A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

JUNE 9, 2026

The Lake County Board of County Commissioners met in regular session on Tuesday, June 9, 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; Kirby Smith (arrived at 9:56 a.m.); and Timothy Morris. Commissioner not present: Anthony Sabatini. Others present were: Jennifer Barker, County Manager; Melanie Marsh, County Attorney; Marisol Saldana, Agenda Coordinator, County Manager's Office; Gary J. Cooney, Clerk of the Circuit Court and Comptroller; Mary Burns, Accounting Director; and Josh Pearson, Deputy Clerk.

INVOCATION AND PLEDGE

Commr. Campione welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Pastor Bobby Rowe, with the Fellowship of Christian Athletes (FCA) in North Lake County, gave the Invocation and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

AGENDA UPDATE

Ms. Jennifer Barker, County Manager, said that for Tab 4, the request was updated to include Commissioner Sabatini's remote participation in the current meeting, noting that staff would let the Board know if he signed in. She also commented that for Tab 15, a revised resolution and an additional resolution were added, and that on Tab 27 the background summary was updated to reflect the Planning and Zoning Board unanimously approving the proposed ordinance. She mentioned that Tab 32 was added as an addendum, and she requested that this be moved under the regular agenda.

SPECIAL RECOGNITION

Commr. Parks said that there would be a letter of recognition and public honoring of Ms. Janet Lewis, Manager for the Lake County Historical Museum and the Umatilla Historical Museum. He indicated that he was the liaison to the Lake County Historical Society and Museum, and that the displays were largely a result of Ms. Lewis' work. He commented that Ms. Lewis would be moving on to other things, and he read the letter of recognition to Ms. Lewis. He encouraged everyone to visit the museum.

Commr. Campione also encouraged everyone to visit the Umatilla Historical Museum.

MINUTES APPROVAL

On a motion by Commr. Morris, seconded by Commr. Parks and carried unanimously by a vote of 3-0, the Board approved the minutes for the BCC meeting of April 14, 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. Thomas Criscuolo, a resident of Lake County, expressed concerns for traffic on State Road (SR) 44, and he asked if there were any plans for the widening of SR 44 from the St. Johns River bridge to SR 44 in the City of Mount Dora. He also mentioned that between Pine Lakes and Cassia, there were some parts of the highway which had curves with no signs, and he inquired if there were plans to have someone look at these parts of the road.

Commr. Campione mentioned that SR 44 was a state road; therefore, the County could not put its own signs up, though they could notify the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) and put a request in. She added that FDOT had conducted a safety study over the last couple years and had looked at adding some turn lanes, and that it was ultimately up to them, although the County could raise and elevate those concerns. She opined that the curves and turn lanes were an issue, and relayed that she had heard requests for double lines and more enforcement. She also indicated that Mr. Mike Olka, Engineering and Operations Director for the Public Works Department, would meet with Mr. Criscuolo.

Mr. Banks Helfrich, a farmer from the Clay Road District and a candidate for State House of Representatives District 25, provided a farm tip of the day regarding when to harvest watermelons, and spoke about serving others.

Ms. Elanah Coulson, a resident of Lake County, opined that Embry–Riddle Aeronautical University was pushing Paisley, Lake County and the Florida Forest Service to allow them to cut down 40 acres of trees on either side of a dirt runway and pave an airstrip in the middle of the Ocala National Forest, as well as run five planes there. She indicated that this was protected Federal land, and opined that it was also a wildlife concern. She opined that this would not be right to allow, and that Lake County would be open to lawsuits from any environmental agencies and citizens. She opined that Embry–Riddle Aeronautical University had been using its campus area and buildings for a research park to benefit its system and students, and that the Boeing building was expected to be completed by 2027. She also relayed background information about the property.

Commr. Campione expressed appreciation for this, noting that this was not something that the Board had voted on; however, they were affected by it.

Mr. Rick Carlins, a resident of the City of Fruitland Park, thanked the Board for recently approving an ordinance; however, he had emailed some amendments to the Board. He relayed that the Collier County ordinance had been brought to the Board, and opined that currently, the weaknesses were that the approved ordinance was symbolic and limited action largely to litigation initiated by the Board of County Commissioners (BCC). He elaborated that it contained no prohibition against County participation in constitutional enforcement, and that it contained no enforcement for penalties or provisions. He added that it explicitly denied creation of private rights of action, and that it lacked anti-commandeering language and Federalism case law. He also commented that it did not prohibit the use of County personnel or resources for unconstitutional enforcement, and that it only provided discretionary authority to the Sheriff, rather than affirming constitutional non-cooperation authority. He relayed his understanding that there had been many people in support of the Collier County ordinance, and that they wanted to proceed with the

stronger and more enhanced ordinance. He opined that the County's ordinance would be stronger with these amendments, and he read one of the recommended amendments regarding the anti-commandeering doctrine.

CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT AND COMPTROLLER'S CONSENT AGENDA

On a motion by Commr. Parks, seconded by Commr. Morris and carried unanimously by a vote of 3-0, the Board approved the Clerk of the Circuit Court and Comptroller's Consent Agenda, Items 1 through 10, 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.

Sunstone Community Development District FY 2027 Proposed Budget

Notice is hereby provided of having received the Sunstone Community Development District Proposed Budget for Fiscal Year 2027 pursuant to Section 190.008(2)(b), Florida Statutes.

Country Greens Community Development District FY 2027 Proposed Budget

Notice is hereby provided of having received the Country Greens 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.

Bella Collina Community Development District FY 2027 Proposed Budget

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

County Road 33 Community Development District FY 2027 Proposed Budget

Notice is hereby provided of having received the County Road 33 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.

Lake Harris Community Development District FY 2027 Proposed Budget

Notice is hereby provided of having received the Lake Harris 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.

Hicks Ditch Community Development District FY 2027 Proposed Budget

Notice is hereby provided of having received the Hicks Ditch 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.

Dewey Robbins Community Development District FY 2027 Proposed Budget

Notice is hereby provided of having received the Dewey Robbins 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.

Lake Emma Community Development District FY 2027 Proposed Budget

Notice is hereby provided of having received the Lake Emma 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 Fruitland Park Ordinance 2026-001

Notice is hereby provided of having received Ordinance 2026-001 from the City of Fruitland Park.

COUNTY MANAGER'S CONSENT AGENDA

Commr. Campione said that she had comment cards for Tabs 14 and 15.

On a motion by Commr. Parks, seconded by Commr. Morris and carried unanimously by a vote of 3-0, the Board approved the Consent Agenda, Tabs 3 through 18, pulling Tabs 14 and 15 to the regular agenda, as follows:

PROCLAMATIONS

Recommend approval of Proclamation 2026-55 proclaiming June 15-21, 2026, as Men's Health week, per Commissioner Parks.

COUNTY ATTORNEY

Recommend approval:

1. To allow Commissioner Sabatini to participate and vote using an electronic platform on items included on the June 9, 2026, agenda due to extraordinary circumstances; and

2. To allow Commissioner Campione to participate and vote using an electronic platform on items included on the June 23, 2026, agenda due to extraordinary circumstances; and

3. To allow Commissioner Parks to participate and vote using an electronic platform on items included on the August 3, 2026, agenda due to extraordinary circumstances.

There is no fiscal impact.

PUBLIC SAFETY

Fire Rescue

Recommend approval:

1. Of Contracts 26-602 for Pharmaceuticals as needed with the following pool of vendors: Bound Tree Medical, LLC (Dublin, OH); Drake Pharmacy Solutions, LLC (Port Charlotte, FL); Henry Schein, Inc. (Melville, NY); Life-Assist, Inc. (Rancho Cordova, CA); Revelation Wholesale, LLC (Casselberry, FL); and Skyline Pharmaceuticals, Inc. (Fort Lauderdale, FL); and

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

The estimated fiscal impact is $350,000 (expenditure) and is within, and will not exceed, the Fiscal Year 2026 Budget. Annual expenditures shall at no time exceed the available Fiscal Year Budgeted funds.

County Probation

Recommend approval of the Lake County Transportation Plan in accordance with Section 394.462, Florida Statutes.

COMMUNITY SERVICES

Housing and Community Services

Recommend approval:

1. Of a Substantial Amendment of the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Fiscal Year 2023-2024 Annual Action Plan; and

2. To authorize the Office of Housing and Community Services Director to execute any documents required by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development; and

3. Of corresponding authorization Resolution 2026-56 related to the Substantial Amendment for Fiscal Year 2023-2024 Action Plan; and

4. Of a budget transfer in the amount of $229,752 reallocating CDBG funds from Community Projects to CDBG Capital Projects.

The fiscal impact is $229,752 (expenditure - grant funded).

Recommend approval:

1. Of a Substantial Amendment of the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Fiscal Year 2024-2025 Annual Action Plan; and

2. To authorize the Office of Housing and Community Services Director to execute any documents required by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development; and

3. Of corresponding authorizing Resolution 2026-57 that adopts the Substantial Amendment to the CDBG Fiscal Year 2024-2025 Action Plan; and

4. Of a budget transfer in the amount of $346,000 reallocating CDBG funds from CDBG Capital Projects and Community Projects to CDBG Capital Projects.

The fiscal impact is $391,300 (expenditure - grant funded).

Recommend approval of Unanticipated Revenue Resolution 2026-58 (URR) to accept and appropriate $2,713,646 for the FY 2025-1026 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Annual Action Plan.

The fiscal impact is $2,713,646 (revenue/expenditure - grant funded).

Solid Waste

Recommend approval and execution of a Second Amendment to the Revocable Non-Exclusive License Agreement with Coastal Conservation Association for an oyster shell storage site at the Astatula landfill facility.

There is no fiscal impact. Commission District 3.

INFRASTRUCTURE AND TRANSPORTATION SERVICES

Facilities Management

Recommend approval:

1. Of Contract 25-921 for HVAC Preventative Maintenance and Repair Services to NASH Plumbing and Mechanical, LLC (Belleview, FL) servicing 237 County-wide HVAC systems; and

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

The estimated annual fiscal impact is $600,000 (expenditure) and is within, and will not exceed, the Fiscal Year 2026 Budget.

Fleet Management

Recommend approval:

1. Of Contract 26-911 with JF Acquisition, LLC, d/b/a JF Petroleum Group (Morrisville, NC) to provide aboveground Fuel and Fluid Storage with Related Hardware, Software, and Services; and

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

The annual fiscal impact is estimated at $250,000 (expenditure) and is within, and will not exceed, the Fiscal Year 2026 Budget. Annual expenditures will not exceed available funding in future Fiscal Year Budgets.

Public Works

Recommend approval:

1. To proceed to closing on a deeded right-of-way dedication for Grove at Pine Meadows (DR-2017), which is in the City of Eustis; 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 4.

Recommend approval to repeal and replace the Construction Agreement previously approved by the Board of County Commissioners on March 24, 2026, with the Central Florida Expressway Authority (CFX) for the County to reimburse CFX for a portion of the right-of-way acquisition, design, permitting, and construction associated with CR 455, Cook Road, and Schofield located between U.S. 27 and S.R. 429 as part of the Lake/Orange Expressway Project in the amount of $16,348,714.42, spread over 20 years. The first payment of $817,436.12 is scheduled for approximately October 15, 2027, with annual payments of $817,435.70 thereafter through October 15, 2046.

The fiscal impact is $817,436.12 (expenditure) in Fiscal Year 2028 and $817,435.70 annually through Fiscal Year 2046 (expenditure). Commission District 1.

PARKS AND WATER RESOURCES

Water Resources

Recommend approval:

1. Of an Interlocal Agreement between Lake County and the Lake County Water Authority to accept $1,000,000 for the Lake County Distributed Wastewater Treatment System Program; and

2. To adopt Unanticipated Revenue Resolution 2026-60 (URR) to accept and appropriate in the amount of $1,000,000 for the Lake County Distributed Wastewater Treatment System Program grant funds.

Parks and Trails

Recommend approval:

1. Of Contract 26-420 with Florida Recreational Products, LLC. d/b/a Topline Recreation Inc. (Deltona, FL) for the one-time purchase of a replacement playground at North Lake Regional Park for the Office of Parks & Trails; and

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

The estimated fiscal impact is $173,224 (expenditure) and is within, and will not exceed, the Fiscal Year 2026 Budget.

FIRST AMENDMENT TO CONTRACT WITH ONSYTE PERFORMANCE

The Chairman opened the floor for public comment.

Ms. Cindy Newton, a resident of Commission District 4, said that she had been advocating for distributed wastewater treatment systems (DWTS) as a replacement for conventional septic, and that individuals had found out that they were receiving more charges than they originally thought. She opined that the extraordinary costs would be passed onto the consumer, and she wondered how many more costs would be added to these contracts. She indicated her understanding that the contractor was unable to keep up with these installations under the current payment with the original contract, and she questioned that with the County becoming a responsible party of the continuation of the maintenance and installation upon OnSyte dissolving or going bankrupt, would this include the units that were only under the grant, or all of the DWTS that OnSyte was putting into Lake County; additionally, she asked if this would include the community DWTS with community drain fields. She inquired what the cost would be to the taxpayers if the County had to take over this maintenance.

Commr. Campione relayed that the intent behind their fee structure was to ensure that the units fell under that utility operating the system, and so that they were able to maintain them. She added that the extenuating circumstances that they found in many properties were such that it was not straightforward to install a DWTS, and that these added costs were not calculated in the original cost of installation.

Ms. Melanie Marsh, County Attorney, explained that the County was only responsible for the units associated with the grant, and that if the company went under, this amendment would provide the County the source code so that they could find another operator or bring it in-house, reiterating that this was only for the units covered under their grant. She also relayed that the

extraordinary circumstances were things that the property owner would have to cover because this was a benefit to the entirety of the house versus just this unit.

Commr. Parks noted that this was still a pilot program, and that the purpose of this item was to address difficult cases. He stated that this could be reviewed each year, and that it was up to how much funding the State provided.

Ms. Newton expressed concerns for ongoing maintenance because they only received one quote.

Commr. Parks said that there were other competitors coming online with the same kind of system, opining that there would be much opportunity for competition.

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

Ms. Marsh clarified that regarding rates with this amendment, there could be annual increases of four percent or Consumer Price Index (CPI), whichever was lower, noting that this only applied to people who voluntarily signed up to be part of this program.

Commr. Morris relayed that the County was still the ones collecting the funding and paying OnSyte, and expressed concerns that if people did not pay, then the County would have to foreclose on them; however, OnSyte would continue to be paid regardless. He opined that OnSyte needed its own receivables department.

Commr. Campione relayed her understanding that because of the way it went on the bill, the County had to assume that responsibility because they were in the position to have the leverage to say that one would either pay, or there were repercussions. She opined that this was the best mechanism currently, and said that she liked that the County had the ability to receive the source code so that they or another company had the ability to take over.

On a motion by Commr. Parks, seconded by Commr. Morris and carried unanimously by a vote of 3-0, the Board approved the First Amendment to contract 22-917 with OnSyte Performance, LLC, related to the replacement of traditional septic systems with individual DWTS and for operation and maintenance of DWTS.

RESOLUTION REGARDING EAST CROOKED LAKE DRIVE AND COUNTRY CLUB ROAD

Commr. Campione relayed that this item regarded the installation of stop signs and all-way plaques on East Crooked Lake Drive and Country Club Road in the City of Eustis area, as well as some speed tables and signage prohibiting trucks over 10 tons unless they were for local delivery.

The Chairman opened the floor for public comment.

Ms. Lisa Chapman, a resident on East Crooked Lake Drive, thanked Commissioner Campione and staff for visiting and observing this issue on the road. She expressed concerns for the road becoming a cut through for heavy commercial trucks and speeding commuters, and she expressed support for these proposed measures to control the amount of traffic and speed. She also indicated concerns for wear and tear on the road, and the liability for someone being harmed on the street.

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

On a motion by Commr. Morris, seconded by Commr. Parks and carried unanimously by a vote of 3-0, the Board approved the following items: Resolution 2026-59 to install stop signs and all-way plaques on East Crooked Lake Drive (5069) and Country Club Road (5170); Resolution 2026-62 to upgrade the No Truck Signage to include a "No Trucks over 10 Tons Local Delivery Exempt" sign; add Residential Area sign just north of Country Club Road (5170) intersection; add two speed tables on East Crooked Lake Road (5069); and add two speed tables on Waycross Avenue (5072) between Country Club Road (5170) and Abrams Road (5371).

COMMENTS ON TABS 10 AND 12

Commr. Parks mentioned that Tab 10 regarded the second amendment to the agreement with the Coastal Conservation Association (CCA), and he explained that the County had offered space to the CCA at their landfill years prior to take oyster shells to a dedicated area for them to be dried out, crushed and taken to other parts of the state to reseed oyster beds. He said that this second amendment was to add another service to grow mangrove seedlings there, which would go out to replenish mangroves, opining that this was the best defense for hurricanes.

Commr. Morris stated that for Tab 12, the Sourcewell cooperative contract was a catch-all contract for many vendors. He said that he wanted to ensure that if the County was using this contract, there would be more than one vendor that did the work they needed, along with them getting a competitive look at multiple vendors and not just awarding a contract because a vendor had a Sourcewell contract.

Ms. Barker confirmed this.

PRESENTATION ON DEEP INJECTION WELLS

Mr. David Salinas, Director for the Office of Solid Waste, presented information relating to deep well injection as it pertained to the Heart of Florida Landfill in Sumter County. He explained that leachate is the liquid generated mainly from rainwater passing through waste, and that as the water passed through the waste, it collected soluble and non-soluble solids, including harmful substances; additionally, leachate is also produced from the decomposition of other landfill waste. He showed a cross section example of a landfill which included the layers, noting that leachate was captured at the bottom of a lined landfill where pumps were installed in a sump to extract the leachate for treatment or disposal. He indicated that leachate could be treated in four primary ways including recirculation, evaporation, treatment with wastewater treatment plants, and deep well injection. He explained that deep well injection is the process of injecting wastewater into porous formations below groundwater sources, insulating the liquid waste from drinking water aquifers, inserted between watertight rock layers, noting that there were six well classes for deep well injection in the State of Florida. He commented that the Heart of Florida Landfill's permit was for a class V well which was used for exploratory purposes only and did not allow for wastewater disposal, noting that this phase was intended to evaluate the feasibility of a future class I permitted deep well for the disposal of leachate. He then showed a proposed drawing of the exploratory well, as well as the process of deep well injection. He mentioned that per the

Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP), there were more than 180 active class I wells in the state, and that no new hazardous waste wells had been installed since 1983. He related that waste treated to be non-hazardous or demonstrate waste would remain where it was placed, while hazardous was defined as 10,000 years; therefore, the waste had to be treated to become non-hazardous or demonstrate that it would remain in place for 10,000 years in order to be injected. He said that approximately 54 wells in the state were for municipal wastewater disposal, and that currently, Pasco, Indian River, and Charlotte Counties had leachate deep wells. He listed the following potential concerns for class I deep well injections: well construction failure; faults or fractures in the geology; minimal risk of induced seismicity; prolonged storage causing degradation to the impermeable rock layer; site contamination at the source; and improper abandonment or sealing.

Ms. Blanche Hardy, Hydrogeologist with the Lake County Water Authority (LCWA), stated that well construction was unpredictable in karst geology, which they had in Sumter and Lake Counties, and she displayed an image of substantive sinkholes in the direct vicinity of the well; furthermore, the State had found that this area was indicative of karst geology. She commented that there could also be damage to aquifers, springs and seeps, noting that there were springs in the area already and that there were 729 potable wells within one half-mile of this site. She reviewed cross sections of exploratory wells drilled by the United States Geological Survey (USGS) which appeared in the definitive report issued on the Floridan Aquifer in Central Florida. She then reviewed a drawing of a plate, noting that this well was in the direct vicinity of the proposed well and that it would be in the potential 20, 40 or 50 year water supply that they may need to secure and treat to provide for their growing population. She displayed a map of good water in the State, noting that Lake, Sumter and Marion Counties were the water supply for millions of citizens between the Cities of Tampa and Cocoa Beach; furthermore, this was where they were discussing allowing or not protesting the proposed well. She also showed a map indicating that the well would sit below 2,600 feet of freshwater. She displayed a map of the close to 20 class I injection wells in the state, noting that almost all of them were on the coast; therefore, they were under thousands of feet of saltwater as opposed to freshwater. She indicated that when they were placed in the middle of the state, they potentially started to impact water supply. She stated that they were not allowed to be placed by drinking water wells, and that there were a number of instances where deep injection wells had contaminated groundwater. She expressed concerns that if one was placed in Sumter County, it could contaminate groundwater and drinking water if there was an accident, and she opined that this was a bad idea. She also reiterated that there were other ways to treat leachate, opining that this was not an emergency. She added that she had heard that they would not accept leachate from outside of Sumter County, and recalled that she had inquired what the reduction of the tipping fee would be for the citizens to Lake County if this was allowed; however, no one was discussing a reduction in tipping fees for being able to potentially put leachate in a manner that could potentially impact their groundwater supply.

Commr. Smith arrived at 9:56 a.m.

Commr. Parks did not think that the County should support a deep well injection system, and said that if they were not treating it, the standard was that if they were going to inject it, it would not be treated to the quality of water from where they were injecting it into.

Ms. Hardy clarified that leachate was not considered to be hazardous, and stated that she had not seen to what extent they would treat it, if at all. She relayed her understanding that this was due to the odor, opining that there were many ways to address this. She commented that leachate was usually sent to wastewater treatment plants, and opined that the other means were more expensive.

Commr. Morris asked how far along they were.

Ms. Hardy replied that they were currently requesting permission to do a class V exploratory boring, and that if this was okay and they went for a class I, anything that happened between the land surface and the bottom of the boring was in the drinking water supply.

Commr. Morris inquired if the Board should write a letter of concern.

Commr. Campione opined that it should be a letter of opposition and that it should list the other alternatives, along with the reasons stated by Ms. Hardy and what the Board's concerns were.

Commr. Smith asked if they could put this through a wastewater plant for reclaimed water.

Ms. Hardy reiterated that leachate was treated with wastewater treatment plants.

Commr. Smith inquired if it would be like reclaimed water from a wastewater treatment plant.

Ms. Hardy explained that if they were to treat it to the appropriate standards, they could inject it as aquifer storage and recovery, and that it would not need to go so deep.

Commr. Smith agreed that they needed to explore all the opportunities.

The Chairman opened the floor for public comment.

Ms. Kathryn Wright, a concerned citizen, relayed her understanding that a landfill leachate had highly concentrated mature pollutants, and she expressed concerns for health. She opined that given that mechanical systems were prone to failure, a leak could possibly go undetected for years, indicating her understanding that FDEP only checked this at a minimum of every five years. She also questioned why FDEP gave authority to do this.

Ms. Marsh asked if the Board wanted a letter signed by the Chairman, or if they wanted staff to bring back a resolution in opposition.

Commr. Campione expressed support for a resolution with a cover letter.

Mr. Marty Proctor, a resident of the City of Groveland, said that the trash put in solid waste containers went to the Heart of Florida landfill to dump this debris, noting that the landfill sat on top of water. He indicated support for taking the water and leachate that came off this and pumping it underneath their drinking water to address this situation.

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

<u>2026 HURRICANE SEASON OUTLOOK</u>

Ms. Megan Milanese, Director for the Office of Emergency Management, reviewed weather terminology and hurricane categories. She mentioned that they saw recent hurricane

responses over the last few years, noting that they did not see a landfalling hurricane in the previous year. She specified that they had Hurricanes Debby, Helene and Milton in 2024, Hurricane Idalia in 2023, and Hurricanes Ian and Nicole in 2022. She displayed the 2025 hurricane season names, and said that they had expected to see between 13 to 19 named storms in 2025, noting that they saw 13 develop. She added that they expected to see between six and 10 hurricanes, and that they saw five, noting that four had become major hurricanes of category three or above. She mentioned that for 2026, they were expecting a below normal season, noting that they received information from Colorado State University which had predicted 13 named storms with six becoming hurricanes and two of those becoming major hurricanes. She said that the National Hurricane Center gave a range and had predicted from eight to 14 named storms with three to six becoming hurricanes, and one to three of those becoming major hurricanes. She showed the 2026 hurricane season names, and indicated that County preparation included the following: they prepared year round; did partnerships, collaboration and coordination with the county stakeholders, including non-governmental organizations and nonprofits; held a public hurricane expo; and ensured that their agreements were up to date and in place. She relayed the following information for residents before a hurricane came: make a plan; determine where they planned to shelter during a hurricane; plan for pets; create a disaster supply kit early; stay informed; and get involved. She displayed a list of the County's primary shelters, noting that they may not open each shelter for every activation. She encouraged people sheltering in place to know where the safe room was in their home, noting that it would be the innermost location. She also mentioned that the home environment may be loud and frightening, and that one should stay away from doors, windows and skylights, along with only opening the refrigerator when necessary and staying informed. She commented that with AlertLake.com, one could receive alerts directly to their phone, and that the County always opened the Citizens Information Line (CIL) at 352-253-9999 when they activated for storms; additionally, she encouraged individuals to pay attention to local media outlets. She listed the following items for after a hurricane: be careful; stay informed to the latest information; stay away from downed, loose or dangling power lines; ensure food safety; be safe when cleaning up debris; take photos of damage to one's house, furnishings and surroundings for insurance; drive only when necessary; if traffic lights are out, treat it as a four-way stop; and contact family, friends and neighbors as soon as possible.

LAKE COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY UPDATE & PROPOSED FY 2027 BUDGET

Mr. Bobby Bonilla, Assistant County Manager, indicated that the LCWA was a special district with a Board of Trustees, and that they were still in the process of transferring Hickory Point and had added additional properties to the LCWA as part of the transfer, which included blueways, Helena Run, Pasture Reserve and Lady Lake. He displayed properties that they currently had open to the public, and said that the Lake Norris Conservation Area was an operating agreement with the St. Johns River Water Management District (SJRWMD) where the LCWA played a key role in the management of that property. He showed information related to the blueway system, and stated that the last part of the run underway was the Lake Apopka Run. He displayed a list of programs that the LCWA Board of Trustees had adopted, noting that this

included stormwater and floodplain oversight and management. He showed the current organizational chart, and he listed the following accomplishments: the water quality lab; the Lake County Water Atlas; much of the litter that had been removed and samples taken was done by staff and in partnership with volunteers; partnered with the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC) and the SJRWMD to collect data; did much community engagement throughout the county with activities taking place throughout the county on a monthly basis; created a library of events; land management and restoration was still part of their purview and responsibility, along with aquatic plant and waterway management; waterway signage throughout the county; in the last three years, they had been able to increase the amount of tree removal from waterways, noting that if outsourced, each tree would cost about $14,000, which would have been in excess of $1 million; the Nutrient Reduction Facility (NuRF), noting that they were in design to begin a nature based solution with filter marshes and a series of retention ponds to minimize the amount of alum needed, and that this was also meant to connect to the Lake Apopka Trailhead and North Shore Overlook trail system; the Lake Denham Muck Farm, noting that they were currently in the conceptual plan for a master plan of this site and that there were many opportunities for water storage and treatment, along with nutrient reduction, education and recreation; Lake Yale alum treatment; continued to install monitoring devices and rain gauges throughout the county; the stormwater program which had been reduced to three projects, ensuring that municipalities completed the projects; a partnership with the Lake County Sheriff's Office (LCSO) Marine Unit, noting that a building was currently out for bid and would be shared with the LCSO and the LCWA at the Hickory Point Recreational Complex; and the Board of Trustees were able to launch the first annual report which had been sent to the State Legislature, the BCC and the SJRWMD. He then listed the following efficiencies: much consolidation; sharing resources; reaching out to municipalities and other agencies; being part of the development review process; and having the key staff to do all of this. He recalled that they had three LCWA budget workshops on March 25, April 22 and May 20, 2026, and said that the fiscal year (FY) 2027 budget summary included funding the operation and continuing the grant program. He showed a list of multi-phase/multiyear ongoing projects, as well as property value estimates from FY 2025. He said that at the May 20, 2026 meeting, the LCWA Board recommended a tentative budget of $29,050,832 and a millage rate of 0.2940 mills. He showed a graph with the revenues and expenditures over the last four years, noting that in the last three years they had a better return on funds and were only issuing purchase orders (POs) and payments when needed; furthermore, they were restricting and watching the grant program, including asking the municipalities to consider other opportunities at the State and Federal level. He displayed the LCWA proposed FY 2027 budget of $29,050,832, and said that this included the operations, the management services agreement with Lake County, staff restructuring, new positions and capital outlay; furthermore, they were able to maintain reserves of 16 percent of the operating budget as recommended by the Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA). He then mentioned that they had been outsourcing the NuRF since 2022, and that they felt that they could do this in-house. He elaborated that the fiscal impact in 2026 would be around $833,000 for labor costs, and that the LCWA Board had unanimous support

to begin the process of doing the operation in-house, noting that they would be able to save over $330,000. He requested the BCC's support to bring in four additional staff members, noting that the staff would operate the NuRF and other properties; additionally, stormwater engineering would complete the makeup of the LCWA. He stated that these would be licensed engineers who could begin work immediately to design and have shovel ready projects not just for the LCWA, but other municipalities who needed guidance. He stated that part of the number one priority for the legislative team was stormwater conveyance in Lake County, noting that this could be started with a master plan throughout the whole county, along with asking the Cities to adopt the master plan and ensure that the Cities' public works staff was working on those projects. He summarized that this was consolidation, creating efficiencies, and a saving to the taxpayers, as well as the ability to pursue greater grants. He indicated that this would allow them to have shovel ready projects sooner, and he requested the BCC's support to get this staff in place as the NuRF contract was set to expire at the end of FY 2026.

Commr. Campione asked that as long as they were staying within the budget as presented, did the Board have to weigh in on the positions.

Ms. Barker clarified that the BCC had to approve the positions because they were full-time, and then once the positions had been created, staff would load the budget appropriately for the cost. She added that if the Board provided this direction, staff would ensure that this was included with the LCWA's budget, noting that the Board would be approving their millage rate in July 2026.

Commr. Campione relayed her understanding that the positions would take the place of the funding that they were reducing.

Commr. Morris opined that this and the NuRF master plan were great. He also thanked the LCWA Board for what they did.

Commr. Smith opined that the transformation of the LCWA and everything that Mr. Bonilla had been doing had been great, noting that they were reducing their budget by 10 percent.

Commr. Parks indicated his understanding that the BCC was going to approve the budget later.

Ms. Barker confirmed that this was just the initial presentation to the BCC with the requested action being that they would approve the millage rate in July 2026; furthermore, they would be part of the final budget presentation in September 2026.

Commr. Parks opined that the BMAP and a stormwater master plan across the county were of great importance. He also commented that when they had a master plan with the Cities and if they needed grant funding from the State, they would need to have the plan in place first for many years to make themselves more competitive for that funding.

Mr. Bonilla said that once they completed the master plan, they would be asking the Cities to adopt it.

Commr. Parks mentioned that this could be a topic at the roundtable meetings with the Cities.

Commr. Campione opined that this was a great way to do this so that it was a LCWA initiative to have a countywide flow way and stormwater drainage plan. She also said that she wanted to confirm that places in Astor would be included.

Mr. Bonilla recalled that in the Public Works Department presentation, there were some opportunities in terms of funding the stormwater program, noting that it was part of the plan to free up funding so that they could begin sooner.

Ms. Barker relayed that the Board could provide consensus on the four requested positions.

Commr. Smith inquired if the four positions were replacing what was already at the NuRF under the contractual services, and Mr. Bonilla confirmed this.

Commr. Campione asked if they would still use alum, but in a different way.

Mr. Bonilla relayed that they would significantly reduce the amount of alum, and that it would only be if the water needed to be injected with alum after being tested.

The Chairman opened the floor for public comment.

Mr. Proctor deferred his comments in support of staff.

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

FISCAL YEAR 2027 PROPOSED BUDGET SUMMARY PRESENTATION

Ms. Jaime Stewart, Director for the Office of Management and Budget, commented that the County had the budget strategies workshop in February 2026, along with the departmental budget workshops in May 2026. She relayed that the preliminary taxable values came in on June 1, 2026, and she showed the best estimate of property values as of June 1, 2026. She elaborated that based on the best estimate, they saw 7.52 percent growth in the countywide property values, which reflected an overview of the countywide decline in new construction of 13.54 percent in 2026 versus 2025; however, several cities saw a considerable uptick in new construction including the City of Fruitland Park at an approximate 433 percent increase, and the Town of Lady Lake at around a 114 percent increase. She mentioned that the ad valorem revenues were based on the best estimate of property values, and that the status quo millage rate of 5.0254 mills did not include the Tax Collector's FY 2027 budget request, the Medical Examiner's FY 2027 budget request, or the Florida Retirement System (FRS) contribution adjustment. She showed a summary of the preliminary General Fund budget compared to the 2026 adopted budget, noting that the ad valorem increase was 7.36 percent, that the increase of revenue from other revenue sources totaled about $1.3 million from various sources, and that the Sheriff's revenue was the contracted services that his office provided. She also indicated that the fund balance of FY 2026 did not include the PO carryforward amounts, and that it reflected the use of reserve funds for the County's hurricane response during the current year. She said that for expenditures, County departments had an increase of about $852,000, and that the Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) payments were estimated on property values and came in at roughly $17.6 million. She said that the reduction in other grants and aids reflected the anticipated completion of the Rosenwald Gardens project in FY 2026, and that Judicial Support, which reflected the anticipated increases in information technology (IT) supplies, software, utility costs, and the repairs and maintenance, was

at an increase of about $184,000. She mentioned that the Medical Examiner's increase of about $315,000 was estimated based on the increases seen in previous years, and that the preliminary budget fully funded all the Constitutional Officer requests. She stated that reserves decreased to about $31.6 million, which was approximately 10.87 percent of the General Fund expenditures, noting that this was due to the FY 2026 PO and carryforward adjustments which would be calculated later in the budget cycle. She listed the following items for department budget requests: the majority of the departments were seeing a slight increase related to proposed wage adjustments and increases in insurance premiums; the Office of Human Resources (HR) and Risk Management increase of around $3.8 million reflected the projections from the actuary with respect to healthcare claims and increased wages; the IT Department's increase of roughly $350,000 was due to is personnel geographic information systems (GIS) and computer aided design (CAD) positions, in addition to software for those new positions and increases in operational costs; the Office of Parks and Trails increase of approximately $841,000 was due to contractual cost increases; the Office of Housing and Community Services increase of around $7.1 million reflected the transfer of Veterans Services to Housing, and the allocation from the State Housing Initiatives Partnership Program (SHIP) and Community Development Block Grant (CDBG); the Office of Facilities Management was seeing a savings of about $2.4 million, which reflected capital projects that were expected to be completed in FY 2026; the Office of Fleet Management had an increase of about $262,000 for staffing, restructuring, wage increases and increased insurance costs; the Office of Planning and Zoning increase of about $412,000 reflected services from the Comprehensive Plan (Comp Plan) in FY 2026 and the restructuring of the stormwater staff to the office; the Office of Fire Rescue included wage adjustments, FRS and insurance increases, and contractual increases, as well as end-of-life defibrillator replacements; the Office of Transit Services reflected a decrease of approximately $7 million due to the completion of older grant funding, and did not include carryforward for FY 2027; the Office of Solid Waste increase of about $1.99 million reflected an anticipated increase to disposal contracts; and for the Public Works Department, there was an increase of around $13 million which reflected for awarded FDOT grants. She reviewed the Constitutional Officer budget requests, and said that the Clerk of the Circuit Court and Comptroller request included increases for wage adjustments, insurance and FRS rates, along with inflationary impacts to operating expenses. She commented that the Property Appraiser's request included an increase for the staggering amount of new full-time employees' insurance costs, along with a customer queue management system, a timekeeping system, other IT devices, a website redesign, and employee training and development. She commented that the Sheriff's request included an increase for cost of living adjustments (COLA), Jail IT upgrades, IT equipment, an increase in insurance rates, and FRS contribution rates. She displayed an approximation of the Tax Collector's budget which would be due on August 1, 2026, noting that an increase in property values was being used to estimate the value and that this was subject to change. She said that the increase in the County support for Constitutional Officers was mainly attributable to increases related to leases, utilities and other maintenance costs, and that overall, the increase to Constitutional Officer budgets was around $18.3 million. She showed a breakdown of the most

recent fire assessment study which had been presented in May 2026, noting that there were no changes due to the current assessment rates. She commented that proposed solid waste assessment rates reflected the rate adjustments to match the increasing contract costs for hauling and disposal, and she displayed proposed rates for once per week and twice per week service, noting that the proposed rate increase was $37. She stated that for minimum wage impacts, the County had taken a proactive approach to stay ahead of the State schedule, and that the countywide minimum wage had been adjusted to $16 per hour in FY 2026; furthermore, for FY 2027 they were proposing to adjust the minimum wage to $17 per hour for all BCC employes, plus adjustments for compression. She mentioned the following next steps in the budget process: in July 2026 they would receive the certified taxable values, adopt initial assessment resolutions, and set the maximum millage rates; in August 2026, they would hold a budget workshop and public hearing for the Infrastructure Sales Tax (IST) plan; and in September 2026 they would hold their public hearing to adopt the FY 2027 budget.

Commr. Parks asked if the Constitutional Officer budget requests totaled a 10 percent increase, and Ms. Stewart confirmed this. Commissioner Parks then relayed his understanding that the County departments increase was one percent, and he inquired if the County was still about 22 to 23 percent total of the dollar bill figure.

Ms. Barker indicated her understanding that the County departments were about 24 to 25 percent of the total General Fund. She added that other items such as CRAs and debt service were around 22 to 25 percent, and that the Constitutional Officers were about 50 to 60 percent. She elaborated that a majority of the increase for the departmental budgets was related to healthcare premiums for each employee.

Commr. Campione asked about outstanding Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) funds for prior hurricanes.

Ms. Barker relayed her understanding that they were anticipating a total of about $14 million, noting that they had spent around $18 million since 2022 and that they had received approximately $2.5 million to $3 million so far.

RECESS AND REASSEMBLY

The Chairman called a recess at 10:48 a.m. for five minutes.

PUBLIC HEARINGS: REZONING

REZONING CONSENT AGENDA

Commr. Campione reminded the Board that if they had an ex parte communications on cases, she would ask them to disclose this.

Mr. Mike Fitzgerald, Director for the Office of Planning and Zoning, displayed the advertisements for that day's rezoning cases on the overhead monitor in accordance with the Florida Statutes.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

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

On a motion by Commr. Morris, seconded by Commr. Smith and carried unanimously by a vote of 4-0, the Board approved the Rezoning Consent Agenda, Tabs 1 and 2, as follows:

Tab 1.
Rezoning Case #PZ2024-279
Sorrento Ave - Elkridge
Request approval of a Development Agreement to address the provision of wastewater services approved under Sections 163.3220-163.3243, Florida Statutes, known as the Florida Local Government Development Agreement Act.

Tab 2.
Rezoning Case #PZ2024-018
Mountain Lake Drive
Request approval of a Development Agreement to address the provision of wastewater services approved under Sections 163.3220-163.3243, Florida Statutes, known as the Florida Local Government Development Agreement Act.

REZONING REGULAR AGENDA

Tab 3.
Rezoning Case #PZ2025-334
Haines Creek Estates PUD Amendment (RZ)
Amend and restate Planned Unit Development (PUD) Ordinance #2023-36, for property identified as alternate key numbers 1387728, 1387736, 1387779 and 3829154 to amend Section D, Architectural Design Standards.

Tab 4. Ordinance No. 2026-27
Rezoning Case #PZ2026-76
Wiggins CR 439, LLC (CUP)
Conditional Use Permit (CUP) approval on approximately 20.06 +/- acres to allow utility services associated with a well drilling and repair facility and other associated uses within the Agriculture (A) District.

Tab 5. Ordinance No. 2026-28
Rezoning Case # PZ2025-186
Jones Property - Whitney Rd (RZ)
Rezone approximately 18.76 +/- gross acres from Agriculture (A) to Rural Residential (R-1) district to facilitate a minor lot split for a single-family residential dwelling.

Tab 6. Resolution 2026-61
Rezoning Case # PZ2025-186
Jones Property - Whitney Rd
Approval of Resolution under Section 14.11.01(G), Lake County Code, Appendix E, Land Development Regulations, to allow the creation of one additional lot through the Minor Lot Split process on property owned by Randy A. Jones Jr. and Emily Blanchard Jones, Trustees of the Randy and Emily Jones Family Trust.

HAINES CREEK ESTATES PUD AMENDMENT (RZ)

Mr. Fitzgerald presented Tab 3, Rezoning Case #PZ2025-334, Haines Creek Estates PUD Amendment (RZ). He explained that the requested action was to amend and restate the Planned Unit Development (PUD) Ordinance 2023-36 to amend Section D, Architectural Design Standards. He relayed that the Planning and Zoning Board had voted unanimously to recommend approval, and that the location was Goose Creek Road, south of Eagle Point Court. He mentioned that pursuant to Ordinance 2023-36, the subject property was approved to be developed as a single family residential subdivision with 145 lots, and that the ordinance had included architectural design standards governing building design elements. He commented that subsequent to approval

of the PUD ordinance, the Florida Legislature had amended Florida Statutes to prohibit local governments from regulating the specified building design elements in a PUD, and that the applicant sought to amend the ordinance to reduce the minimum square feet of living area from 1,500 to 1,200, remove the roof pitch minimum requirement, remove the specific building material and color requirements, remove the language requiring architectural design standards to be placed in the homeowners association (HOA) declarations, and update transportation improvement agreements. He specified that these agreements were highlighted as resurfacing Goose Creek Road from County Road (CR) 44 to the development entrance, installing right turn lanes at eastbound CR 44 onto Goose Creek Road and Shelley Drive as allowed pursuant to existing right of way, and extending Eagle Point Court west to the subdivision entrance.

Commr. Smith disclosed that he had spoken to the engineer.

Mr. Logan Opsahl, an attorney representing the applicant, indicated that the proposed amendment was to make the PUD text consistent with the plan that was approved in 2023, and that at the time of original submittals to approval of the PUD, the site plan showed a minimum of 1,200 square feet for the single family homes; however, the text of the PUD said 1,500 square feet. He clarified that the plan was unchanged, and remarked that the applicant also wanted to address the design standards that the Florida Legislature enacted relating to a lack of requirements. He specified that this included the roof pitch, the architectural design standards, and the inclusion of those standards in the HOA documents. He stated that the transportation improvements were already contained in the PUD, and that additional conversations and agreements with staff also took into account the resurfacing of Goose Creek Road and the shoulders.

Commr. Campione relayed her understanding that the design standards had a date per Florida Statutes where one was allowed to make those requirements, noting that this development predated this.

Mr. Opsahl confirmed this, commenting that these items were implemented by ordinance after the Florida Legislature created the statute. He added that both of these items happened after the approval of this PUD, though items such as roof pitch and exterior were the specifics that they were incorporating into this PUD. He said that it was consistent with the statute, indicating his understanding that this fell in line with the County's standard PUD language.

Commr. Morris asked if this was approved before the new statute, and Mr. Opsahl confirmed this. Commissioner Morris then inquired if the applicant was asking to go back and do what the new statute said that they could do.

Mr. Opsahl said that this was correct.

Commr. Morris asked what the County would get out of this if it was done.

Mr. Opsahl indicated that one of the additions for transportation was the resurfacing of Goose Creek Road and the implementation of the shoulder, which were being added to the PUD.

Commr. Morris inquired about the estimated cost for this, and Mr. Opsahl replied that it was about $200,000.

Commr. Smith relayed his understanding that the square footage was a typo in the PUD, and he asked if this would be consistent with the site plan from before.

Mr. Opsahl confirmed this.

Commr. Smith stated that he was not agreeable with the architectural changes, and he asked if they were planning on having flat roofs.

Mr. Opsahl denied this.

Commr. Smith inquired if they planned on putting metal roofing up in case they had a 1:12 roof pitch, and Mr. Opsahl did not believe that a metal roof was part of this. Commissioner Smith then expressed concerns for changing the stucco or Hardie Board, and stated that he was agreeable with moving it from 1,500 square feet to 1,200 square feet; however, he was not agreeable with everything else.

Commr. Campione stated that the PUD said 1,500 square feet, indicating her understanding that the PUD would control this.

Ms. Marsh confirmed that the PUD would have come first, and that if the site plan was inconsistent, then whoever designed it on the developer side did not follow the terms of the PUD. She also clarified that there was no site plan because this was residential; rather, it would be preliminary plat, construction plans, and final plat, which would all come after the PUD.

Commr. Campione indicated her understanding that the statute which addressed architectural items said that when it went into effect, it shall not impact projects approved before a certain date.

Ms. Marsh said that this was correct and that this statute went into effect on July 1, 2023; furthermore, this project had been approved about three weeks before it went into effect.

Commr. Campione opined that the statute was clear that it would not affect a project that was already there.

Mr. Opsahl indicated that for the square footage, he was referencing the PUD plan which was part of the ordinance, opining that they had been consistent on their submittals and that this was how the project was to be overlaid. He noted that currently, the County code did not have the minimum square footage requirements, and opined that it required consistency with the PUD plan. He relayed that the overall impetus of the reason they were present was consistency to the PUD.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

Mr. Gary Wiepking, a resident on Formosa Island Road, expressed concerns for the type of housing that would be built and if it would affect the value of the homes in the surrounding area. He also indicated concerns for if they would be changing the fencing or wall around the subdivision, and he recalled that the applicant had been granted right of way to Goose Creek Road and were going to put in a park and a parking lot; however, he was unsure of the status of this. He asked about a right turn lane on Goose Creek Road, and he expressed concerns with regards to a traffic light at CR 44 and Harbor Shores Road. He relayed his understanding that the applicant would start putting up a traffic light on June 8, 2026, though nothing was happening.

Ms. Lizzeth Jensen, a neighbor of the subject property, expressed concerns for speeding and traffic on Harbor Shores Road, and opined that the streets were not wide enough and that the curves were dangerous. She also indicated concerns for property values, and she questioned why the quality of what the houses would look like had to change drastically. She also opined that if

they had two entry points and did not put a right turn lane coming from the City of Leesburg onto Goose Creek Road, there would be more fatalities.

Mr. Ray Hayden, a resident on Dennis Road, indicated concerns for traffic on the Haines Creek Road bridge, and opined that they needed a turn lane into this development, along with a traffic light at the next intersection. He also opined that the second entry needed to be addressed for ingress and egress, along with emergency service personnel who would have to arrive there.

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

Mr. Opsahl said that the traffic light was in design at the County stage, and that the discussed turn lane was in the PUD ordinance to the extent that there was room, noting that construction plans had been submitted to the County. He clarified that that the County code no longer had the roof pitch requirements, and that the adjustment was to match the code as currently written. He opined that the exterior language was fine to keep, and that they could remove the redline changes in the packet, which included revisions to the entity, some dates, and a general reference to comply with the zoning code. He relayed that the applicant was comfortable with leaving in the other redlines relating to design standards, and that they would implement the additional transportation requirements following their discussions and agreements with the County.

Commr. Smith asked about the guarantee for the park and parking area, and if it was in the PUD.

Ms. Marsh replied that this PUD did not include the parking language that the County started incorporating in October 2025, and that the only parking requirements in this ordinance said that all single family units would have a paved two-car wide driveway access from garage to street and only one driveway access per lot. She remarked that if the applicant did the minimum width, then they would have the same issues with other subdivisions where people could be parking on the street and blocking emergency services.

Mr. Chuck Hiatt, with Halff and representing the applicant, explained that the internal roads met the requirements of the County, which was 12 feet of drivable surface, noting that they had 10 feet of asphalt and two feet of drop curb. He clarified that this had been approved, and that the applicant was trying to get the square footage consistent with the PUD plan.

Commr. Smith asked if this 12 feet was per lane for a total of 24 feet per road, and Mr. Hiatt confirmed this.

Ms. Marsh stated that the issue the County had in other subdivisions that were doing 12 foot wide roads was that they were selling homes where people had multiple drivers and were on small lots, noting that people were parking in their driveway, using their garage for storage, and also parking in the street. She added that there were several subdivisions where they could not get emergency vehicles down the road, and that they ended up in long discussions with HOAs because HOAs could not or would not enforce garage and driveway parking. She said that since October 2025, the County had included standard parking language in their PUD indicating that the road width must be a minimum of 34 feet if they were going to allow on-street parking. She stated that

if they were not going to allow on-street parking and have the 12-foot minimum standard, then they had to provide driveways that would accommodate four vehicles in length or width without impeding the sidewalk, or the developer had to include overflow parking on each block or strip of road because parking would not be permitted in the roadway; additionally, developers were being required to put up signage. She elaborated that under the Florida Fire Prevention Code, the signage for no parking had to be placed every 60 feet on both sides of the road if parking was being prohibited on both sides.

Commr. Smith asked if the County could add to the current item that there would be parking on one side only.

Ms. Marsh replied that if they only had the 12 foot lane widths, they were not supposed to have parking on either side.

Commr. Morris inquired that if they went to 1,200 square feet instead of 1,500 square feet, could they design something with a wider road.

Mr. Hiatt clarified that they were trying to get to 1,200 square feet to be consistent with the plan.

Commr. Smith expressed concerns for the road widths in subdivisions, opining that it would be great if they could address this.

Mr. Hiatt said that they could include no parking in the HOA documents, and have the HOA likely police it; however, it was not a guarantee.

Commr. Smith opined that they could also widen the roads.

Mr. Hiatt indicated that this would be a new preliminary site plan submittal and a new construction plan approval, and that they were ready to start construction.

Commr. Parks said that he was surprised that the applicant was coming back, and he recalled how contentious the original hearing was. He added that the issues of what it was going to look like had been brought forward, which was why some of the PUD criteria was included. He questioned if the applicant's intentions were possibly to do something cheap, and said that he was not supportive of this. He also opined that the road width was important, and stated that the other roads going into the neighborhood were substandard. He mentioned that the developer was responsible for the right turn lane, relaying his understanding that it had been discussed during the previous hearing to mitigate traffic.

Mr. Opsahl opined that they had an approved PUD with a typo, and that this was the only process to correct this and ensure that the ordinance was consistent.

Commr. Parks opined that it was not a typo because the PUD was the governing document.

Mr. Opsahl said that items such as roof pitch were to match the code, and that the applicant was present for consistency and to include the additional transportation agreement. He indicated that the exterior finish items could be disposed of.

Ms. Marsh pointed out that for Mr. Hiatt's suggestion for the HOA documents to enforce no parking, there was some case law where the HOA could not enforce parking or no parking on publicly dedicated roads; therefore, she did not think that this was necessarily feasible, though they would have the option of overflow parking, or wider or longer driveways.

Commr. Campione said that the roads would be dedicated and that the County would have the ability to place no parking signs.

Ms. Marsh confirmed that they could incorporate that the developer would have to fund the signs, and that the signage was fairly expensive. She said that the County could do this, though they would typically want this cost to go back to the developer if the developer was not going to design to have street parking.

Commr. Smith relayed his understanding that the developer was keeping the roads, and Ms. Marsh clarified that they would be publicly dedicated.

Commr. Morris stated that he wanted the HOA to address it.

Mr. Opsahl mentioned that it was right of way going into the neighborhood.

Ms. Marsh remarked that this PUD incorporated the language that it would be brought into the municipal service benefit unit (MSBU) to fund the roads.

Commr. Smith indicated his understanding that the roads were currently 10 feet of asphalt and two feet of Miami curb on each side, and he asked how much width they needed.

Chief David Kilbury, Public Safety Director, explained that Chapter 18 of the Florida Fire Prevention Code required that a street for fire department required access be 20 feet unobstructed, along with having 13.6 feet of vertical clearance; additionally, if there was an exception to this, the Fire Marshal could mandate additional fire protection requirements if there was difficulty in accessing it. He related that 20 feet of width, unobstructed, included no parking on the streets, and that the only way to overcome this was bulb-outs or dedicated areas. He added that there would be no overnight parking and no on-street parking, and that unattended vehicles on the street were not allowed. He mentioned that a different County had put it on the developer that no parking signs had to go up as the certificate of occupancies (COs) for the buildings started to occur. He elaborated that the enforcement would be on the Sheriff, and that without the street signage, they did not enforce the fire code; therefore, it was incumbent upon the developer to educate in the documents, as well as posting this on the streets.

Mr. Jeff Earhart, Engineering and Operations Director for the Public Works Department, said that the traffic signal at Harbor Shores Road was under contract, and that they were waiting on material to come in. He opined that it was unlikely for there to be right of way sufficient to allow the right turn lane, and mentioned that the agreement said “if it was available.”

Commr. Parks opined that this was not the County’s issue and that the developer needed to make the turn lane happen, which may require the purchase of right of way. He expressed concerns for the County possibly having to fund the turn lane at some point, when one could argue that it would not be needed if this item had not been approved.

Chief Kilbury added that it was incumbent upon the design professional to show through AutoTURN CAD that their largest firetruck could navigate the corners.

Commr. Smith relayed his understanding that his previous approval of this item was due to the right turn lane, and opined that it had to go in.

Mr. Opsahl indicated that the applicant would pull this request and continue to work with staff.

Commr. Smith asked if this would allow the applicant to come back with more changes.

Ms. Marsh explained that if they withdrew the request, they would operate under the previously approved PUD.

Commr. Parks reiterated that he did not see the turn lane as the County's responsibility.

Commr. Campione opined that the turn lane needed to be there and that it was not safe currently, noting that this could possibly make it even worse.

WIGGINS CR 439, LLC (CUP)

Commr. Campione said that she had communications with the owner of the property, Mr. Wiggins, and with Mr. Wilson, a property owner across the street.

Commr. Parks relayed that he had spoken to the applicant and received some emails.

Mr. Fitzgerald presented Tab 4, Rezoning Case #PZ2026-76, Wiggins CR 439, LLC (CUP). He said that the requested action was a conditional use permit (CUP) to allow a utility service associated with a well drilling and repair facility, and other associated uses within an Agriculture zoning district. He stated that the Planning and Zoning Board had recommended approval on their regular agenda with a vote of 6-1, and that the location was east of CR 439, south of CR 44A; additionally, the future land use (FLU) was currently Rural. He remarked that the proposed concept plan depicted two phases of development, that phase one included a proposed 9,400 square foot warehouse and office and a 3,900 square foot barn for storage, and that phase two was a 9,800 square foot flex space for storage and agricultural support services, including the sale and repair of electrical power equipment in case of emergency. He relayed that this was considered an essential utility service for rural areas, and that the applicant was proposing to utilize existing tree lines on the property as a buffer; furthermore, the buildings would be set back over 100 feet from the property lines, and the applicant would be utilizing private well and septic for the subject property. He said that the request was not anticipated to adversely affect transportation levels of service in the area, and that staff had received correspondence in opposition and support, with 13 support emails.

Commr. Morris relayed his understanding that this property was in the BMAP and that they would have to utilize DWTS.

Mr. Fitzgerald replied that it was in the middle of the St. Johns BMAP.

Mr. Dan Langley, an attorney representing the applicant, said that staff and the Planning and Zoning Board had recommended approval of the application, opining that the CUP met all criteria for approval under the code and was consistent with the Comp Plan. He noted that this business had been around since 1939, that it was a family owned business, and that it would continue to survive as such. He opined that they were a great community partner and were well known for what they did, and he clarified that this was not an industrial use; rather, it was an agricultural and utility support use. He added that there was no manufacturing or processing, and that this was a low intensity use service business with de minimis traffic and a low employee count. He praised the buildings and architecture, opining that it fit the rural character, and he remarked that the buildings were set back off CR 439 by over 240 feet. He also opined that there was adequate natural landscaping that would buffer the neighbors and create a beautiful environment.

He opined that it was vital that businesses like this went into rural areas to support the agricultural community.

Mr. Greg Wiggins, President for Wiggins Bros. Well Drilling, provided information about his family and business, and said that they still served the agricultural market mostly comprised of plant nurseries, sod farms, and fresh fruit, vegetable, cattle and horse farms. He mentioned that there was still a significant amount of the county's rural population which received their water from private wells, and that the services that they provided were essential to these rural communities. He said that their business had been located at the corner of CR 46 and Round Lake Road in Sorrento for over 42 years, and that future plans for that area included high intensity growth with the City of Mount Dora expanding over that area. He expressed concerns for staying there, and he mentioned that the City of Apopka had placed water lines nearby. He said that he wanted it to remain a Lake County unincorporated business, and that they felt moving north to this location would put them in a central location for their customers; furthermore, when Round Lake Road was extended, they would be able to get back to some of the customers to the south. He opined that CR 439 was a substantial road, and relayed that they currently had an agricultural exemption on their property. He said that they had left many of the good trees in the front and the side, and that they would be incurring extra expense to build an attractive building. He added that they were also going to have a four board fence around the property to fit the rural lifestyle there, and that their cattle would be able to graze areas around the property.

Mr. Clayton Wiggins, with Wiggins Bros. Well Drilling, provided information about his family, and opined that this site was an ideal location for their business as it provided them a closer commute and was central to the area they served. He recalled a concern raised at the Planning and Zoning Board meeting regarding what a new owner would do if they sold the property, and he clarified that they had no intention of moving from this property or leaving this business, noting that the company was 87 years old. He opined that they were currently cramped and that this new building would give them the ability to stock more parts and better serve the community. He said that his company provided essential services, and opined that they got along well with neighbors; additionally, they believed that they would be a valuable addition to the area.

Ms. Sherie Lindh, with LPG Urban and Regional Planners and representing the applicant, opined that the CUP protected the County because it could be revoked if they did not abide by the conditions. She opined that they met the Comp Plan and the LDR in regard to the use and support uses, and stated that a traffic impact analysis had been done and submitted, noting that they were considered a de minimis impact. She added that an environmental assessment was also conducted, that there were no wetlands, that they were not in a 100 year flood zone, and that there were no protected species. She showed images of what the applicant envisioned the site to look like, pointing out that the site was 20 acres and that the CUP area was only 10.92 acres. She said that they met the impervious surface ratios (ISR) and were below the allowed thresholds, and that they were also below the floor area ratios (FARs). She remarked that they would provide 35 percent open space as required, and that they technically provided more open space than this. She mentioned that the applicant would fence the entire site, and that they would still have to go

through site plan approval and meet all the CUP and LDR standards, including architectural standards. She also related that the 2025 Florida estimates of population by the University of Florida (UF) Bureau of Economic and Business Research (BEBR) included 445,881 residents with approximately 200,867 residents within unincorporated Lake County, which was about 45 percent of the population, noting that this was within the rural areas. She said that water was an essential service for each property owner, and that based on a 2021 report by UF Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences (IFAS), the agricultural industry, which included approximately 150,000 acres of agricultural production, brought in about $481.49 million annually; furthermore, this did not include the other associated food manufacturing process related to agriculture. She opined that there was a severe economic impact if water was not available during and after storms and freezes.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

Mr. Alex Macovicius, a neighbor of the subject property, opined that this was a commercial business headquarters, and said that their current location was already zoned commercial with vacant land ready for expansion. He opined that the City of Mount Dora was not stopping well drilling, and that there were other properties already zoned commercial near the subject property. He expressed concerns for moving their headquarters into a residential area, as well as for large commercial vehicles delivering. He indicated concern for road fatalities, and opined that there was little to no restriction on the current proposal when it came to the site, nor was there anything stopping the property from being sold after the green light was given. He opined that the applicant could expand at their current location, purchase an already existing commercial property, or run their business on their 30 acre residential property. He relayed concerns for security lights, and opined that residents would like to keep it residential.

Mr. Tim Wilson, a resident on CR 44A, said that he had not seen anyone clear 10 acres of heavily wooded property and then apply for a CUP for a business after the fact. He opined that nothing around him looked like the architectural renderings and was not a business. He opined that the plan was not consistent with other properties in the area, and mentioned that the plan allowed for two 35 foot high buildings; furthermore, he opined that nothing in the area looked like two three-story buildings. He opined that this set a bad precedent for further commercial development at that intersection, and that this development adversely impacted his property. He opined that no one wanted a business at that intersection, and asked why the applicant did not put this business at the 150 acres they owned two miles away. He expressed opposition to this.

Ms. Pamela Schneider, a resident on CR 439, expressed support for this item, opining that this corridor was already a mixed use area. She indicated that rural residents relied on wells for water, particularly if they were responsible for livestock, and she opined that Wiggins Bros. Well Drilling responded quickly to provide well repair services; therefore, she opined that having them in the neighborhood would be an asset. She opined that their current operation on SR 46 was well maintained, and she expected that any operation on CR 439 would also be maintained at the same standard. She opined that concerns regarding hours of operation, lighting or noise could be

addressed in the CUP, and she believed that having Wiggins Bros. Well Drilling there would be a net benefit and not detract from the existing mixed use and rural character of the area.

Ms. Newton opined that they had to look at the future of the CUP language, and that dark sky lighting standards should be required and be limited to what was necessary for safety and security. She opined that although the applicant had stated that the electrical and plumbing work was currently handled through outside recommended companies, the proposed language appeared broad enough to allow future expansion into additional utility-related services. She opined that the CUP should clearly prohibit storefronts, retail sales areas, service counters, or other customer facing commercial operations onsite. She opined that the CUP should not create loopholes for incremental commercial expansion in any agriculture area, and that it should include language strictly limiting the property to well drilling and directly associated operational functions, as well as no expansion into unrelated utility or service businesses without a new public hearing for approval. She opined that clear conditions and enforceable limitations were essential to protect the surrounding properties that preserved this rural character of the area.

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

Mr. Langley remarked that the Board had received a number of letters in support, and opined that a 35 foot building height was consistent with residential zoning. He added that it was set back from the road by over 240 feet, and he clarified that dark sky lighting was already in the CUP. He said that there was no intention to have a large retail center, and that most activity occurred offsite. He opined that the property owners who had spoken were well buffered naturally from the subject property, and that it would not be a visual impact to them. He opined that it would fit with the rural character of the community, noting that it was a 20 acre property and that the development envelope was small compared to the acreage. He relayed that there would be cattle remaining, and he asked the Board to approve the CUP as recommended by staff and the Planning and Zoning Board.

Commr. Campione said that the Board had spent much time trying to come up with ways to preserve and promote rural land uses, and opined that the last thing they wanted to do was interject commercial uses into rural communities; however, she opined that the distinction with the subject item was the support nature and that it was no different than an essential utility provider. She opined that they could not have rural uses and promote farming if they did not have services such as well services, and she mentioned that there was a marijuana growing and production facility nearby which was zoned agriculture in the Rural FLU and the rural protection area. She elaborated that those uses were intense, that someone could do this on any of the properties on CR 439, and that this was a function of something that came out of the State Legislature. She commented that like many current agriculture uses, the Board did not have a say over setbacks or how they were developed because the Board had been preempted on these items. She said that she understood the property owners who did not want something to change; however, she opined that it could potentially be an agriculture use and change it drastically, noting that it would feel like an industrial use. She clarified that the proposed use looked more like a farm use, and that the

buildings were used to provide a service that directly supported rural uses. She opined that the key was ensuring that the ordinance did not open the door for commercial uses, and that with the way it was designed with agriculture architecture and four board fences, the applicant was trying to fit into the rural feel and be good neighbors. She opined that the CUP gave this level of control and created a better scenario as long as it was used for this purpose. She explained that if the Wiggins family decided to sell the property, it said that it had to be used for this purpose, opining that an agriculture use would likely be the alternative. She stated that the ordinance would not allow it to turn commercial.

Commr. Smith confirmed that once this CUP was done, it had to come back to the Board for approval of any changes.

Commr. Campione asked how often trucks came to bring items, and if they were semitrucks.

Mr. Greg Wiggins replied that they would be able to store more items, and that they ordered larger amounts, noting that they would be box trucks or flatbed trucks from local suppliers rather than semitrucks. He mentioned that they might have a delivery two or three times a week, and that they had a zero tolerance policy for safety. He said that they would occasionally receive an over the road delivery three or four times per year, and he showed an image of one of their service trucks which usually left in the morning and come back to the shop once or twice per day.

Commr. Campione inquired if they would ordinarily be doing business in the evening if there was an emergency.

Mr. Greg Wiggins commented that they would respond to calls at night, and that they would normally be there for one or two hours and then return and store the truck. He then said that their plan was to have motion sensor lights.

Commr. Morris asked if they did retail sales.

Mr. Greg Wiggins responded that their retail sales were incidental, and he displayed an image of the front of their current business, noting that the sign did not mention sales or getting parts. He added that most people paid by credit card or mail.

Commr. Smith relayed his understanding that they would have less traffic at night than a family with a teenager.

Mr. Greg Wiggins opined that one of his sons going to get a truck would be no different than a resident pulling up to a house for 20 minutes and then leaving. He also recalled that he had stated that his business hours were 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, noting that this was the time that his secretary was present, when they received deliveries, and when a customer could visit. He said that they were like a utility and could be called on a holiday, noting that they had to respond if this occurred. He indicated his understanding that the Planning and Zoning Board had included language regarding general hours, and said that he would prefer it to be similar to other utilities in that there would be no operating hours, noting that they would not be there doing anything other than if they needed to service someone and leave.

Commr. Campione expressed concerns for them getting something at night being an argument that they were outside the 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. hours, and she asked if there was a way

to word this so that it would be predominantly 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. with the understanding that there would be times when it was used without it being an emergency.

Mr. Greg Wiggins stated that they may sometimes have a safety class, and that they may be able to invite some nursery and agriculture accounts with a SJRWMD official to discuss consumptive use permits, etc., a few times per year. He commented that he would not want to be doing something like this and feeling that he was in violation of the CUP.

Commr. Smith opined that they needed to keep it as 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. with emergency service being allowable.

Ms. Marsh stated that they could change it to "emergency service calls" and allow training and incidental use, and that delivery hours could be 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Mr. Greg Wiggins commented that it was very rare for deliveries to be after 5:00 p.m.

Ms. Marsh said that instead of general hours of 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., it would be delivery hours of 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, noting that they could then eliminate "excluding times of necessary emergency operations" or leave it as a separate sentence with other incidental uses including training and employee meetings.

Commr. Parks relayed his understanding that the only issue was deliveries and the small amount of retail they did, noting that retail and deliveries could be 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Commr. Campione opined that saying "retail" would open the door for this.

Mr. Langley opined that the intent of the language was originally consistent with what Mr. Greg Wiggins was saying with regard to how he operated, noting that it discussed general hours when the office was open. He opined that they could expand language to say "general hours of 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding necessary emergency service, calls, operations, and after hours pickups for customer service calls," as well as possibly adding another sentence that addressed the concern about deliveries. He said that deliveries should generally be consistent with the 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday timeframe.

Ms. Marsh stated that they could combine this into the first sentence that would say "general office hours and deliveries between the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday," and that she was fine with the emergency service calls and/or operations, or incidental training or other employee-related items in the evening.

Commr. Campione said that it was along the lines of something incidental as opposed to something expected to be a regular item, noting that a regular item would be an issue. She clarified that they were not going to turn it into a training facility; rather, they would sometimes have some training.

Mr. Langley commented that when businesses generally had business hours, the owner was there before this to open the business, and that the janitor was there after hours cleaning, noting that these were incidental things that happened outside of business hours. He remarked that Mr. Wiggins was trying to clarify that those items were not intended to be prohibited.

Ms. Marsh summarized that they could do "general office and delivery hours of 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, after hours emergency calls or operations permitted, and employee training or educational seminars permitted as an incidental use."

On a motion by Commr. Smith, seconded by Commr. Parks and carried unanimously by a vote of 4-0, the Board approved Tab 4, Rezoning Case #PZ2026-76, Wiggins CR 439, LLC (CUP), with the changes provided by Ms. Marsh.

JONES PROPERTY – WHITNEY ROAD (RZ) AND RESOLUTION 2026-61

Commr. Morris disclosed that he received an email from Mr. Randy Jones, the applicant, and that he had answered it.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

Ms. Newton displayed the map from the staff report, and relayed her understanding that there was only one house there; however, the County map appeared to show two houses. She asked if the applicant was looking to put additional homes there aside from the one extra house.

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

Mr. Fitzgerald showed an aerial of the subject parcel, and commented that the aerial that the County had on file showed one home. He displayed an illustration of the original lot split of parcels A and B, noting that the rezoning and the request for an additional parcel were running concurrently. He showed a potential sketch of what the new parcel would look like in front of the residential home, and said that if the Board approved the additional lot split, the applicant would have to return for a variance request to have the 50 foot wide road frontage, noting that the minimum requirement was 100 feet. He believed that the additional home shown on Ms. Newton's aerial was an accessory dwelling unit (ADU).

Ms. Marsh relayed that the Property Appraiser's Office showed a home built in 2022 with a total living area if about 5,000 square feet, and then there was a secondary residential structure built in 2024 at about 2,700 square feet; therefore, it was possibly an ADU.

Commr. Campione said that she did not see how they could divide more.

Mr. Fitzgerald added that they still had to request a variance for the road frontage.

Ms. Marsh clarified that the building permit issued in 2023 was for an ADU with a total area of 4,430 square feet.

Mr. Jones stated that this was currently his primary residence, along with an ADU that his mother and father in law lived in, and that they were requesting to rezone the property to Rural Residential (R-1) to do the minor lot split and add one additional home to the property.

Commr. Campione asked if he would be selling it.

Mr. Jones replied that it was for family, that the new home would be behind a church, that there was a nursery to the north, and there was a 10 acre tract to the south. He relayed his understanding that property across the street was zoned R-1 with likely three or four homes across the front of the property.

Commr. Campione relayed that it was a mixture of larger and smaller lots, with some agriculture uses. She opined that this looked like someone wanting to use their property for the highest and best use, and that it was not going to affect anyone else in a bad way.

On a motion by Commr. Morris, seconded by Commr. Smith and carried unanimously by a vote of 4-0, the Board approved Tab 5, Rezoning Case # PZ2025-186, Jones Property - Whitney Rd (RZ), and Tab 6, Rezoning Case # PZ2025-186, Jones Property - Whitney Rd.

PUBLIC HEARING: ORDINANCE 2026-24 PAIN MANAGEMENT CLINICS

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 ARTICLE VIII, CHAPTER 3, LAKE COUNTY CODE, ENTITLED PAIN MANAGEMENT CLINICS; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; PROVIDING FOR INCLUSION IN THE CODE; PROVIDING FOR FILING WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

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. Smith, seconded by Commr. Parks and carried unanimously by a vote of 4-0, the Board approved Ordinance 2026-24 repealing Article VIII, Chapter 3, Lake County Code, entitled Pain Management Clinics.

PUBLIC HEARING: ORDINANCE PLACING LEVY OF FIVE-CENT LOCAL OPTION FUEL TAX ON BALLOT

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

AN ORDINANCE OF LAKE COUNTY, FLORIDA, PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY OF A FIVE-CENT LOCAL OPTION FUEL TAX IN LAKE COUNTY; PROVIDING FOR APPROVAL OF THE LEVY BY VOTERS IN A REFERENDUM; PROVIDING THAT THE IMPOSITION SHALL BE EFFECTIVE FOR A PERIOD OF TEN (10) YEARS BEGINNING JANUARY 1, 2028; PROVIDING FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE FUEL TAX; PROVIDING FOR THE FUEL TAX PROCEEDS TO BE DISTRIBUTED AMONG LAKE COUNTY AND THE MUNICIPALITIES; PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD ON NOVEMBER 3, 2026; PROVIDING BALLOT LANGUAGE; PROVIDING FOR NOTICE OF THE SPECIAL ELECTION; PROVIDING FOR NOTIFICATION TO THE STATE OF FLORIDA, DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE; PROVIDING FOR AMENDMENTS TO LAKE COUNTY CODE, CHAPTER 13, ARTICLE II; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; PROVIDING FOR INCLUSION IN THE CODE; PROVIDING A CONFLICT CLAUSE; PROVIDING FOR FILING WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

Mr. Brian Lueth, a resident on Piney Woods Way, asked if this gas tax would provide funding for internal subdivision roads in communities that had been there for decades, noting that his community was part of the Lake County road management system. He also asked that if the five cent sales tax was not made available for internal roads and if the County did not have the identified funding source, what was the financial mechanism for repairs and maintenance of internal subdivision roads. He added that he was in the Greater Pines community.

Commr. Parks clarified that gas tax was used for resurfacing in general, including neighborhood roads and other roads, and that there was a plan for neighborhoods.

Ms. Barker stated that she was not seeing Greater Pines on the list of roads rated four and five, which were the highest priority, noting that they would have to take some Public Works Department staff to that area to do a pavement rating. She indicated that staff could review this.

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

Commr. Morris relayed his understanding that everyone received calls, noting that there was some concern with the referendum because the School Board, the North Lake County Hospital District (NLCHD) and the State also had referendums; therefore, he was concerned about the timing.

Commr. Smith relayed that he did not have any concern, and opined that they should bring it to the voters and let them vote on whether they wanted the gas tax.

Commr. Parks proposed waiting and seeing as things played out, and he agreed that they wanted to be careful with the School Board referendum. He mentioned that the BCC could do this with a 4-0 vote at any time, and that they would have to advertise it. He mentioned that the Board could see what happened and how budgets were going to change, noting that this was more of a true user fee.

Commr. Campione indicated her understanding that when grouping it with other items, people may look at it differently than if it was not.

Commr. Morris opined that they needed it, but that the timing was the most important part. He opined that there would be much confusion with what was occurring at the State level compared to the NLCHD, and that there could be much social media on it. He opined that they could potentially wait for a 4-1 vote, and said that they could potentially put it on the following year.

Commr. Parks opined that they had to personally run a campaign on it.

Commr. Smith opined that three of the Commissioners had stated the intent, noting that it was a user fee and that it was needed for Greater Pines and other roads. He pointed out that government was responsible for public safety, infrastructure and some well-being.

Commr. Campione relayed her understanding that Commissioner Smith would want it to pass.

Commr. Smith confirmed this, noting that he wanted it to pass four months prior.

Commr. Parks reiterated that the Board could address this at any time by referendum or a 4-1 vote.

Ms. Marsh remarked that they could call a special referendum at any time, though if it was done in an off year where they did not necessarily have a general election, they would have to pay for the cost of the election.

Commr. Morris indicated that he wanted it to pass, and opined that it could fail if it was included with everything else.

On a motion by Commr. Morris, seconded by Commr. Parks and carried by a vote of 3-1, the Board denied this item.

Commr. Smith voted no.

REGULAR AGENDA

ORDINANCE REGARDING CERTIFIED RECOVERY RESIDENCES

Ms. Marsh recalled that staff had brought this item forward to the Board a couple meetings prior, and that it was required by the State under 2025 legislation that they had to make provisions for certified recovery residences and create an Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) process if they needed an exception. She also recalled that Commissioner Campione had been concerned with people requesting ADA accommodations for zoning, which was a legitimate concern; therefore, she had talked to some of her counterparts in other Counties, and what staff had brought back on the current day was an ordinance which would expand it. She mentioned that originally, they were going to allow it as permitted in Community Commercial (C-2), Employment Center (C-3) and Planned Commercial (CP), noting that they brought back additional allowances; furthermore, it would be a CUP in Agriculture, Urban Residential (R-6), Mixed Residential (R-7), Multifamily Residential (R-10), Residential Professional (RP), Neighborhood Commercial (C-1) and industrial zonings. She said that by allowing it to come back as a CUP in those additional zonings, the Board would have more control over this, and that staff requested the ability to advertise this ordinance.

On a motion by Commr. Smith, seconded by Commr. Morris and carried unanimously by a vote of 4-0, the Board approved the following items: to advertise an Ordinance creating Section 3.03.00, Lake County Code, Land Development Regulations, to be entitled, Certified Recovery Residences, and amending Appendix E, Chapter II, Lake County Code, Land Development Regulations, entitled Definitions, and Chapter III, Section 3.01.03, entitled, Schedule of Permitted and Conditional Uses, as required per Senate Bill 954 (2025); and to authorize, if accepted by a majority plus one vote, to conduct the Second Public Hearing of the proposed Ordinance at 9:00 a.m., rather than at 5:05 p.m. as required by Section 125.66(4), Florida Statutes.

ORDINANCE DISSOLVING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

Ms. Marsh said that this item was recommending approval to advertise an ordinance dissolving the Board of Adjustment and transferring those functions to the BCC, and that if they approved it for advertising, staff would bring it back at the June 23, 2026 meeting to go into effect in July 2026; therefore, the BCC would start seeing variances on their rezoning agenda starting July 14, 2026. She recalled that the Board had discussed this several times in the past, and that staff made some changes. She mentioned that they were currently down to two members on the Board of Adjustment, and that they had to cancel the June 2026 meeting. She opined that it would be more efficient with the BCC, noting that the BCC was already granting waivers as part of conditional zonings.

Commr. Campione indicated that her thought had always been that the BCC was already addressing variances when it came to conditional uses and PUDs, and opined that it was more efficient. She relayed her understanding that other Boards in the past had sometimes wanted to have them separate to take the heat off the BCC, noting that they could sometimes be difficult cases; however, she did not think that this was a good reason to give it to a separate board.

Commr. Parks expressed opposition to this, and said that he still believed in the process of having it separate and that it had been time-honored in Lake County. He opined that they could

make changes to address not having enough Board of Adjustment members, and he stated that he understood both sides of it.

Commr. Smith asked about what they would do for the public waiting on a decision from the Board of Adjustment, which could not move forward as a result of having to keep canceling meetings due to not having a quorum. He opined that it was not that the Board of Adjustment was bad, but that they could not get people to volunteer.

Commr. Campione opined that some of the technical issues which had come up before that group were issues that the BCC was immersed in already, and that it was not fair to force someone to go to a court of law because they did not like the way a decision came out. She opined that it was in the public's interests for it to be with a group that had more day to day involvement with some of the questions that came up with a variance.

Commr. Morris pointed out that they could always go back.

Commr. Parks opined that the same argument could be made for the Planning and Zoning Board.

Commr. Campione clarified that the Planning and Zoning sent items to the BCC for the ultimate decision.

Commr. Parks opined that there were qualified people on the Planning and Zoning Board who could also be qualified on the Board of Adjustment.

Commr. Campione opined that many people were qualified, but that the issues were ones that the BCC was familiar with already, and that this was helpful to the public and the applicant.

Ms. Marsh said that in 2026 as of May, they only had 10 cases for variances, noting that there was a significant decline.

Commr. Campione relayed her understanding that if the Board moved forward on the current day to advertise, they could address the cases that would have otherwise gone to the Board of Adjustment.

Ms. Marsh confirmed this, indicating her understanding that there were about four or five cases postponed because they did not have a sufficient number of board members.

Commr. Campione stated that in the following year, if this was not working and they needed a separate board, then they could set this up.

On a motion by Commr. Morris, seconded by Commr. Smith and carried by a vote of 3-1, the Board approved to advertise an Ordinance dissolving the Board of Adjustment and transferring its functions to the Board of County Commissioners.

Commr. Parks voted no.

OTHER BUSINESS

APPOINTMENTS TO THE PUBLIC SAFETY COORDINATING COUNCIL

On a motion by Commr. Parks, seconded by Commr. Morris and carried unanimously by a vote of 4-0, the Board appointed the following individuals to the Public Safety Coordinating Council, with applicable waivers: Ms. Jana Quash as a Local Court Administrator (or person designated by Local Court Administrator) with no term; Ms. Stephanie Boyd (Monitoring and Technical Assistance Analyst) as a Representative of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health

Program Office of the Department of Children and Families with no term; and Ms. Ashley Henry (Chief Probation Officer, Office of County Probation), as a Director of County Probation or Pretrial Intervention Program with a four year term.

APPOINTMENT TO THE KEEP LAKE BEAUTIFUL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

On a motion by Commr. Smith, seconded by Commr. Parks and carried unanimously by a vote of 4-0, the Board appointed Mr. Michael Jaycox (with conflict waiver) as the Elected Municipal Representative to the Keep Lake Beautiful Advisory Committee to fill an unexpired term ending May 31, 2028.

APPOINTMENTS TO THE VALUE ADJUSTMENT BOARD

Commr. Parks nominated Commissioner Sabatini and Commissioner Morris.

Commr. Morris volunteered to serve as the Chairman.

On a motion by Commr. Parks, seconded by Commr. Smith and carried unanimously by a vote of 4-0, the Board appointed Commissioner Sabatini and Commissioner Morris (as Chairperson) to the Value Adjustment Board, with terms ending July 11, 2027.

On a motion by Commr. Morris, seconded by Commr. Smith and carried unanimously by a vote of 4-0, the Board appointed Honorable Jennifer Hill to the Value Adjustment Board with a term ending July 11, 2027.

APPOINTMENT TO THE LAKE-SUMTER MPO COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

On a motion by Commr. Parks, seconded by Commr. Morris and carried unanimously by a vote of 4-0, the Board appointed Ms. Amelia Swart to the Lake-Sumter Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Community Advisory Committee.

COMMISSIONERS REPORTS

COMMISSIONER PARKS – VICE CHAIRMAN AND DISTRICT 2

FLORIDA WILDLIFE CORRIDOR IN ZONING REPORTS

Commr. Parks relayed that he would like to add an agenda item at a future meeting for the Board's zoning reports to check if the location of a request was within the Florida Wildlife Corridor.

Ms. Marsh remarked that staff could add this to the zoning report.

COMMISSIONER SMITH – DISTRICT 3

LIBERTY TREE CELEBRATION

Commr. Smith stated that the Liberty Tree celebration was great, and he thanked the City of Fruitland Park and Commissioner Morris. He hoped to have Liberty Trees at each school and city.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES ONLINE PROXY FORM

Ms. Barker explained that Commissioner Sabatini was going to attend the National Association of Counties (NACo) meeting, and that as part of the registration process, they had to name a voting representative on behalf of the BCC. She relayed that Commissioner Sabatini was requesting that he be named as the voting representative for the Lake County BCC while he was

at the NACo convention, noting that they needed to complete the registration and get Commissioner Sabatini's hotel accommodations.

Commr. Morris questioned what he would be voting on.

Commr. Campione opined that the NACo was generally a more liberal organization than the Florida Association of Counties (FAC).

Commr. Parks indicated that this was why they were encouraging everyone to participate in FAC so that they could fill committees at NACo.

Commr. Campione inquired if the County would be paying for Commissioner Sabatini to attend, and if he would be doing an online proxy.

Ms. Barker clarified that Commissioner Sabatini would be attending the convention, and that the County was trying to register him for the meeting; furthermore, the County would be paying for him to attend. She asked if the Board would like staff to bring this item back on June 23, 2026 for discussion when Commissioner Sabatini would be in attendance.

Commr. Campione opined that it was worthy of discussion because they had to decide how they were going to handle things like this, noting that she was not fully comfortable making a decision at the current time.

COMMISSIONER SMITH – DISTRICT 3

NATIONAL DONALD DUCK DAY

Commr. Smith commented that it was National Donald Duck Day.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to be brought to the attention of the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 1:19 p.m.

_____
LESLIE CAMPIONE, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:

_____
GARY J COONEY, CLERK