A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

JULY 28, 2026

The Lake County Board of County Commissioners met in regular session on Tuesday, July 28, 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; and Timothy Morris. Commissioner not present: Anthony Sabatini. Others present were: Jennifer Barker, County Manager; Melanie Marsh, County Attorney; Misty Spahn, Executive Office Manager, County Manager's Office; Gary J. Cooney, Clerk of the Circuit Court and Comptroller; Kristy Mullane, Chief Financial Officer; and Stephanie Cash, Deputy Clerk.

INVOCATION AND PLEDGE

Commr. Campione welcomed everyone to the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) meeting and noted that it was being streamed on the County website; furthermore, they were also broadcasting the meeting via Zoom.

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

AGENDA UPDATE

Ms. Jennifer Barker, County Manager, stated that she did not have any updates to the agenda.

SPECIAL RECOGNITION

Commr. Parks relayed that he was honored to make a special presentation for Ms. Gabby Suver, noting that she was a resident of Lake County, a teacher in Lake County, and a world-class triathlete. He mentioned that he met her a few months prior, and that her story weighed on his heart. He opined that there were many accidents on the roads, such as crashes and hit and runs, affecting many lives, and noted that Ms. Suver's life was impacted greatly by a hit and run incident. He commented that Ms. Suver was now an advocate for public safety, and that she was trying to educate others and change policy, which he opined could help protect lives in the future. He opined that out of what happened to her, much good would come, and that she would have a great impact. He remarked that he brought this forward to emphasize public safety on the roads and to present a special letter of recognition to Ms. Suver, and he read the letter and presented it to Ms. Suver.

Chief David Kilbury, Public Safety Director, opined that it was good to have a reunification with a former patient that had a positive outcome, and that even though a bicycle rider hit by a vehicle had a high chance of suffering a fatal injury, Ms. Suver was back functioning and was not even in a wheelchair. He opined that the Lake County Office of Fire Rescue had a system that worked, which included the emergency room (ER) being brought to the patient in the field, and noted that Ms. Suver was taken to Orlando Regional Medical Center as quickly as possible. He said that he was proud of the over 450 men and women of the Office of Fire Rescue and proud that there was a survivor to tell her story.

Ms. Suver said that she was a professional triathlete and an elementary physical education (PE) teacher, and related the following: on November 15, 2025, she was riding on the far-right

side of the road wearing bright colors in broad daylight with her rear and front lights on; she was hit by a vehicle and thrown into a fence pole; the driver kept going and left her there; other drivers found her and called 911; she was airlifted to a hospital in the City of Orlando; her injuries included many spinal and neck fractures, which required a T9 through T11 fixation fusion and a T10 and L2 kyphoplasty; other injuries included nine fractured ribs, sternum fracture, left scapula fracture, level three liver laceration, double impact concussion, left open knee fracture, and a complete tibia and fibula break needing two rod infusions; she spent 29 days in the hospital between trauma and the rehab institute; and she was released December 14, 2025. She mentioned that the doctor said that looking at the x-rays, they would have assumed that she was paralyzed, and she opined that it was only by God's grace that she was still alive and healing. She commented that she was sent home with a wheelchair, and that she had to relearn how to walk, noting that her mother stayed with her for two months to help take care of her. She remarked that it had been eight months since the accident, and that she was currently able to swim, bike, and run, noting that six months after the incident, she completed her first sprint triathlon since the crash, placing third overall. She relayed that she did another triathlon on June 14, 2026 where she placed first overall for females and was fourth with the men, opining that even though she had a long way to go to get back to her previous fitness and to return to racing competitively at the professional level, it was a good start. She opined that the incident had brought to light a growing tension against cycling in the area, and that changes in the law needed to happen to increase the safety of cyclists. She opined that there needed to be more driver education and awareness because there were still many people who did not know to share the road with bicycles, and that cyclists needed to set a good example by following the rules of the road. She opined that they all needed to be more kind and patient with each other, remembering that they were all human beings with lives, families, and stories and were worthy of respect. She pointed out that Matt Scarborough Bicycle Accident Law was working towards a legislative legal change to help make the roads safer and protect vulnerable road users and was called the Gabrielle Suver and Niki Isaac Cyclist and Vulnerable Road User Protection Act, noting that this would do the following: help to provide enhanced criminal penalties for hit and run and reckless driving offenses involving vulnerable road users; establish the vulnerable road users victim compensation fund for hit and runs; require universal bodily injury liability insurance; establish minimum safe passing distances, such as three feet for a speed limit under 45 miles per hour and six feet for over 45 miles per hour; extend the statute of limitations for hit and run offenses involving vulnerable road users; establish a dedicated tip line and reward matching program; and provide enhanced penalties for reckless and aggressive driving causing injury to vulnerable road users. She mentioned that she had quick response (QR) codes available to those who would like to read and sign the petition. She opined that being able to ride a bike outside was a beautiful gift, and that people needed to appreciate, value, and protect it.

Commr. Parks hoped that others would be inspired by Ms. Suver's story.

Chief Kilbury commented that he was glad to see her doing so well.

Commr. Campione expressed appreciation to Commissioner Parks for bringing this forward, opining that it was an amazing story and an inspiration; additionally, she indicated appreciation to Lake County's first responders for the part they played in her story.

EMPLOYEE AWARDS

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

FIVE YEARS

Maria Abdoulkarim, Office of Housing and Community Services Director
Office of Housing and Community Services

Robert Petrino, Field Technician
Office of Water Resources

John Rockett, Sign and Striping Technician I
Public Works – Traffic Operations

Steven Wheeler, EMS Battalion Chief
Office of Fire Rescue – EMS

QUARTERLY AWARDS
EMPLOYEE OF THE QUARTER

Cristina Garrido, Planner II
Office of Planning and Zoning

Mariellie Alvarez, Legal Program Specialist
County Attorney's Office

Ms. Nelson mentioned that Ms. Garrido received the award because of praise from one of the County's commercial customers for her exceptional work coordinating the model home development agreement process, and that as the assigned case manager, she successfully facilitated collaboration across multiple departments while demonstrating professionalism, efficiency, and a commitment to continuous process improvement. She also commented that Ms. Alvarez was nominated by the Office of Housing and Community Services for the vital role she played in the County's State Housing Initiative Partnership (SHIP) downpayment assistance program where she was responsible for preparing, coordinating, and closing loan documents for eligible homebuyers, noting that she worked closely with lenders, title companies, attorneys, the housing team, and applicants to resolve issues, obtain required documentation, and meet critical closing deadlines. She served as a valuable resource due to her ability to analyze information, identify potential risk, and provide clear recommendation, allowing department leadership to make informed decisions regarding funding expenses; additionally, she had been instrumental in assisting the department with a grant review of funding and was able to recover $420,000 in costs and fees for Lake County.

SUPERVISOR OF THE QUARTER

Christina Shelton, Facilities Maintenance Manager
Office of Facilities Maintenance

Ms. Nelson related that Ms. Shelton demonstrated exceptional leadership by improving processes, increasing team efficiency, and enhancing customer service through innovation and training, and that she identified gaps in service delivery and implemented improvements that

enhanced her team's efficiency, resulting in better customer service for the County and its stakeholders. She elaborated that the initiatives included streamlining processes for responding to daily work orders, improving the handling of after-hours calls, and implementing online capabilities for damage assessment forms; additionally, she developed and facilitated monthly training sessions for her team and various County departments, fostering a greater understanding of operational efficiency and effectiveness throughout the organization.

T.E.A.M. OF THE QUARTER
EMERGENCY DISPATCH QUALITY ASSURANCE TEAM
Joanna Buchanan, Division Chief
Margaret Albandor, Emergency Dispatch Supervisor
Candice Collier, Emergency Dispatch Supervisor
Amber Otero, Emergency Dispatch Supervisor
Heather Pelton, Emergency Dispatch Supervisor
Sarah Bray, Emergency Dispatch Lead
Katherine Ennis, Emergency Dispatch Lead
Tina Winkler, Emergency Dispatch Lead
Erica Braddock, Telecommunicator

Ms. Nelson commented that the Office of Fire Rescue Emergency Dispatch Quality Assurance Team was being recognized for their outstanding performance during their recent reaccreditation as a center of excellence for both emergency medical and emergency fire dispatch, and noted that the quality assurance team was responsible for reviewing emergency calls, ensuring protocol compliance, identifying areas of improvement, and helping dispatchers provide the highest level of service possible. She relayed that during their accreditation process, 50 randomly selected emergency calls were evaluated by the academy's reviewers, and that the feedback consistently praised the quality of the calls and the thoroughness of the quality assurance team's evaluation. She commented that this accreditation cycle was especially significant as it marked the first that Lake County simultaneously pursued reaccreditation for both medical and fire dispatch, and that the successful achievement placed Lake County among an elite group of emergency dispatch centers worldwide, recognized by the International Academies of Emergency Dispatch for excellence in emergency communication.

MINUTES APPROVAL

On a motion by Commr. Parks, seconded by Commr. Smith and carried unanimously by a vote of 4-0, the Board approved the minutes for the BCC meetings of May 19, 2026 (Regular Meeting), May 21, 2026 (Special Meeting), and May 26, 2026 (Special 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.

Ms. Cindy Newton, a resident of Commission District 4, expressed concern about the Deep Woods Ranch Airport, and said that according to a previous BCC meeting, they were just paving the airstrip and adding a 10,000-foot hangar. She showed the original 1987 map of this area when

it was licensed as a sod airstrip, and noted that in 2006, it came back to the BCC for an amendment, which included dividing the property into four parcels. She indicated her understanding that the landowners were given property rights to use the airstrip, and that the eight acres in the center of the property was excluded from the conditional use permit (CUP); furthermore, some extra usage for training and other uses was allowed since they had been using the airstrip to help fight fires due to fires in the late 1990s and for occasional use during droughts. She displayed a recent survey, and explained that they were doing the following: paving the airstrip; extending the taxiway or length of the airstrip; adding a paved parking area for twelve airplanes; adding lighting on the airstrip with the intensity to see up to 10 miles, which was not dark sky compliant; adding 1.88 miles of an eight-foot tall wildlife fence, noting that they would have the right to euthanize any animals that made it past the fencing for the safety of the students; and they had taken the hangar out of the plans.

Commr. Campione relayed her understanding that they were in the process of asking for a permit from the St. Johns River Water Management District (SJRWMD) with regard to the paving of the airstrip.

Ms. Marsh indicated her understanding that they were having discussions with the SJRWMD and the National Forestry Service.

Mr. Rick Carlins, a resident of the City of Fruitland Park, indicated concerns about artificial intelligence (AI) data centers, surveillance, Flock Safety cameras, and other cameras, opining that they collected data by taking photographs of vehicle license plates, locating cell phones, using facial recognition, and storing this data. He opined that even though this technology could be used for good purposes, it could also be used against personal liberties, and he gave an example of it possibly being used against someone traveling to visit a loved one during a government shutdown, such as the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) shutdown. He remarked that he wanted to find out how these cameras were being funded in Lake County so that he could oppose it, and that he was gathering information, opining that public surveillance had reached a level where it needed to be stopped.

Ms. Marsh stated that the BCC did not fund Flock Safety cameras; however, the Lake County Sheriff's Office (LCSO) did use them, and that he could use a public records request to the LCSO to get a copy of their contract.

Mr. Carlins relayed his understanding that the LCSO was funded by the BCC.

Ms. Barker clarified that the LCSO was funded through the General Fund of the Lake County budget.

Ms. Marsh elaborated that the Sheriff was a separate Constitutional Officer, and that since he was the custodian of his own records, the BCC did not have custody of his records or sign his contracts, noting that Mr. Carlins would have to reach out to that office.

Commr. Campione commented that the BCC was asked for permission to use County right of way for these cameras; however, the private sector could also give permission to these companies to place their cameras.

Mr. Carlins clarified that he was aware of this, and that he was after the ones that were being funded.

Commr. Smith related that the BCC had been steadfast in not allowing any red-light cameras on County right of way.

Commr. Campione remarked that the BCC had been completely opposed to the use of cameras used to collect license plates for the purposes of giving tickets that were automated, and that the County had not given permission for them.

Ms. Marsh clarified that there were school zone cameras, which the BCC had denied a request for from the City of Eustis, and that there were license plate readers (LPRs), which the BCC had approved for the Cities of Clermont, Lady Lake, Fruitland Park, and Mount Dora as well as the LCSO for County right of way; however, they were not red-light cameras.

Commr. Campione commented that the County had agreements in place for each of those instances for audits, which were required for the use of the cameras, noting that they were not used to give tickets but in tracking felony offenses, outstanding warrants, silver alerts, and things of that nature. She opined that when evaluating the cameras and weighing the reasons for having them versus the reasons for not having them, one should keep in mind that there were different levels of oversight.

Commr. Parks pointed out that the BCC had a presentation on this, and that Mr. Carlins could obtain a copy of it; additionally, he could obtain a copy of the agreement from the LCSO.

Mr. Carlins wondered if the County did not approve of the use of cameras for ticketing purposes at all, noting that there were cameras in school zones.

Commr. Campione reiterated that the County had denied any request for school zone cameras and the tickets.

Commr. Smith added that these were in the cities.

Ms. Marsh commented that these were also on private property, and that the County had received some complaints for them.

Mr. Carlins mentioned that he had received a ticket in the mail for this, and questioned if he was obligated to pay it.

Commr. Campione stated that this would be from a camera that somebody besides the BCC authorized, and indicated her understanding that it was a smart practice to go to the court hearing for those.

Mr. James Friend, a resident of Lake County, expressed appreciation to the BCC for the countywide stance on license plate readers (LPRs), and opined the even just a few LPRs were too much. He opined that Flock Safety was trying to obtain digital fingerprints, which were tied to license plates, and that the correlation of data was becoming a dragnet of surveillance. He relayed his understanding that there were police officers that abused the Driver and Vehicle Information Database (DAVID) system, noting that Sumter County had suspended all LPRs because of a Sumter County Sheriff's Office deputy's illegal surveillance of another officer's ex-wife. He opined that this system enabled abuse, and that even though he supported first responders and

police officers, not everybody was a good person. He opined that Lake County had good police officers and Sheriff's deputies, and that Flock Safety cameras were not needed.

Ms. Miranda Brenton, a resident of Lake County, indicated appreciation for the difficult job of balancing public safety with protecting the freedoms that made Lake County a wonderful place to live. She asked that Lake County remove Flock Safety cameras, and opined that even though she supported the Sheriff's deputies and wanted them to have the resources needed to solve real crimes, public safety and constitutional rights should never be viewed as competing priorities. She relayed her understanding that across the country, communities were beginning to reconsider these systems, and noted that the Sumter County Sheriff's Office suspended its Flock Safety camera program after a detective was arrested and accused of improperly using the system and other law enforcement databases for personal reasons, opining that this incident demonstrated why many residents worried about the potential for abuse when powerful surveillance tools existed without perfect safeguards. She commented that other communities had also decided that the risks outweighed the benefits, and she listed other places in the country that had cancelled their contracts with Flock Safety and removed their cameras. She opined that even though the cameras could help solve crimes, a system that recorded the daily movements of ordinary citizens, stored that information, and made it searchable across thousands of agencies should not be normalized, and that once this infrastructure existed, future misuse was probable. She opined that as technology became more powerful, their commitment to protecting individual liberty should become stronger, and requested that the BCC would pause, reconsider, and begin the process of removing these cameras. She opined that Lake County should remain safe and free, and that they should not have to sacrifice one for the other.

Mr. Andrew LaRue, a resident of Commission District 3, asked the BCC to get rid of the Flock Safety cameras, opining that the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States (U.S.) superseded the government's right to collect mass surveillance on citizens. He opined that police officers were too busy doing their job to watch everyone, and he questioned who owned the data and what the safeguards were. He opined that this did not have proper safeguards in place, and that the government in general could misuse this tool. He also opined that what happened to Ms. Suver was a serious issue, and that the best solution would be to build more trail systems for bicycles and pedestrians, separating them from cars on the road.

Ms. Jenny Owen, a resident of Lake County, expressed concern about Flock Safety, and said that when she had made a public records request for documents pertaining to it, she was directed to the Lake County Sheriff's Office (LCSO), noting that the records custodian would not provide those documents.

Ms. Lisa Hayden, a resident on Dennis Road in the City of Leesburg speaking via Zoom, indicated appreciation to the BCC for all the work they did for the community, for the opportunity to speak remotely, and for all the attention given to issues that impacted their lives. She requested that the Board consider scheduling a formal public hearing regarding the Embry Riddle Deep Woods Ranch aviation training facility, as this would allow the BCC to review the facts. She opined that the current proposal expanded beyond the scope of the existing CUP, and that the

residents would have a chance to discuss how this could impact lives, businesses, property values, the Ocala National Forest with the clearing that would be done outside of the parcels that were purchased, and the noise disruption to the surrounding soundscape. She opined that this matter was significant enough to be placed on an upcoming agenda.

Mr. Alan Chen, a resident of Treasure Island Road in the City of Leesburg speaking via Zoom, agreed with what Ms. Hayden and Ms. Newton had said, and noted that at the previous BCC meeting, Mr. Egor Emery, a resident of Lake County, requested a public hearing on the Embry Riddle Airport project situated in the Ocala National Forest, which he would also like to request. He remarked that according to a news segment on the airport, an Embry Riddle representative said that they continued to work closely with Lake County, the U.S. Forest Service, and other regulatory agencies as they developed a limited footprint in the area; however, he indicated his understanding that the County was no longer involved since Embry Riddle was just going to pave the runway and possibly add or replace a hangar. He opined that the project was much more extensive than just paving the runway, and that the BCC may be unaware of the extent and impact of this project. He expressed concerns that there would be significant far-reaching consequences, and opined that this would negatively impact about 50,000 acres, the soundscape, nearby residences and towns, the wildlife, and local ecotourism, which could lead to loss of revenue and jobs in Lake County; furthermore, he opined that the number of permanent jobs that the project would bring in were minimal. He opined that there were potential violations to Lake County code in the most recent plans submitted to these regulatory agencies, and that while it appeared that Lake County had reviewed these plans, issues remained. He requested a public hearing to discuss the full ramifications of Embry Riddle's airport project with the BCC.

Ms. Marsh commented that originally, Embry Riddle came to the County to amend the CUP, and that there was a public hearing; however, they ultimately withdrew their application and opted to work under the existing CUP. She related that they submitted to the County for a site plan approval, and that she was not sure of the status of that, noting that they were also obtaining permits from the SJRWMD and the National Forestry Service because they were going to be going outside the bounds of this property for tree clearing.

Mr. Mike Fitzgerald, Director for the Office of Planning and Zoning, remarked that the site plan was still under review. He commented that the applicant was working with outside agencies for permitting, and that they were waiting approval of the site plan.

Commr. Campione relayed her understanding that when reviewing a site plan, it was completely separated from the SJRWMD or any other agency issuing their permits.

Mr. Fitzgerald confirmed this, and mentioned that there was a Florida Statute passed that precluded any government agency from withholding an approval on a plan because the applicant had not received an outside agency's permit. He related that the County could approve something even if the applicant did not have a Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) or SJRWMD permit, and that they could still approve it if they had met Lake County code.

Commr. Campione indicated her understanding that even if the site plan was approved by staff, Embry Riddle may not obtain a permit from the National Forestry Service or SJRWMD, and that the County's approval would not mean that they would be able to do what they wanted to.

Ms. Marsh stated that Florida Statute 125.022 said that, "A County may not require as a condition of processing or issuing a development permit or development order that an applicant obtain a permit or approval from any State or Federal agency unless the agency has issued a final agency action that denies the Federal or State permit before the County action on the local development permit." She explained that the County could not stop processing this under the Lake County codes because they had permits pending with other agencies.

Commr. Campione pointed out that the property owner had divided the property, and that there were two other owners in addition to Embry Riddle. She commented that the rights to the runway would run to the benefit of those others parcels as well, and relayed her understanding that those other property owners could request a public hearing or a review; however, this was not something that the County had received.

Commr. Parks opined that the BCC could have an update on how this was proceeding, and that the other agencies could come in and provide some update so that it was out in the open. He opined that even if the other agencies did not come, an update on the status could be placed on the agenda so that the residents could come and see it.

Commr. Campione agreed, and opined that she had to be careful when asked to comment on it because the property owners had rights. She stated that she did not want to say something that might impact their rights, giving them a cause for action against the County, and noted that they were going through the legal process. She opined that asking the other agencies to come in and comment was reasonable; however, she questioned if they would because they had to follow their own procedures. She opined that the County could ask for a written update that could be presented to the Board.

Mr. Fitzgerald recalled that Embry Riddle had legal counsel representing them in their discussion with the Board, and opined that staff could reach out to that counsel to come in and do a presentation to update the Board on the project, including an update to where they stood for outside agency permitting.

Commr. Campione opined that if the County was having a discussion about this, then the property owners could have their representation and be a party to that.

Commr. Morris indicated his understanding that the BCC had given them the CUP.

Commr. Campione pointed out that this was in 2006.

Commr. Morris relayed his understanding that when Embry Riddle made their presentation, there was nothing mentioned about paving anything, opining that there had been many changes to this project.

Commr. Campione indicated her understanding that staff had said that the CUP did not distinguish between paved or unpaved, and that this was a private runway, opining that this was where the issue of authorization came into play.

CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT AND COMPTROLLER'S CONSENT AGENDA

On a motion by Commr. Smith, seconded by Commr. Parks and carried unanimously by a vote of 4-0, the Board approved the Clerk of the Circuit Court and Comptroller's Consent Agenda, Items 1 through 7, 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.

Central Lake Community Development District Proposed Budget

Notice is hereby provided of having received the Central Lake 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 2026-025

Notice is hereby provided of having received Ordinance 2026-025 from the City of Fruitland Park.

City of Tavares CRA Financial Statements and Independent Auditor's Report

Notice is hereby provided of having received the City of Tavares CRA Financial Statements and Independent Auditor's Report for the Fiscal Year ended September 30, 2025.

City of Tavares' Annual Comprehensive Financial Report

Notice is hereby provided of having received the City of Tavares' Annual Comprehensive Financial Report for Fiscal Year 2025.

City of Groveland's Financial Statements

Notice is hereby provided of having received the City of Groveland's Financial Statements for Fiscal Year 2025.

City of Umatilla's Annual Comprehensive Financial Report

Notice is hereby provided of having received the City of Umatilla's Annual Comprehensive Financial Report for the fiscal year ended September 30, 2025.

COUNTY MANAGER'S CONSENT AGENDA

Commr. Morris asked for Tab 11 to be pulled to the regular agenda.

On a motion by Commr. Parks, seconded by Commr. Smith and carried unanimously by a vote of 4-0, the Board approved the Consent Agenda, Tabs 3 through 12, pulling Tab 11 to the regular agenda, as follows:

COUNTY ATTORNEY

Recommend approval to execute an Estoppel Letter regarding the Lease Agreement between Lake County and Southridge Shoppes (US), Inc., for the Sheriff located at 4215 County Road 561, in Tavares. There is no fiscal impact.

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

Procurement Services

Recommend approval:

1. To declare the items listed on the attached inventory as surplus; and

2. To authorize their removal from the County's fixed asset records; and

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

The fiscal impact cannot be determined at this time (revenue).

HUMAN RESOURCES AND RISK MANAGEMENT

Recommend approval of a Liability Claim Settlement for a motor vehicle accident which occurred on June 23, 2024. The fiscal impact is $100,000.

COMMUNITY SERVICES

Housing and Community Services

Recommend approval of the Urban County Cooperation Agreements relating to the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program between Lake County and the City of Umatilla and the Town of Astatula, respectively, for Fiscal Years 2027, 2028 and 2029.

There is no fiscal impact.

Transit Services

Recommend approval:

1. To accept the Florida Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged Trip and Equipment Grant Agreement for Fiscal Year 2026-2027; and

2. To adopt Unanticipated Revenue Resolution 2026-82 (URR) to accept and appropriate $212,787 for the CTD Trip and Equipment Grant; and

3. Of a budget transfer in the amount of $23,643 funds Transit Reserves for Operations to the Contractual Services.

The total fiscal impact is $1,050,769 — $945,693 (revenue/expenditure - grant funded) and $105,076 (expenditure - county match).

Recommend approval:

1. To accept the Federal Transit Administration’s Capital Grant Award Number FL 2026-031 for $2,248,842; and

2. To adopt Unanticipated Revenue Resolution 2026-83 (URR) to accept and appropriate $2,206,095 for the Federal Transit Administration’s Capital Grant; and

3. To procure the three replacement fixed route buses under the Jacksonville Transportation Authority’s RFP P-23-030, a contract between Jacksonville Transportation Authority and Gillig, LLC.

The fiscal impact is $2,248,842 (revenue/expenditure — 100 percent grant funded).

INFRASTRUCTURE AND TRANSPORTATION SERVICES

Facilities Management

Recommend approval:

1. To award RFQ Q2026-00042 to RMS Orlando, Inc. (Orlando, FL) for the Building 320 Reroofing Project; and

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

The fiscal impact of $231,500 (expenditure — $212,500 plus $19,000 for contingency purposes) is within, and will not exceed, the Fiscal Year 2026 Budget. Commission District 3.

Recommend approval of an Interlocal Agreement with the Town of Montverde (Town) for Lake County (County) to perform fire and life safety inspections and establish shared costs for water infrastructure improvements pertaining to the new construction of Fire Station #85.

The total estimated fiscal impact is $197,095.02 ($87,047.51 — County expenditure and $110,047.51 — Town reimbursement), and is within and will not exceed this Fiscal Year's Budget.

Public Works

Recommend approval:

1. To award RFQ Q2026-00109 to Estep Construction, Inc. (Apopka, FL) to resurface and add right and left turn lanes on northbound CR 437 at Sorrento Avenue; and

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

The fiscal impact is $157,359.83 (expenditure) is within, and will not exceed, the Fiscal Year 2026 Budget. Commission District 4.

TAB 11: ROUND LAKE ROAD EXTENSION PROJECT

Commr. Morris indicated his understanding that the County was paying $2.7 million for 39 percent of what was needed, and inquired if the County had asked the owners to help with the road system and roundabouts or asked for any compensation as opposed to just writing a check for $2.7 million.

Commr. Campione replied that there had been many discussions with attorneys, and that there were certain things the County could and could not ask for when dealing with eminent domain, opining that this was essentially what it was. She elaborated that this was the result of approaching a property owner and either doing eminent domain or having a negotiated agreement, and that there were limitations on what the County could request to negotiate over. She commented that this was the extension to take the road to County Road (CR) 44, and that it would provide a County standard north/south connection, noting that this had been on the Lake-Sumter Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) list for several years.

Commr. Morris relayed her understanding that it was 39.75 percent of the needed right of way, and that the County had invested another $6 million just to buy right of way.

Commr. Campione opined that there was much right of way to get from Wolf Branch Road to CR 44, and opined that there would be other purchases to get to CR 44 for a major north/south connector.

Commr. Morris opined that considering the cost, the County should have done eminent domain, and that even though Ms. Marsh would say that the County would spend as much funding doing that, the County needed to draw the line somewhere. He opined that the funding spent on Britt Road was ridiculous, and that there was currently another $6 million to $8 million needed to obtain right of way, noting that this cost did not include building the road.

Commr. Campione relayed her understanding that appraisals were done the same way for eminent domain, and that all the costs were in line with what it would cost to buy property in that area, including the following: three appraisals were done; the appraisals were provided to the property owner; and the owner could deny purchase, opining that suing for the land could go on for a long time.

Commr. Morris wondered why the County did not try to negotiate with all the property owners or do eminent domain all at one time.

Commr. Campione indicated her understanding that the County was doing a purchase with a certain amount of funding and was doing as much as they could with an allocated amount budgeted through the MPO and from impact fees.

Ms. Marsh commented that this property purchase was called a friendly acquisition, and that it was pre-eminent domain, as they followed the same rules for eminent domain. She explained that the advantage of pre-acquisition included avoiding attorney fees and costs for the property owner, which through eminent domain, the County had to pay 100 percent, and that when

a property was taken through eminent domain, the cost was usually double to triple the appraised value plus attorney fees, engineering fees, design fees, and consultant fees, which the County was 100 percent responsible for. She remarked that the $2.7 million on the current agenda included the price of the right of way and the engineering and attorney fees for that property owner in a lump sum, and that since they were vacant properties, there were engineering fees associated with it because it was anticipated that the property owners of those large vacant tracts would want to develop at some point. She related that the County Attorney's Office preferred friendly acquisition to eminent domain, which could be a very long process, noting that there were currently two cases of eminent domain that were started in 2018 that were still not finished because of various issues with the property owners. She pointed out that when doing eminent domain, not everybody could be done in one action, and that separate actions had to be filed for each property owner, noting that they did not want to do many cases at one time because it would consume much attorney time, as they were intensive types of litigation, especially when at the trial level. She mentioned that doing eminent domain in one lump sum required the County to have the appraised values and cash deposited into the registry of the court to do a quick take, which was a way to obtain a right of way and move forward with a project while spending years in court regarding the actual value. She pointed out that friendly acquisition was a much more time-efficient process to go through, and that the County was using the funds that were available to acquire those pieces versus trying to do it all in one lump sum. She stated that if this property was taken through eminent domain, there would be a much higher cost than what was proposed on the current day.

Commr. Morris opined that if one of the landowners said to take it by eminent domain, then the County would be in the same situation.

Ms. Marsh commented that if there was one final holdout, then there would be a small portion of the appraised value available to deposit in the court registry, and that the County could do a quick take to obtain the property, proceed with the project, and deal with the compensation issue as time went on for however long it took. She reiterated that doing a friendly acquisition was a much more efficient way to get the project closer to the finish line. She remarked that years prior, the County did not use eminent domain, and that if the property owners were not willing to donate the property, then the projects did not get done. She mentioned that with the growth in the county currently, waiting for developers to donate property could possibly cause the County to have much worse infrastructure issues than at the moment, and that this was the way they had done eminent domain for several years, which was more efficient, quicker, and less costly than going through the formal court process.

Commr. Campione related that when the Wekiva Parkway was going in, there was much discussion with the MPO, the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), the Central Florida Expressway Authority (CFX), and everybody involved about the terminus on CR 46, noting that they had limited road infrastructure to handle the traffic coming off the Florida's Turnpike and the Wekiva Parkway. She stated that even though there was a large push to get this extension in place at that time, there was no funding for it, and that the County asked FDOT and CFX to help make this connection to CR 44 to alleviate traffic on some other roads, including Britt Road and Wolf

Branch Road; furthermore, since the funding was not there, the County was using impact fees paid in the district to help make this portion of the acquisition.

Commr. Parks remarked that he would like to avoid the quick take with the negative public perception and the long expensive eminent domain process, opining that this item made sense because of the time issue, as it could be done now. He recalled that many of the roads in Lake County were State roads at one time, and that they were handed to the County, opining that they were given with very little right of way and other issues. He opined that the County had to fix this with a shrinking State budget for roads and transportation, and that even though nobody liked this, it needed to go forward.

Commr. Smith opined that it was much better than eminent domain.

On a motion by Commr. Smith, seconded by Commr. Parks and carried by a vote of 3-1, the Board approved the following items: a Purchase Agreement for property with Wolf Branch LLC for the Round Lake Road Extension Project; a Pond Drainage Easement Agreement; to authorize the County Manager to execute any necessary amendments that do not have an additional fiscal impact; to authorize the Chairman to execute any necessary closing documents, including an Affidavit Affecting Real Property with County Attorney review and approval; and a budget transfer in the amount of $830,000 from ROW/Easement - Round Lake Road Segment II to ROW/Easement - Round Lake Road Segment I.

Commr. Morris voted no.

MAXIMUM MILLAGE RATE FOR TRIM NOTICES

Ms. Jaime Stewart, Director for the Office of Management and Budget, related that the purpose of the current day's presentation was to establish the maximum millage rates to be included on the truth in millage (TRIM) notices and to approve the public hearing dates and times for the Fiscal Year (FY) 2027 budget. She showed a chart of the July 1, 2026 certified property values provided by the Lake County Property Appraiser, and noted the following: the countywide millages, which included the Lake County General Fund Countywide Millage, the Lake County Ambulance Municipal Services Taxing Unit (MSTU), the Lake County Water Authority (LCWA), and the Lake County Public Lands Voted Debt increased 8.78 percent over the current year's values; the Lake County Stormwater, Roads, Parks MSTU increased 7.48 percent; the Lake County Fire Rescue MSTU increased 8.58 percent; and the largest increase in property value came from the Wellness Way MSTU at 56.58 percent. She stated that the FY 2027 recommended budget for all funds totaled $959,234,928, which was a decrease of $93,000 from the FY 2026 proposed budget, and that even though the budget was currently reflecting a reduction from the current year, some of the larger multi-year projects may be carried forward to FY 2027, which would increase the total budget, noting that the FY 2027 recommended operating budget was $842,454,337. She commented that the FY 2027 recommended budget would fully fund the following: County operations, such as new position requests; judicial support; Constitutional Officer budgets; minimum wage adjustments and compression countywide; and would allocate $7.7 million towards road resurfacing. She related that this did not include the following: LCWA Management Services Agreement updates; the purchase order carryforward projections; the Lake County Tax

Collector's budget; and the Medical Examiner's FY 2027 budget request. She remarked that the department position requests were both from the Office of Fire Rescue, and she displayed a chart showing the fiscal impacts. She relayed that the proposed millages were at status quo, with the Wellness Way MSTU being reduced, and that a breakdown of the proposed millage rates for 2027 included the following: the Lake County General Fund Countywide Millage was 5.0254 mills; the Lake County Ambulance MSTU was 0.4629 mills; the Lake County Fire Rescue MSTU was 0.4800 mills; the Lake County Stormwater, Roads, Parks MSTU was 0.4957 mills; the LCWA was 0.2940 mills; the Wellness Way MSTU was 0.1454 mills; and the Lake County Public Lands Voted Debt was 0.1000 mills. She mentioned that this reflected a 50 percent reduction to the Wellness Way MSTU and a recommended increase to the Lake County Public Lands Voted Debt to cover the adopted voter-approved $50 million in funding for debt service payments. She commented that some important dates in the budget process included the following: the Lake County Tax Collector's budget was due August 1, 2026; the Infrastructure Sales Tax budget workshop was August 11, 2026; the public hearing was on August 25, 2026; the first budget public hearing would be at 5:05 p.m. on September 8, 2026; and the final budget public hearing would be held at 5:05 p.m. on September 22, 2026. She stated that the requested action for the current day was to approve the maximum millage rates to be included on the TRIM notices and to approve the budget public hearing dates and advertisements.

Commr. Campione relayed her understanding that the Lake County Public Lands Voted Debt millage was to cover the new referendum.

Ms. Barker confirmed this, and said that the original authorization to take out debt related to the acquisition of public lands was in 2007, noting that this debt was retired in April 2026. She commented that the voters in 2024 had voted for a new debt service instrument for up to $50 million using this millage to pay back the debt service for the purpose of acquiring public lands for conservation and recreational uses.

Commr. Campione clarified that this was not the same millage being increased, as it was a new millage based on that referendum.

Ms. Barker remarked that the Public Lands and Trails Acquisition Advisory Committee (PLTAAC) was currently evaluating potential purchases, and that if the County took out the $50 million bond, then the funding would need to be in place to pay the debt service in the following year.

Commr. Parks indicated his understanding that the Wellness Way MSTU had been reduced more than 50 percent, and that this had been the case all along, noting that language had been cleared up in the ordinance.

Ms. Barker explained that in the prior year after concerns were raised by residents in the area, the Board decided that the County would contribute what it would normally pay for any County road maintenance from the General Fund or the gas tax fund, and that anything above and beyond that for enhanced services, such as the landscaping, the medians, the pavers in the roads, mast arms, and the lighting, which were things not typically seen on other County roads, would be paid for out of the MSTU. She elaborated that in the prior year, the rate was reduced 50 percent

from the original proposed rate, and that in the current year, due to the substantial value increase, the County was able to reduce it even further.

Commr. Parks pointed out that it was for a very specific purpose, and that there was no reserve or other account being built up. He opined that as this area continued to grow, it would decrease even more, and that there could be a day when it was not needed, noting that he was pleased with the way it was going.

Commr. Smith added that this was not a countywide MSTU.

Commr. Parks stated that the idea was to keep the rest of the county from paying for those enhancements, and opined that this was where the growth was.

Commr. Campione commented that the County also started to do MSTUs for any new subdivisions that came through the BCC so that future road resurfacing would be funded by the people who lived within those neighborhoods.

Commr. Smith relayed his understanding that the millage rate was not increasing from the prior year for the County of for the LCWA.

Ms. Stewart confirmed this.

Ms. Barker clarified that the exception was the Lake County Public Lands Voted Debt.

Commr. Smith pointed out that this was approved by the voters.

Commr. Campione remarked that these were the maximum amounts, and that at the final hearings, millages could be reduced but not increased.

On a motion by Commr. Morris, seconded by Commr. Smith and carried unanimously by a vote of 4-0, the Board approved to establish maximum millage rates to be included in the Truth in Millage (TRIM) notifications, to hold public hearings at 5:05 p.m. on Tuesday, September 8, 2026, and Tuesday, September 22, 2026, and to advertise these public hearings.

PROPOSED MORATORIUM ON DATA CENTERS

Ms. Kathleen Dial, Executive Director for Development Services, recalled that at the June 23, 2026 BCC meeting, the Board discussed a temporary pause on data centers within unincorporated areas of Lake County and asked staff to bring back information on data centers as well as an ordinance for consideration, and that they had engaged with partners around the region to provide a presentation on data centers on the current day. She opined that this was an important topic and a very complex issue for local governments to engage in, and that there was much public concern about data centers; additionally, data centers were evolving quickly as was all technology these days. She commented that they wanted to present as much information as possible to help inform the Board's decision making and to provide guidance to staff, and that there were several partners in attendance to answer any technical questions. She relayed that in the 2026 Legislative Session, Senate Bill (SB) 484 was passed, which required the following: large load users would bear their own full costs of service, preventing costs from being shifted to residents and small businesses, which was accomplished through a large load customer tariff; public utilities would file for public service commission approval for a tariff structure that complied with the law no later than October 2, 2026; large load customers would be defined as having a monthly peak load of 50 megawatts or more at a single location, which defined a large scale data center; large scale

data centers would use reclaimed water when feasible and undergo a hearing for high volume applications and modifications; water management districts would establish a CUP process separate for large scale data centers and would have the authority to require reclaimed water; CUP amendments for large scale data centers would be treated as new applications through water management districts; there would be a separate permitting approach for large scale data centers at the local government level; local government had the ability to control this through their Comprehensive Plan (Comp Plan) and zoning regulations; and the State was required to do an impact study regarding construction and operations, which would be due July 1, 2027. She then introduced Dr. Issa Batarseh, Professor with the Florida Power Electronics Center at the University of Central Florida (UCF).

Commr. Morris questioned if Lake County had been approached by anybody wanting to build an AI data center.

Ms. Dial answered that they had.

Dr. Batarseh mentioned that this presentation was based on his personal view as a faculty member who was doing research on energy, and that he would address the data center from the power, electronics, and energy conversion, which was the architectural design of all data centers. He opined that this was a timely discussion, and he expressed appreciation to the BCC for wanting to broaden the conversation and obtain more insight, especially in the technical decision making where information was changing almost daily in this enterprise. He related that data centers had been around for many years, housing computing, storage, networking, power conversion, and cooling infrastructure, noting that in the prior 20 years, it had provided the physical and digital infrastructure behind information technology (IT), media streaming, bank services, cloud computing, and artificial intelligence (AI). He mentioned that cloud computing was a wave from about 10 years prior that was given much infrastructure, and that AI was a larger wave that needed a facility that could handle it. He opined that the question was not if AI was coming but if everyone was prepared for it, and that the BCC was asking this at the right time. He commented that these facilities worked all the time and provided a digital lifeline to the economic community, and that this was happening at a large scale throughout the U.S. He mentioned that unlike the previous wave, the amount of power needed for AI was very large, and that the difference between cloud computing and AI computing was that AI had almost 100 times more power consumption because even though they all did computing, AI also did training. He explained that AI required disrupting the entire computing process to answer just one question while cloud computing gathered data slowly through computing at a very high speed, and opined that even though talking about doubling in a few years was difficult for the mind to understand, the need for power for a processing unit for large language models would double very quickly. He relayed that in the digital revolution in the previous 20 years, they doubled power every 18 months, and that with the doubling of the power, the price went down by half, the size went down, and reliability went up. He pointed out that AI computing power was changing every day because it had the code to improve itself, and that every data center built before AI did not have this, noting that this agent needed much power. He displayed a table showing types of data centers and their typical power requirements, and said

that most of them were the data centers that they were used to, such as those for Walt Disney World and UCF, that worked fine with power coming from their current utility. He remarked that the amount of power the AI factory required was a large change, and that this would be the first time humanity would reach one gigawatt for a facility, noting that they would need more here and there. He showed a graph of global AI data center power in gigawatts, and pointed out that the amount of power needed was very large. He opined that whether people in the U.S. liked it or not, they needed to provide that power or somebody else would provide it, and that AI would continue to grow. He explained that growth in server rack power was going from 10 kilowatts to one megawatt, and that there would be thousands of those racks inside the factory, opining that it was a community in a box. He commented that they were also changing the power architecture needed for data centers by trying to cut the cost and the power consumption, which they called efficiency, and that startup companies were happening throughout the world very quickly. He displayed an example of the power architecture for an 800 volts direct current (VDC) data center from Delta Electronics, and said that it described their next three-year projection from the utility power all the way to the microchip, noting that powering this data center was changing as he spoke. He opined that the economic development from changing that infrastructure was large, and that they had to change the architecture of their current facilities. He showed a graphic of the current 12-volt data center architecture, including transformers, and said that they were dealing with very low efficiency, difficulties with the supply chain, and very low voltage architecture. He mentioned that in the prior five to 10 years they went to 48 volts, and that this was what most data centers used. He opined that they could not continue with that infrastructure, as they needed one megawatt, and he showed a graphic of the new architecture with a solid state transformer. He stated that everyone was following this and changing the infrastructure, and that the utility would provide the support from the left side of the diagram while innovation and creativity would take it to the microchip, opining that they were going there slowly. He remarked that some of the questions that needed to be answered before they were ready to embrace this technology included the following: how to generate the power; how to deliver the power to the box inside the factory; since every question to AI caused a total disruption to the grid, who would control the grid to make it safe for operation, ensuring that the voltage, power, and frequency were stable, which was his research area; how to address the issue of cooling and water resources; and how to address the land and regulatory issues, which was what the BCC was looking at. He opined that AI was causing a boom and a change in humanity, and that they were going to either accept it or not. He opined that this was not like the previous wave, as it had unprecedented infrastructural needs and investment, and that the data centers would now always be around even if they were not in Lake County because of the amount of computing power required. He opined that this would expand economies, and that a new wave of skills would be needed for the new jobs. He opined that the universities in the State of Florida needed to address this, and that they had done this with cloud computing and every technology wave. He commented that every watt that came to the box came through power electronics, which was an enabling technology, and opined that they could either

be scared of it or embrace it. He opined that there was challenge and opportunity, and that they needed to plan correctly and address the issues, as every challenge came with a great responsibility.

Ms. Dial mentioned that there were other regulatory agencies that could provide oversight on a local and regional level, noting that a large load customer would also need to obtain approval from other agencies for things such as water consumption, stormwater management, power generation, electric grid impact, and wetland buffers. She relayed that the BCC would regulate building height, setbacks, landscaping, site access, noise, vertical construction, zoning, and land use, and that if it was the direction of the Board, these could be addressed through the Land Development Regulations (LDR) update. She commented that items such as water quality, air quality, electronic waste (E-waste), heat waste, hazardous waste, and the effects on wildlife would be regulated at a State and Federal level, noting that even though they had been approached by a large data center, there were none that they were actively working on as economic development projects at this time. She remarked that there were several partners in attendance on the current day to help support the Board's discussion and answer any questions, including the following: Mr. Marc Hoenstine, Managing Director of Economic Development with Duke Energy; Mr. Jack Henkel, Chief Operating Officer (COO) of the Florida High Tech Corridor; Mr. Mike Kelly, with Lake Economic Area Development (LEAD); Mr. Paul Sohl, Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the Florida High Tech Corridor; Mr. Clay Coarsey, Water Supply Planning and Assessment Division Director, with the SJRWMD, participating via Zoom; and a representative from Sumter Electric Cooperative, Inc. (SECO).

Commr. Parks opined that the physical digital infrastructure behind all those uses mentioned in the presentation should be considered, as they were part of daily life; however, there were also many issues to address, noting that SB 484 provided more guidance and protection. He inquired what the most critical issue was, such as the water issue or the energy grid.

Dr. Batarseh replied that from his perspective, the challenge was the amount of power that needed to be available and how to get this power delivered to the factory, and pointed out that getting the power from the grid to the microchip had several stages. He commented that if they went from 38 kilovolt-amperes (KVA), which was the transmission line people saw, down to the factory, there was a large transformer needed to bring that down to the factory, and that everything they had done in the prior 20 years was in alternating current (AC) systems, which was brought down to direct current (DC) to 12 volts for the factory, noting that this had worked fine. He explained that when they were dealing with one megawatt per rack, they needed to bring 100 megawatts to the factory, and that since the utility did not change easily, they needed to be more efficient, such as 90 or 95 percent versus 70 percent. He related that the challenge was to change the box that brought the power down, and that everyone wanted to address that phase. He stated that inside the factory, water was needed to move the heat out of every rack, including freshwater, reclaimed water, and possibly seawater, noting that large companies, such as Google, were going to the ocean for cooling. He commented that if a company came to Lake County, they would need 100 megawatts, and that the question would be if Lake County could provide this. He remarked that the factory would get hot because 90 percent efficiency meant that 10 percent of the gigawatt

had to get out, and that the water would come in and take it out. He mentioned that renewable energy cut the water usage because using renewable energy on the front end was all DC to DC, and that this could cut much power loss, noting that the issue of water and infrastructure were the issues that would have to be raised.

Commr. Parks questioned if the technology was there to go to DC.

Dr. Batarseh answered that the DC architecture was new technology, and noted that NVIDIA Corporation drove that model. He explained that inside the box would be 1,000 volts DC, and that if the voltage was raised to 1,000, the current went down and that losses became less, noting that if there was 95 percent efficiency, there would be large savings.

Commr. Parks wondered how this would affect residents' energy bills, and expressed concern about the water usage, noting that SB 484 would address some of that. He stated that he wanted to ensure that groundwater would not be used for cooling.

Commr. Smith asked how a large load data center was defined.

Dr. Batarseh commented that he did not see any standard in what defined a rack, and that since rack power was about 10 kilowatts, which was much power, and was used to power a home, that was the load. He mentioned that the load went up to 50 kilowatts and then 100 kilowatts for data centers for cloud computing, and that since the UCF power station had to deliver more, the load went up. He related that they had to provide power to the number of servers in the room, and that they made it cool by lifting it from the ground and ensuring that the power was consumed at high efficiency and cooled. He remarked that with AI, it was one megawatt per rack, which could be compared to an entire community's power in that box, and that to remove 10 percent of the heat from that was a very heavy load. He mentioned that SB 484 said that a large load data center was defined as 50 megawatts, and that they would be in that range. He relayed that some of the startup companies were doing five megawatt boxes and bringing about 50 to 100 boxes to the factory, and that the load would continue to go up because the demand was going up, which meant more computing and more people using AI.

Mr. Hoenstine explained that a large load was defined by the legislative body or the local government, and that there were differences throughout the states. He stated that in the State of Florida, a large load was defined as 50 megawatts and above, opining that this did not mean that they should not protect under 50 megawatt facilities. He commented that at Duke Energy, they had a process for under 50 megawatts, and that for those data centers that were 50 megawatts and above, they went through the large load tariffs, noting that per SB 484, every investor and utility was required to file a large load tariff for the public service commission to consider.

Commr. Smith indicated his understanding that reclaimed water could be used to cool the equipment, and inquired if a closed cell system, which used very minimal water once full, could be used, opining that this could address the water issue. He opined that the County could require a data center to build a small reclaimed water facility at their site.

Mr. Hoenstine related that even though they were not a water utility, as an economic developer working for a power utility, they received many requests from projects across the six states that they service, and that they had heard from their clients that they could do closed loop

water cooling, noting that there were at least two different types, such as those that had chillers onsite and those that did not. He elaborated that those that did not have chillers had zero water closed loop systems, and relayed his understanding that they would charge that system and not have to take any more water from local communities as long as there were no leaks in the system. He indicated his understanding that this was what much of the industry was moving toward.

Commr. Smith opined that the County could set policy to require one of those systems, and relayed his understanding that they were looking at taking the AC into a transformer and turning it into DC.

Commr. Campione commented that she was curious about examples that existed around the state which were reaching those higher megawatts, and asked if there were any. She opined that it was hard to know what was real on social media, and that even though she had heard shocking stories about data centers, she did not know if they were from real communities.

Mr. Hoenstine remarked that 50 megawatts would be like a rebar plant or small steel mill, and that Duke Energy did not serve any large load data centers in the State of Florida at the current time; however, they did serve many data centers that were one to three megawatts, which would be like one or two Walmart Super Centers. He related that the State of Florida was one of the top five states for the number of data centers; however, they were not large enough to be considered a large load data center.

Commr. Campione asked if they were large enough to be having the impacts people were complaining about, such as the noise.

Mr. Hoenstine mentioned that he had visited the State of Virginia to learn what they had gone through, and that the City of Ashburn in Loudoun County, Virginia was the center for data centers in the U.S. He commented that he learned much about what was being heard in the media and what was happening in real life, and he encouraged everyone to tour a data center, opining that there was much to be learned. He remarked that there was much mitigation that could be done, and opined that when they walked by a few data centers to listen, they found that it was very quiet. He opined that they could hear the road noise over the generators in cases where generators were running; however, most of those data centers were connected to permanent power and did not need to be running generators.

Commr. Campione relayed her understanding that even though the State of Florida was in the top five as far as number of centers, the size would be about the footprint of two Walmart Super Centers.

Mr. Hoenstine stated that they were one to five megawatts on average in the State of Florida currently.

Commr. Campione questioned if they were using closed loop systems, and Mr. Hoenstine said that he did not know. Commissioner Campione then opined that the Board should visit some sites, visit those communities, and get feedback from people that were there.

Commr. Parks expressed concern about electromagnetic fields (EMFs), and said that he had received questions about the signal coming off the data centers. He wondered what the Board could tell people about that.

Mr. Hoenstine remarked that he had not heard that concern.

Commr. Campione stated that the Board heard this concern frequently, including when the transmission lines were being enlarged from the City of Umatilla to Volusia County; however, she opined that creating efficiency might lower the EMFs. She opined that EMFs would be a large concern for humans.

Mr. Hoenstine commented that this was not something they had heard of much for data centers.

Mr. Coarsey related that he was not aware of any data centers in the SJRWMD that were using a closed loop or evaporative cooling process; however, he indicated his understanding that both of those technologies were available for data centers to use. He commented that there had not been any data centers in the SJRWMD that were large enough to require a consumptive use permit; however, per SB 484, any permit for a large scale data center would have to go before their governing board for consideration.

Commr. Campione relayed her understanding that there were not any data centers in the SJRWMD that were reaching the threshold of requiring a consumptive use permit.

Mr. Coarsey confirmed this, and added that there were no data centers currently coming in for a consumptive use permit; however, there were some data centers that were served by public supply utilities, such as the one for UCF, that were smaller in size.

Commr. Campione pointed out that the County was planning to possibly move forward with a temporary moratorium until it could be ascertained what the limitations and regulations would be in order to protect the community, noting that this would only be in the unincorporated area. She opined that if any Cities were considering this, then it would be closer to urban areas, and that data centers may possibly find it more difficult to acquire appropriate sites there. She opined that Ms. Barker could reach out to the City Managers to inform them of this discussion and see if any of them would like to opt-in to the County's ordinance.

Ms. Marsh commented that the City of Minneola recently passed a data center moratorium using a very broad definition of a data center.

Commr. Parks opined that this was a very important subject, and that they had received many valid concerns from residents. He remarked that he would be willing to tour a data center, opining that this would be important research. He stated that he wanted to ensure that the moratorium was done correctly and to take time to draft the right regulation for this matter, and that he wanted to know what the County could do regulatorily with water usage. He related that he wanted an end date for the moratorium for when the County could have something in place that would protect Lake County and be balanced in regards to public safety, opining that this was a great place to start.

Commr. Morris opined that a moratorium had a negative connotation for Lake County, and questioned why the County should say that it was not interested in talking about it since they would have the ability to say yes or no anyway. He mentioned that it went against economic principles, such as bringing business into the county, noting that LEAD was currently talking to

people that would need something like this. He inquired why the County would say that there would not be anything available for at least a year.

Commr. Smith indicated his understanding that there was a pause on it until the Office of Planning and Zoning could come up with some good definitions.

Commr. Campione relayed her understanding that there was not a pause but a way to draft something, and that it would go through the Office of Planning and Zoning first.

Ms. Marsh remarked that at the July 23, 2026 BCC meeting, the Board by consensus told them to move forward with the Citrus County version of the ordinance, and that this ordinance was scheduled to go to the Planning and Zoning Board on August 5, 2026, noting that she would send that draft to the BCC on the current afternoon. She clarified that the Citrus County version was also very broad, and that their definition of data centers captured everything from an Emergency Operations Center (EOC) to a basic server room, noting that working with staff, they made some exemptions. She relayed that even though this ordinance did not define large load data centers, when it came back to the Board it could be narrowed or not approved at all, and that this would come back in the second week of August 2026, which would be the first public hearing.

Commr. Parks asked how long it would take to make this policy, and wondered if the Board could change it after research, workshops, and public hearings.

Ms. Marsh replied that if the Board imposed the moratorium, then it could be dissolved at any point in time, and that they typically did moratoriums for a year because it was a long process to impose it, such as the two public hearings, the Planning and Zoning Board approval, and display ads.

Ms. Dial mentioned that the moratorium could be done for a year or until they brought forward an ordinance with the code that was needed to support a large load data center. She commented that the East Central Florida Regional Planning Council (ECFRPC) was convening a roundtable of County staff for the Counties that they served in September 2026, and that she had asked them to look at model codes that could be adapted to help support Counties and municipalities get the restrictions needed into the code. She stated that she did not know how long this would take, opining that it would be good to have staff engaged in the process to bring back a model code.

Commr. Morris relayed his understanding that hospitals used AI, and opined that if a hospital wanted to build a data center, they could not have one with the moratorium in place.

Ms. Marsh commented that the exemption language they drafted included data center server rooms for governmental agencies, educational institutions. healthcare providers, nonprofit organizations, facilities used primarily to host enterprise information technology, and ancillary AI applications that supported the operations of the owner for the primary purpose of supporting the entities' internal operations. She related that a hospital would be able to do that, and that this would exclude a data center built for the sole purposes of providing AI to third parties.

Commr. Smith opined that it would be interesting to see what was drafted, and that the main concerns he had heard were the drain on the power supply and the drain on the water supply, which he opined could be corrected.

Commr. Campione indicated appreciation for the information, and hoped that staff would have conversations as they narrowed down how to prepare an ordinance. She opined that even though economic development was important to the local economy and students, keeping everyone safe and ensuring that there was not a situation that was harmful to the community was more important. She stated that she wanted both while including the right details and not excluding things that were beneficial to the community from a job creation standpoint, opining that the Board needed to take into consideration ways to protect the community.

RECESS AND REASSEMBLY

The Chairman called a recess at 11:05 a.m. for five minutes.

SECOND PUBLIC HEARING: ORDINANCE 2026-33 CERTIFIED RECOVERY RESIDENCES

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

AN ORDINANCE OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF LAKE COUNTY, FLORIDA; CREATING SECTION 3.03.00, LAKE COUNTY CODE, LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS, TO BE ENTITLED, CERTIFIED RECOVERY RESIDENCES; AMENDING SECTION 3.01.03, LAKE COUNTY CODE, LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS, TO INCLUDE CERTIFIED RECOVERY RESIDENCES AS A PERMITTED OR CONDITIONAL USE IN SPECIFIED ZONING DISTRICTS; AMENDING CHAPTER II, LAKE COUNTY CODE, LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS, ENTITLED DEFINITIONS; 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 2026-33 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. Required per Senate Bill 954 (2025).

PUBLIC HEARING: ORDINANCE 2026-34 LANDSCAPE BUFFER REQUIREMENTS

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

AN ORDINANCE OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF LAKE COUNTY, FLORIDA; AMENDING SECTION 9.01.06 LAKE COUNTY CODE, APPENDIX E, LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS, ENTITLED LANDSCAPE BUFFER REQUIREMENTS; ESTABLISHING A MINIMUM BUFFER WIDTH FROM PUBLIC ROADS; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; PROVIDING FOR INCLUSION IN THE CODE; PROVIDING FOR FILING WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Ms. Marsh clarified that per the prior discussion, this ordinance included a Type C 25-foot buffer if developing along roadways, excluding single lots of record, noting that they would bring back more landscape code in the future as requested by the Board.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

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

Commr. Campione recalled that the discussion for this item from the prior BCC meeting was that staff was going to continue to work on this to come back in the near future to refine it with some of the items discussed, such as landscape material and incentivizing leaving natural existing vegetated areas, noting that she did not want to wait until the regular LDR changes.

Commr. Parks indicated his understanding that it was decided to get this in place while continuing to work on improving the LDR.

Commr. Campione agreed, and mentioned that she did not want to have the smaller buffer that was there before.

Commr. Parks commented that he was in favor of moving forward and working on the codes in the near future.

On a motion by Commr. Parks, seconded by Commr. Smith and carried by a vote of 3-1, the Board approved Ordinance 2026-34 amending Section 9.01.06, Lake County Code, Appendix E, Land Development Regulations, entitled Landscape Buffer Requirements, to establish a minimum landscape buffer width for properties developing along public roadways.

Commr. Morris voted no.

APPOINTMENTS TO THE PARKS, RECREATION AND TRAILS ADVISORY BOARD

Ms. Barker stated that the District 4 appointment was pulled off, and that this would be brought back at a later date.

Commr. Parks remarked that he was in favor of the District 2 representative continuing.

On a motion by Commr. Smith, seconded by Commr. Parks and carried unanimously by a vote of 4-0, the Board approved to reappoint Mr. Jim Peacock to the Parks, Recreation and Trails Advisory Board. The term for members in District 2 expired on June 30, 2026.

APPOINTMENTS TO THE PUBLIC LANDS AND TRAILS ACQUISITION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Commr. Parks commented that those were all current members, and that he was in favor of continuing their service, opining that they were doing a great job.

On a motion by Commr. Parks, seconded by Commr. Morris and carried unanimously by a vote of 4-0, the Board approved the reappointment of the following members to the Public Lands and Trails Acquisition Advisory Committee: Mr. Tim Sallin for District 2; Mr. Cade Carter for District 4; and Ms. Donna Bosold and Mr. A.J. Rohe as At-Large Members.

COMMISSIONERS REPORTS

COMMISSIONER PARKS – VICE CHAIRMAN AND DISTRICT 2

SPECIAL RECOGNITION

Commr. Parks expressed appreciation for placing the Special Recognition of Ms. Suver on the agenda, opining that she did a great job. He mentioned that there were QR codes that could be used to sign a petition or give support, and asked that Lake County's legislative delegation consider legislation regarding improved education and tougher consequences for hit and run drivers,

opining that Ms. Suver had some good ideas. He opined that her personal experience would give more weight to the legislative delegation, and requested that they would invite Ms. Suver to come speak to them about some of the legislative things she mentioned on the current day.

WATER QUALITY ENHANCEMENT AREAS

Commr. Parks requested information on water quality enhancement areas (WQEAs), and opined that it was akin to wetland mitigation for the nutrient side of water resources. He relayed his understanding that even though it had been law for a couple of years, it was finally starting to gain traction, and opined that since they were going to be doing some rulemaking in the current year, it could be important for the County to have an update on what a WQEA was and how it could help Lake County. He indicated his understanding that there was a way to potentially purchase these properties with land management funds, and that there was a credit system in place statutorily, noting that he would to like to discuss this in conjunction with the LCWA.

Commr. Campione relayed her understanding that this was separate from the Basin Management Action Plan (BMAP).

Commr. Parks confirmed this, and added that it was a tool that could help the County achieve its BMAP.

COMMISSIONER CAMPIONE – CHAIRMAN AND DISTRICT 4

TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS

Commr. Campione commented that at the previous BCC meeting there was discussion about the Wekiva Protection Area and the transfer of development rights (TDRs), and opined that even though there were several areas that were already developed in the receiving areas, there were some parcels that were completely pristine large tracts, such as the area east of the RedTail community. She opined that this should be a sending area instead of a receiving area, and that these parcels were much like those in the Wekiva Protection Area where one would not want to see development. She explained that Mr. Wilson Hamrick's TDRs discussed at the prior meeting were different from those attached to existing property in the sending areas, and that they were not speculative, as they were existing and not attached to a property, opining that this was what made them very accessible to developers who wanted to purchase them and place them on these receiving properties. She opined that this was a real threat, and asked that the Board would keep an open mind and consider how these could be taken off the market. She opined that even though the PLTAAC had many parcels submitted, some of the parcels in the receiving areas should also be under consideration.

Commr. Parks related that there was a PLTAAC meeting coming up on July 30, 2026, and opined that $50 million was not as much as it seemed.

Commr. Campione suggested obtaining funding through FDEP even though there was a limited amount of funding available for land acquisition at the State level, and that they had the Florida Forever program, opining that the County could explore obtaining State funding to acquire the TDRs so that they were not used to increase the density of those properties.

Commr. Parks opined that it would require working with FDEP and getting the right people.

Commr. Campione opined that the Friends of the Wekiva River and the Audubon Society could help the County make its case to FDEP to see if this request could get on a list or to see if there was a way they would consider helping purchase the TDRs to take them off the books.

Commr. Parks opined that the County's lobbyists could help with this as well.

Commr. Morris commented that he was not interested in buying them, and that if they were valuable, then the TDRs could be sold.

Commr. Campione clarified that her idea was to see if the State would be interested in trying to preserve the Wekiva Protection Area, and indicated concern that they could be sold, opining that it would cause regret if the properties they could be attached to were developed.

Commr. Smith inquired how long the TDRs had been on the open market, and opined that even if the TDRs were sold, the developer still had to follow the density rules, which did not allow 500 homes in 20 acres.

Commr. Campione related that there were 325 units, which could allow one unit per acre, and opined that they could be clustered into a high density-looking subdivision in this area.

Commr. Smith remarked that a developer could do one unit per acre just like anybody else with 50 percent open space, and that he did not see a reason for the County to pay for them. He relayed his understanding that the County could let him go to an urban area and sell them there.

Commr. Campione indicated her understanding that the County could not do this because it would devalue those properties currently in the receiving areas, opining that they would lose that opportunity.

Commr. Smith opined that people in the receiving area did not want to receive anything.

Commr. Campione mentioned that when the Wekiva Protection Act went into place, there were people who were given the right to have TDRs transferred in and people who had the opportunity to have them sold from their land, and opined that if the locations where the TDRs could go were expanded, then this could be an issue to the people who had the right to receive. She stated that what she wanted to stop from happening was for locations that were pristine and were part of the Wekiva Protection Area to be protected, opining that they should have been purchased by the State. She pointed out that these TDRs were not available to sell until 10 years prior, and that this was only because he sued the State to obtain what had been promised. She opined that since there was an exponential rate of growth in Lake County, these TDRs would be attractive to a developer.

Commr. Morris opined that the residents did not vote for a $50 million bond issue to buy TDRs, as they wanted the County to buy land that they could use.

Commr. Smith opined that the price for the TDRs was not appropriate, noting that Mr. Hamrick had started with $19,000 per unit, which was just a guess.

Commr. Campione opined that someone who still owned their land and had TDRs on them was different from somebody who was paid TDRs by the State of Florida when their land became conservation land in the Wekiva Protection Area.

Commr. Smith indicated his understanding that if a guy had 10 TDRs on agricultural land, which had one unit per 20 acres or one unit per five acres with 50 percent open space, and sold his

TDRs, he could keep his land but not build on it. He asked if the person who bought the TDRs had to follow the same density rules of where they came from or if they followed the new rules of where the TDRs were going to.

Commr. Campione answered that the receiving areas had their own densities and bonus points.

Commr. Parks explained that every property had a bundle of rights, and that if an owner sold TDRs, then they sold their ability to develop the property; however, they still had all the other rights that were on the property, such as putting cows on it.

Commr. Campione opined that this owner could still have the right to have one house and sell the rest of the rights.

Commr. Parks added that it was a free market principle, and opined that one could sell TDRs on a market to a developer in an area that needed more units. He opined that it was important to tie these rights to the over allocation number so that it came out of this ledger, and that the County was not adding units, as they were transferred to a certain area, which he opined should be near the cities. He mentioned that this TDR situation was set up long before the current BCC, and opined that the TDRs had failed to transfer because of the size and location of the receiving area. He opined that a case could be made to FDEP; however, he also did not want to use the $50 million bond funds to purchase the TDRs, noting that there was about $80 million worth of properties requesting to be purchased.

Commr. Smith commented that he would not mind going to FDEP to see if they wanted to purchase the TDRs; however, he did not want to spend the residents' tax funds on this.

Commr. Campione stated that she brought this up because she hoped that there may be other ways to purchase the TDRs, noting that at the prior BCC meeting, she had mentioned finding other funding sources, such as FDEP. She remarked that she wanted to bring this issue to everybody's awareness, opining that the residents would probably like to see land in some of those receiving areas preserved. She opined that since the goal of the PLTAAC was to preserve land, then lands that were pristine properties in that area should also be preserved.

Commr. Smith indicated his understanding that there was a sending area where the TDRs came from and a receiving area where those rights could go, and inquired if a resident in the receiving area had to obtain something from a sending area to be able to build or if he could build on his property the way it was already zoned.

Commr. Parks opined that a person in the receiving area could make a case under the current rules to build a certain way with a limited density, and that if they wanted to add extra units, then they could buy another person's TDRs, noting that the County would have to approve it or not.

Commr. Smith opined that the County would not have to approve it, and that a person in a receiving area could still build to the current zoning.

Commr. Campione indicated her understanding that the current zoning in the Wekiva Protection Area was one unit per 20 acres.

Commr. Smith questioned if a person could build one unit per five acres if this person bought TDRs from a sending area that allowed one unit per five acres, or if he still had to build one unit per 20 acres.

Ms. Marsh relayed her understanding that the density for a receiving area was one unit per 20 acres, and that if they bought enough TDRs, they could get as much density as one unit per acre. She mentioned that there was a second receiving area in the Mt. Plymouth/Sorrento receiving area, which had a density of 5.5 units per acre.

Commr. Parks opined that the question remained about what the process was and if the County would be forced to accept those TDRs.

Commr. Smith asked if there could be a workshop on TDRs for the Wekiva Protection Area, and opined that this was an important issue that he wanted to be more educated on.

Commr. Campione opined that the County should make an argument to the State and try to save some of these pristine locations that were in the receiving area with support from the environmental groups that wanted to see these lands protected.

Comm. Parks opined that a workshop may not provide answers that were clear, and that FDEP could help with this workshop.

Commr. Morris questioned why it took a lawsuit to obtain the TDRs.

Commr. Campione replied that there was much land being purchased at the time, and that the Wekiva Parkway situation was very political, which included the following: the City of Orlando area wanted to see the beltway completed; environmental groups were concerned about what would happen to the Wekiva River Basin; and there was much trading with locations and what would be obtained in return. She commented that there was funding set aside by the State to buy land and create conservation areas, noting that since the funding only went so far, the State could not pay full value and used TDRs to make up the difference. She related that when the attempt was made to use the TDRs, they were told they could not because they had been paid for the land, and that the lawsuit was to prove that the TDRs were part of the value of what was paid for the land. She opined that the land that was placed in conservation was in a beautiful area of an environmentally sensitive location, and that it was good that the land was purchased.

Ms. Marsh relayed her understanding that when Mr. Hamrick and his two partners contracted with FDEP to sell the land, Mr. Hamrick negotiated to keep the TDRs, and that when he sold the land, there was a contract dispute with FDEP who claimed to have bought all the rights. She stated that Mr. Hamrick litigated with FDEP for 20 years on whether or not the TDRs were his, and that FDEP finally settled and gave him the TDRs. She mentioned that there was an issue when FDEP could not locate the original purchase agreement, and that there were issues with evidentiary matters as well.

Commr. Campione related that there were people with land that was one unit per five acres who were upset when the Wekiva Protection Act was imposed upon them, and that when this led to the BCC imposing lower densities, these properties were changed to one unit per 40 acres in these sending areas. She pointed out that nobody was paid for the rights they lost when those lower densities happened, and that currently under the Bert J. Harris, Jr., Private Property Rights

Protection Act, this could not happen. She opined that it was a historically significant issue, and that even though she was glad that the conservation rules and protections were in place, people who sold their land and did not want to sell their land were having their land devalued and then being paid for that land at the devalued amount.

Commr. Parks opined that FDEP had a role in helping with this issue, and that a prime tool listed for growth management was to use TDRs. He opined that the case could be made that because this was part of growth management, the FDEP should help with it.

Commr. Campione expressed appreciation for the discussion, and opined that there could be an opportunity for a workshop.

NATIONAL CHOCOLATE MILK DAY

Commr. Smith said that it was National Chocolate Milk Day.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to be brought to the attention of the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

_____
LESLIE CAMPIONE, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:

_____
GARY J COONEY, CLERK