the meantime, the County would not be using local resources to take action on something that could be contrary to the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. She opined that the ordinance would do this without needing a committee, and that if a group of citizens wanted to petition the County to consider whether something was unconstitutional and take it to court on their behalf, then the County would have the ability under this ordinance to do that. She opined that this was extremely valuable, and said that even though she appreciated comments about interposition, the County would still go to a court of law according to procedure while not using local resources participating in something that was contrary to the citizens' rights.

Commr. Parks wondered if this was referring to the language in the ordinance that was red and blue.

Commr. Campione indicated that this was correct, and relayed her understanding that the language in red was the new language.

Ms. Marsh clarified that the blue language was added after the approval to advertise based on the documents handed out at a prior meeting, and that the document before the Board with red and blue was what Commissioner Campione was putting forth.

Commr. Campione opined that the ordinance could be titled "Bill of Rights County," "Pro Bill of Rights County," or "Bill of Rights Protector County," and that the reference to sanctuary could be taken out in Section 2-6 and could use the same language, such as "Bill of Rights County." She mentioned that they struck through the actual list of the 10 rights, and opined that this should go back in there so that the Bill of Rights was listed.

Ms. Marsh explained that this was part of the document handed out by the interested party asking to strike it, and that it could be left in.

Commr. Campione recommended that Section 2-6 (c) under judicial relief, could be changed to say "Lake County has the right to seek judicial relief from an Alleged Unlawful Act of federal government officials in response to alleged unconstitutional federal government measures, and to protect the rights of law-abiding citizens in its jurisdictional boundaries," and that another

change could be in Section 2-6 (d), where it could say "An 'Alleged Unlawful Act' shall consist of any federal act, law, order, rule, or regulation, which allegedly violates or unreasonably restricts or impinges upon an individual's constitutional rights as an American Citizen."

Commr. Sabatini suggested that Lake County should use the Collier County version, and opined that most people wanted stronger language.

Commr. Campione pointed out that Mr. Mitchell said that he thought there were issues with the Collier County version.

Commr. Sabatini disagreed, and opined that these were paper protections. He commented that President James Madison called them parchment barriers, noting that at one point he was against the Bill of Rights. He opined that even though there was a piece of paper listing the rights and how they should be protected, what really mattered was the quality of the people in the country and in the elected offices. He opined that it did not matter if the Board passed the strongest version or the weakest version, and that it would have no effect whatsoever. He stated that he would like the strongest one; however, he opined that there were many people in office who would do nothing when tyranny arose. He opined that during the COVID-19 pandemic, it was frightening to see how quickly and how many people turned into anti-American robots, and that the Board should do everything possible to prevent that, including passing a very strong "Bill of Rights Protection" ordinance, which he opined was the most adequate name. He opined that the citizens needed to make sure that they were electing people who would stand up for their rights when tyranny arose, and that during the COVID-19 pandemic, no one was willing to fight, noting that he had to represent the first person arrested in the State of Florida for violating COVID-19 ordinances in Pinellas County. He opined that people had forgotten the injustices and had elected many of the same people to offices who would not stand up for their rights, and that even though he wished this ordinance could have come earlier, Lake County was getting ahead of the next crisis. He expressed concern about the election of a radical president in the next election, and said that even though what happened during the COVID-19 pandemic was senseless, such as the mask and vaccine mandates, there were other things that happened, including the January 6, 2021 protest. He pointed out that 1,575 people were arrested, and that about 95 percent of them were accused of nonviolent crimes, noting that they were apprehended around the country and put in jail cells. He opined that for the first 18 months, people did almost nothing about it, and that even though he represented some of them, he was shocked by how few attorneys stood up to represent those people, noting that he had to fly to Washington D.C. at a loss to represent them in a very disturbing environment. He mentioned that when he was in the City of Tallahassee, he filed a bill to make it illegal to establish task forces in the State of Florida, and that the bill died without a hearing, opining that the representatives in the City of Tallahassee would not do anything to stop the tyranny by supporting the bill. He opined that what was coming for the patriots in January 2029 was going to be severe, and that even though he would make a motion to pass the Collier County version, whatever version was passed would not be a replacement for the type of people being elected who could defend the citizens' rights. He indicated concerns about attacks and rage in the country, and said that he would like to pass the strongest version, such as one that said the County would defund

or not fund any agency or work with any task force or Federal mandate that the Board found to be unconstitutional. He opined that this nation needed the Supreme Court, and recalled that when President Joe Biden issued an executive order mandating that every large business would have to show proof of vaccinations, the Supreme Court stopped it. He opined that even though the ordinance basically said that the County reserved the right to file a lawsuit against the Federal Government, this would not be good enough when tyranny arose, and that the County needed to be serious about the threats that would come and be engaged. He opined that there would not be a legal challenge against the Collier County version, and that it was a good first step.

Ms. Marsh remarked that if the Board wanted to move in the direction of the Collier County version, then they would need to readvertise and bring it back at a future meeting, as it created a cause of action with penalties.

Commr. Parks commented that he was glad to live in Lake County, and expressed appreciation to all who participated in this process. He recognized that the Board could change the ordinance in the future, and that the ordinance presented had the changes from the previous meeting and changes suggested by Commissioner Campione. He stated that even though he was interested in the enhanced version of the ordinance, he only received it on the current day, and that he did not want to vote for something without having read it in its entirety, noting that the County would have to readvertise to consider it. He related that he knew what was in the current version, and that he would support it with the changes that were recommended.

Commr. Smith mentioned that when he first looked at the ordinance, he wondered why it was needed with the current Board who wanted to protect as much as they could for the citizens of Lake County; however, he opined that when they were no longer on the Board, there needed to be something on the record that stood for protecting the Bill of Rights. He commented that he liked the version that was presented and advertised with the few changes that were suggested, and that since he had not read the enhanced version, he would not vote for it. He relayed that he would like to get this ordinance on the record on the current day, noting that he liked using the word "protection" instead of "sanctuary." He opined that if the ordinance needed to be enhanced at a later time, then the Board could do that; however, he opined that this was a good starting point to let the citizens of Lake County know that this Board was serious about protecting their rights.

Commr. Morris opined that he was elected to look at things both ways, and that even though the ordinance had many good things, there could be possible conflicts and confusion, noting that four different ordinances were presented. He opined that even though there was a good Sheriff in power currently, if there was socialist Sheriff elected, then he would have all the power. He remarked that there was an avenue for people to take whose constitutional rights were violated, and opined that even though this ordinance could help them, the County would be financially responsible for the lawsuit. He opined that even though he understood what the County was trying to do, there were too many holes in it currently.

Commr. Campione opined that the point made by Mr. Bosshardt was well taken, such as voting for a document without knowing what was in it, and that there was much information in front of the Board. She indicated her understanding that the majority of the Board wanted to have

a Bill of Rights protection ordinance in place, and opined that since the Board liked the key points that were in at least three of the documents, the County should readvertise. She questioned if the County could advertise all versions of the ordinance with the suggestions made, or if it would be better to have one more meeting before advertising.

Ms. Marsh recommended that there would be one more meeting where there was a discussion on those versions, and that when the Board had agreed on one version, then the County would advertise that. She pointed out that both the Collier County and enhanced versions would create a cause of action, and that they did not clearly define who would make the determination of an unlawful act in the current judicial system, noting that those were items for discussion before agreeing on language for adoption.

Commr. Smith stated that he did not like delaying the ordinance, and opined that someone else could present another version for consideration.

Commr. Sabatini opined that since the enhanced version was preferred, then the County should advertise that version, noting that he did not want to advertise two versions.

Commr. Campione opined that the details and the language really mattered, and said that she did not want to choose another version to advertise. She opined that there was a great ordinance in front of the Board on the current day, and noted that she would advocate for that version. She remarked that even though she did not want to delay this, she was in favor of ensuring that it was right, and inquired if this item could be placed on the agenda for the following meeting with the three versions to chose from. She relayed her understanding that the Board would adopt one of those versions.

Commr. Morris asked if the County Attorney would comment on each of the versions.

Ms. Marsh commented that even though she had just received the enhanced version and had skimmed it, she observed that the enhanced version and the Collier County version were the most concerning legally, as they were both creating a cause of action that would allow an individual to sue and/or look for civil or criminal penalties against the BCC and any employee who allegedly engaged in enforcement of an unlawful act. She related that there was nothing in the either the Collier County version or the enhanced version that said who could make that determination, such as a resident or the Board, noting that judicially the Board did not have authority to declare something an unlawful act. She remarked that there were issues with both of those versions, and that even though these issues could be worked out, the enhanced version created a committee. She stated that the Board would have to decide if a committee was wanted, who would be on that committee, and if the committee would entertain every complaint obtained from a resident, noting that the County received complaints every day from residents, especially for the Office of Code Enforcement. She pointed out that this was just from glancing through the ordinance as she had not read it in its entirety, and that those were her concerns from the legal side.

Commr. Smith relayed his understanding that the current version of the ordinance included the best portions of the Collier County ordinance and added what was best for Lake County, and that this was put forward to the citizens; however, on the current day there was an enhanced

version. He opined that this would delay a decision, noting that this process started a couple of months prior.

Commr. Sabatini indicated his understanding that the Collier County version did not have a committee.

Ms. Marsh stated that it did not; however, it created the cause of action.

Commr. Sabatini opined that the Collier County version was the best, as there had been no legal abuses in many years.

Commr. Campione expressed concern about the cause of action language, and said that there were responsibilities that had to be done, including by the Office of Code Enforcement. She opined that there should not be a cause of action where people could use this ordinance against the County for doing what it was supposed to do and sue the County, and that they did not want to be sued every day for doing their responsibilities.

Commr. Sabatini opined that the citizens had the same legal right currently, and that this ordinance would not incentivize litigation, which could be expensive, and would not shift anything.

Commr. Morris relayed his understanding that it was shifting the cost to the taxpayers.

Commr. Sabatini disagreed, and opined that anyone could complain about an unconstitutional slight.

Commr. Morris indicated his understanding that the ordinance was asking the County to take the lead and sue for the citizens if they felt that something was unconstitutional, which meant that the citizens would be paying for this.

Commr. Sabatini opined that the ordinance would not add any legal weight, and that the underlying concern was that the ordinance would incentivize litigation.

Ms. Marsh related that her largest concern was who would be declaring it an unlawful act, and that one of the versions was saying that there were local penalties. She elaborated that if somebody did not like something, then they could sue under the County's code and claim an unlawful act, and noted that the question was how much the County wanted to spend on arguing about what was unlawful and what was not.

Commr. Sabatini opined that it was duplicative of what already existed.

Commr. Campione indicated concern about the language, and opined that it could be used against people later.

Commr. Morris wondered what would happen eight years from the current day when others were sitting on the Board.

Commr. Sabatini pointed out that anybody could go to the courthouse and file a violation of due process or whatever right they wanted to sue under whether the ordinance was passed or not, and said that he did not see how it would incentivize it.

Commr. Campione opined that the language in the Collier County ordinance created the question of who had decided that definitively, and that even though something was reasonably believed to be a violation of constitutional rights, the people of Lake County were giving the Board authority to make that decision. She remarked that in the legal system, the courts made those

decisions, and opined that the Board could say that something reasonably violated citizens' rights, stand up for the citizens, refuse to enforce it, and vote against using local funds for it; however, to make that determination was contrary to the system of law. She opined that it was a due process issue.

Commr. Sabatini opined that the language was still ephemeral, and that this was just a piece of paper.

Commr. Morris questioned why the Board was doing anything.

Commr. Sabatini stated that he was ambivalent towards it, and that if the Board wanted something that would provoke a conflict with an unconstitutional tyrannical federal act, then he was in favor of that.

Commr. Campione opined that even though she was in favor of fighting back against a tyrannical act, it was not appropriate to adopt an ordinance with language that was problematic.

Commr. Sabatini remarked that if this was the only significant difference between the enhanced version and the original draft, then he did not want to delay a decision and would vote for the original.

Commr. Campione indicated that she was in favor of the original with the language to change the word "sanctuary" to "protection" and referencing American citizens as those that were protected under the ordinance, noting that if someone wanted to add some specific language to it later, this could be done; however, this would be in place.

Ms. Marsh summarized that the motion included the following: removing the term "sanctuary"; leaving in the actual text of the Bill of Rights; adding "protect the rights of law-abiding citizens" in subsection C; adding the phrase "as an American citizen" to the definition; and calling it the Bill of Rights Protection Ordinance.

On a motion by Commr. Sabatini, seconded by Commr. Smith and carried by a vote of 4-1, the Board approved the original ordinance with some language changes, which included the following: removing the term "sanctuary"; leaving in the actual text of the Bill of Rights; adding "protect the rights of law-abiding citizens" in subsection C; adding the phrase "as an American citizen" to the definition; and calling it the Bill of Rights Protection Ordinance.

Commr. Morris voted no.

REGULAR AGENDA

PAIN MANAGEMENT CLINICS

Ms. Marsh stated that this item was for approval to advertise an ordinance that was associated with passing the Bill of Rights ordinance, and that when the Board added something new, something was taken away. She commented that if this approved, it would come back, noting that it was an outdated and obsolete section governed by Florida law.

On a motion by Commr. Smith, seconded by Commr. Parks and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved to advertise an Ordinance repealing Article VIII, Chapter 3, Lake County Code, entitled Pain Management Clinics.

LAKE-SUMTER MPO COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT

Commr. Morris asked to have this item tabled, as there were some people interested in applying for this committee.

Commr. Smith relayed his understanding that there was more than one position open on the Lake-Sumter Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Community Advisory Committee.

Ms. Marsh said that this was correct, and that there were currently two vacancies and one application.

Commr. Smith commented that there was an opportunity for someone else to apply for this committee.

Commr. Campione mentioned that if the Board knew of individuals who wanted to apply for this committee, then those people should apply soon, as those positions had been vacant for a while. She opined that it was a frustrating committee; however, it was a required committee to make recommendations.

On a motion by Commr. Sabatini, seconded by Commr. Smith and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved to appoint Ms. Stephanie Winheim to the Lake-Sumter MPO Community Advisory Committee.

WELLFLORIDA COUNCIL APPOINTMENT

Commr. Campione said that for the WellFlorida Council, there were three applications received, and that there was only one Lake County provider position vacant, including the following: Ms. Juana De La Cruz, who was also appointed to the Children's Services Council and Library Advisory Board; Mr. Christopher Gonzalez; and Ms. Colleen Wallace.

Commr. Morris made a motion to appoint Mr. Christopher Gonzalez.

Commr. Sabatini made a motion to appoint Ms. Colleen Wallace.

Commr. Campione mentioned that the Board had to see if the first motion for Mr. Gonzalez had a second.

Commr. Parks seconded the motion.

Commr. Campione inquired if all of the applicants met the qualifications to be a Lake County provider on the WellFlorida Council, and asked if Commissioner Morris knew Mr. Gonzalez.

Commr. Morris answered that he did not know him.

Commr. Parks opined that this item should be tabled.

Commr. Campione agreed that this should be tabled, opining that this was an issue.

Commr. Sabatini opined that Ms. Wallace was qualified, extremely well-known in the community, very interactive, and very respected in her profession.

Commr. Morris withdrew his motion.

On a motion by Commr. Morris, seconded by Commr. Smith and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board appointed Ms. Colleen Wallace to the WellFlorida Council as a Lake County Provider.

REPORTS

COUNTY MANAGER

MEMORIAL DAY

Ms. Barker commented that all County offices would be closed on May 25, 2026 in observance of Memorial Day.

COMMISSIONERS REPORTS

COMMISSIONER SABATINI – DISTRICT 1

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Commr. Sabatini mentioned that the State was in Legislative Session currently, and he asked the Board to keep watching the bills because it would be for the budget, including the appropriation projects and funding for various other things. He stated that it would end after the current week, and that they would finalize the budget after 72 hours in the following week.

COMMISSIONER PARKS – VICE CHAIRMAN AND DISTRICT 2

SOUTH LAKE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Commr. Parks expressed appreciation to Ms. Barker and staff for helping him with a presentation in the previous week at the South Lake Chamber of Commerce.

MEMORIAL DAY

Commr. Parks wished everybody a thoughtful and safe Memorial Day.

COMMISSIONER SMITH – DISTRICT 3

BUDGET MEETINGS

Commr. Smith relayed that since it was budget time, he would like to see people in attendance for the budget meetings to give suggestions or comments on the budget that they would be taxed for, opining that it was important to understand the budget and to have their voices heard.

WORKSHOP FOR RURAL PROTECTION

Commr. Smith indicated appreciation to the County staff, the City of Leesburg, and other municipalities who attended the workshop for rural protection, and opined that it was moving in a positive direction. He opined that once these maps were done, the Board could meet with each City to solidify this instead of having all municipalities in the same setting, and that it could be more productive moving through the process.

MEMORIAL DAY

Commr. Smith asked that everybody remember why there was a Memorial Day, including the morning memorial, which was for the fallen, and the afternoon memorial, which was for people currently serving. He expressed appreciation to all the veterans and active duty members for their service to their country.

Commr. Morris indicated appreciation to Commissioner Sabatini for his service.

COMMISSIONER MORRIS – DISTRICT 5

CR 466A

Commr. Morris remarked that in the prior week, there was a PD&E study for CR 466A, and indicated his appreciation to Mr. Jeff Earhart, Engineering and Operations Director for the Public Works Department, and staff, opining that they did a great job. He mentioned that the City of Fruitland Park and residents had been in attendance, and opined that even though there were differences of opinion, there was a good basis of what was happening there.

COMMISSIONER CAMPIONE – CHAIRMAN AND DISTRICT 4

WORKING WITH THE MUNICIPALITIES

Commr. Campione opined that since the municipalities had the maps, including those with JPAs, those with interlocal service boundary agreements (ISBAs), and those with nothing, there was the potential to work well together.

BRITT ROAD BID

Commr. Campione indicated her understanding that the Britt Road bid went out on the current day, and that the County should be receiving responses from contractors. She stated that after a decision was made, the work would begin, opining that it would be a very happy day.

RIBBON CUTTING ON DONNELLY STREET

Commr. Campione relayed that in the current week, the City of Mount Dora would be doing a ribbon cutting on the Donnelly Street project.

Ms. Barker mentioned that it conflicted with the County's budget workshop.

Commr. Sabatini wondered if the budget workshop could be shifted, as he wanted to attend the ribbon cutting.

Ms. Barker commented that the budget workshop was at 9:00 a.m.

Commr. Campione opined that the Board could be finished by 12:30 p.m., noting that the Donnelly Street ribbon cutting would be at 1:00 p.m.

Commr. Sabatini suggested that the Board could come an hour early if the meeting could be readvertised.

Ms. Barker stated that it could not be readvertised; however, if the Board could be done by noon, then it should be okay. She related that if the meeting was still going at 11:30 a.m. and there were a couple of departments left, then those could be rescheduled for the following budget workshop, noting that there was one more.

Commr. Campione opined that this was good.

SOUTH LAKE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Commr. Campione commented that she attended the South Lake Chamber of Commerce meeting, opining that staff did a great job. She hoped that the County could replicate something similar for the North Lake Chamber of Commerce meetings, and opined that since the South Lake Chamber of Commerce had one large group, it was easier to present it to everybody at once. She wondered if one of the North Lake Chamber of Commerce meetings could be chosen and if the others could be invited for the presentation on the issues that were covered at the South Lake Chamber of Commerce meeting.

MEMORIAL DAY

Commr. Campione opined that most people would be finding different ways to observe Memorial Day and to bring honor to those who had fought and died for the country, and asked that they would remember what a solemn holiday it was, noting that it was to recognize those who made the ultimate sacrifice for them.

BILL OF RIGHTS ORDINANCE

Commr. Campione expressed appreciation for the hard work done on the Bill of Rights ordinance discussion, opining that it was very thoughtful. She opined that one could delve into some of the things that were raised for future discussion, and said that she was glad that there was something put in place on the current day to say what was important to Lake County to protect the rights of the citizens and to respect the Bill of Rights, the laws, and their actions.

COMMISSIONER SMITH – DISTRICT 3

Commr. Smith said that it was National Plant Something Day.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to be brought to the attention of the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 12:38 p.m.

_____
LESLIE CAMPIONE, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:

_____
GARY J COONEY, CLERK