A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

AUGUST 25, 2026

The Lake County Board of County Commissioners met in regular session on Tuesday, August 25, 2026 at 9:00 a.m., in the County Commission Chambers, Lake County Administration Building, Tavares, Florida. Commissioners present at the meeting were: Leslie Campione, Chairman; Sean Parks, Vice Chairman; Anthony Sabatini; Kirby Smith; and Timothy Morris. Others present were: Jennifer Barker, County Manager; Melanie Marsh, County Attorney; Misty Spahn, Executive Office Manager, County Manager's Office; Kristy Mullane, Chief Financial Officer; and Stephanie Cash, Deputy Clerk.

INVOCATION AND PLEDGE

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

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

AGENDA UPDATE

Ms. Jennifer Barker, County Manager, commented that updates included the following: on Tab 16, the recommended action language was revised to include "if needed"; on Tab 26, the unsolicited proposal was added to the backup; and Tab 29 was added as an addendum, which she requested to have moved to the consent agenda.

Commr. Campione commented that there was consensus to move Tab 29 to the consent agenda.

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
Jenny Deschenes, Records Compliance Coordinator
County Attorney's Office

Edward Morales, Delivery Service Driver/Operator
Office of Library Services

Keaton Woods, Telecommunicator
Office of Fire Rescue – Emergency Dispatch

TEN YEARS
Norma Barrow, Office Associate III
Office of Solid Waste

Addison Harper, Firefighter/EMT
Office of Fire Rescue

Aaron Textor, Digital Services Manager
Office of Communications

FIFTEEN YEARS
Nicole Deyarman, HCVP Coordinator
Office of Housing and Community Services

TWENTY YEARS
Roland Breeden, Maintenance Technician II
Office of Facilities Maintenance

Thomas Carpenter, Assistant County Manager
County Manager's Office

Dwayne Henry, Construction Program Manager
Office of Parks and Water Resources

MINUTES APPROVAL

On a motion by Commr. Sabatini, seconded by Commr. Parks and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved the minutes for the BCC meeting of July 14, 2026 (Regular Meeting) as presented.

CITIZEN QUESTION AND COMMENT PERIOD

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

Mr. Banks Helfrich, a farmer from the Clay Road District, commented that it was harvest season, and that it was also time to put fall crops into the ground, including carrots, onions, radishes, turnips, broccoli, cauliflower, cabbage, brussels sprouts, and leafy lettuces. He mentioned that November 3, 2026 was a harvest for the United States (U.S.), and that citizens could choose who the next representatives would be. He encouraged citizens to participate, opining that a republican democracy would not work unless the citizens were engaged, such as voting, speaking out at council meetings, writing letters to the editor, and running for office. He also opined that regarding artificial intelligence (AI) data centers, the residents should not give up their water, their electrical grid, and their soundscapes until due diligence was done, and said that he was in favor of a one year moratorium on AI data centers.

Ms. Lee Owen, a member of the Board of Directors for Habitat for Humanity of Lake-Sumter and Chair of the Affordable Housing Advisory Committee, opined that buying a house the traditional way was very challenging, and said that the mission of Habitat for Humanity of Lake-Sumter was to make entry level homeownership possible. She commented that they did this by building safe affordable housing for qualified buyers, noting that they did not give houses away. She related that people had to qualify for and obtain their own mortgages, and that they helped people with that process. She remarked that their program empowered families to invest in the future through sweat equity and financial education, and that in the prior fiscal year, which closed on June 30, 2026, they had completed 35 repairs for low income homeowners across Lake County and built 11 new homes in the Cities of Tavares, Groveland, and Leesburg and in the Town of Lady Lake with an additional seven in Sumter County for a total of 18 new homes. She mentioned that for the upcoming fiscal year, they aimed to complete a similar number of repairs for low income homeowners and build 15 new homes in Lake County for qualified low income homebuyers within the Cities of Tavares, Eustis, and Leesburg with an additional seven in Sumter

County for a total of 22 new homes. She expressed appreciation to Lake County for the infrastructure funds from the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funding, and noted that it helped them with the Sager's Cove pocket neighborhood community, which would soon be under construction. She relayed that there were two celebrations coming up, including the Eustis High School Construction Academy's kick-off for the current year's building project on September 10, 2026 and the Leesburg High School Construction Academy's kick-off for their current project on September 11, 2026, noting that the youth were learning trades that could provide them with jobs after graduation.

Mr. Chuck Hiott, representing Lake 100, requested that the Board postpone the adoption and State submittal of the proposed 2050 Comprehensive Plan (Comp Plan) until after the November 3, 2026 property tax referendum vote, and opined that since land use policy and economic development were inherently connected, the Comp Plan would guide Lake County's growth, infrastructure investments, employment centers, and business climate for decades to come. He opined that if the property tax referendum passed, then it would be prudent have a long term policy framework that would help avoid future amendments while ensuring that the plan reflected the County's economic priorities, and said that Lake 100 had assembled a private sector review committee to evaluate the draft Comp Plan through the lens of economic development and business competitiveness. He stated that they had already begun identifying areas of concern, and opined that additional time was needed to develop constructive recommendations and practical solutions to strengthen the final document. He commented that their goal was to collaborate with the County by providing meaningful private sector input before the plan was finalized, and opined that a postponement would allow additional time for the County to consider the outcome of the property tax referendum while incorporating thoughtful recommendations from the business community, resulting in a stronger plan that better supported Lake County's long term economic prosperity.

PROCLAMATION 2026-90 POLYCYSTIC KIDNEY DISEASE AWARENESS DAY

Commr. Campione related that there were two proclamations to present, and asked for them to be approved.

On a motion by Commr. Smith, seconded by Commr. Sabatini and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved Proclamation 2026-90 designating September 4, 2026, as Polycystic Kidney Disease Awareness Day in Lake County, and Proclamation 2026-91 declaring the month of September 2026 as Hunger Action Month.

Commr. Campione read and presented Proclamation 2026-90 to Ms. Dylan Bova, with the Polycystic Kidney Disease (PKD) Foundation.

Ms. Bova stated that PKD affected over 600,000 Americans, and that she was diagnosed with the disease at 13 years old even though it did not run in her family. She remarked that she did her best to advocate for those who did not know if they had it yet so that it would not be as difficult for them as it was for her because of research funding and support for this disease.

PROCLAMATION 2026-91 HUNGER ACTION MONTH

Commr. Campione read and presented Proclamation 2026-91 to Ms. Stephanie Palacios, with Second Harvest Food Bank of Central Florida.

Ms. Palacios relayed that they liked to make people aware of Hunger Action Month, and opined that there may be members of the community who had time and talents that they would like to share with the local community, such as volunteering at a local food pantry. She pointed out that they had 55 food pantries in Lake County that could use this support, and she asked Lake County residents to volunteer during this Hunger Action Month; additionally, if there were those who were seeking assistance, they could visit their website at feedhopenow.org to find help.

CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT AND COMPTROLLER'S CONSENT AGENDA

On a motion by Commr. Sabatini, seconded by Commr. Morris and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved the Clerk of the Circuit Court and Comptroller's Consent Agenda, Items 1 through 3, 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.

City of Minneola Annexation Ordinance

Notice is hereby provided of having received Annexation Ordinance 2026-09 from the City of Minneola.

City of Umatilla Ordinances

Notice is hereby provided of having received Ordinances 2026-E, 2026-E1, 2026-I and 2026-I-1 from the City of Umatilla.

COUNTY MANAGER'S CONSENT AGENDA

Commr. Smith requested to pull Tab 19 from the consent agenda.

On a motion by Commr. Sabatini, seconded by Commr. Parks and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved the Consent Agenda, Tabs 5 through 18, with the addition of Tab 29, pulling Tab 19 to the regular agenda as follows:

COUNTY ATTORNEY

Recommend approval for County Attorney to conduct a Closed Session of the Board of County Commissioners to be held on September 8, 2026, to discuss Mark Dickinson, an individual, and Florida Carry, Inc., a Florida not-for-profit corporation, vs. Lake County Fair Association, Inc., Lake Agriculture and Youth Fair Association, Inc., Lake County, Florida, Peyton C. Grinnell, in his official capacity as Sheriff of Lake County, Florida, and Peyton C. Grinnell, individually; Circuit Court of the Fifth Judicial Circuit in and for Lake County, Florida; Circuit Court Case No. 2026-CA-001525.

There is no fiscal impact.

COUNTY MANAGER

Recommend approval of the 2027 meeting dates for the Board of County Commissioners: 01/05/27, 01/19/27, 02/02/27, 02/09/27, 02/23/27, 03/02/27, 03/09/27, 03/23/27, 04/06/27, 04/13/27, 04/27/27, 05/04/27, 05/11/27, 05/25/27, 06/01/27, 06/08/27, 06/22/27, 07/13/27, 07/27/27, 08/03/27, 08/10/27, 08/24/27, 09/07/27, 09/14/27, 09/28/27, 10/05/27, 10/12/27, 10/26/27, 11/02/27, 11/16/27, 12/07/27 and 12/21/27.

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

Management and Budget

Recommend approval of a budget transfer in the amount of $91,282 from Machinery/Equipment (Capital Expenses) to Operating Expenses, as requested by the Fifth Judicial Circuit of Lake County.

The fiscal impact is $91,282 (expenditure).

Recommend approval to advertise an Ordinance amending Chapter 13, Article IV, Lake County Code, entitled Local Provider Participation Fund. Required per the One Big Beautiful Bill Act, Public Law 119-21 (2025). There is no fiscal impact.

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

Building Services

Recommend approval:

1. To increase the expenditure limits of Contract 25-734 for Document and Scanning Services with Advanced Data Solutions, Inc. (Oldsmar, FL) from $75,000 to an estimated $200,000; and

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

The estimated fiscal impact is $125,000 (expenditure) and is within, and will not exceed, the Fiscal Year 2026 Budget.

PUBLIC SAFETY

Fire Rescue

Recommend approval:

1. Of Contract 26-522 for Emergency Medical Services (EMS) Billing Services to Digitech Computer, LLC (Dublin, OH); and

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

The estimated fiscal impact is $750,000 (expenditure) and is within, and will not exceed, the Fiscal Year 2026 Budget. Annual expenditures shall at no time exceed the available Fiscal Year Budgeted funds.

Recommend approval:

1. Of the First Amendment to the Interlocal Agreement with the City of Mount Dora dated January 23, 2024, related to the Eudora Roundabout; and

2. Of a License Agreement with the First National Bank of Mount Dora; and

3. To authorize the Chairman to execute both documents with County Attorney review and approval.

There is no fiscal impact at this time. Commission District 4.

Public Safety Support

Recommend approval of a Perpetual Utility Easement to Sumter Electric Cooperative, Inc. (SECO), needed for electrical services for new Orange Mountain Public Safety Communications Tower, located at 15155 Schofield Road, in Clermont (Alternate Key 3960771).

There is no fiscal impact. Commission District 1.

INFRASTRUCTURE AND TRANSPORTATION SERVICES

Public Works

Recommend approval:

1. To proceed to closing on Right-of-Way Dedications for CR-470 Villages Development, which is in the City of Leesburg; and

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

There is no fiscal impact. Commission District 5.

Recommend approval of a Maintenance Agreement with Pulte Homes Company, LLC to maintain landscaping, hardscape, and lighting associated with the new roundabout at the intersection Schofield Road and Lakehaven Boulevard.

There is no fiscal impact. Commission District 1.

Recommend approval to award the CR 452 from CR 44 to the Lake/Marion County Line - Phase 2 project (Contract 25-741) to C.W. Roberts Contracting, Inc. for $4,258,663.70.

The fiscal impact is $4,258,663.70 — $2,971,194 (revenue/expenditure - grant funded) and $1,287,469.70 (expenditure) and is within, and will not exceed, the Fiscal Year 2026 Budget. Commission District 3 and 5.

Recommend approval:

1. Of a Change Order to Wellness Way and Hancock Road Supplement Roadway Improvement Agreement with Lennar Homes, LLC, to add roadway and landscape design services in the Clermont Area; and

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

3. To adopt Unanticipated Revenue Resolution 2026-93 (URR) to accept and appropriate $2,000,000 for the South Transportation Benefit District Fund.

The estimated fiscal impact is $532,440 (expenditure) and is within, and will not exceed, the Fiscal Year 2027 Budget. Commission District 1.

Recommend approval:

1. To accept public Right of Way and Easement Deeds that have been secured in conjunction with development, roadway, and stormwater projects; and

2. To authorize the Chairman to execute an Assignment of Rights, accepting transfer of rights related to the Johns Lake, LLC, Quitclaim Deed dated June 16, 2026, if needed, with County Attorney approval of the form.

The fiscal impact is $144.80 (expenditure) and is within, and will not exceed, the Fiscal Year 2026 Budget.

Recommend approval to adopt Resolution 20226-94 to install all-way stop signs and all-way plaques on Lakeshore Drive (5154) and Woodward Avenue (City of Eustis Maintained Roadway), in the Eustis Area.

The estimated fiscal impact is $10,000 (expenditure) and is within, and will not exceed, the Fiscal Year 2026 Budget. Commission District 3.

Recommend approval to adopt Resolution 2026-95 to post “No Trucks Over 10 Tons Local Delivery Exempt” signs on Britt Road (4981) between Wolf Branch Road (4583) and State Road 44 (SR 44) in the Eustis area. Advance warning signs will be placed on Wolf Branch Road (4583) and SR 44 to notify drivers of the restriction.

The estimated fiscal impact is $2,000 (expenditure) and is within, and will not exceed, the Fiscal Year 2026 Budget. Commission District 4.

TAB 19: NORTH LAKE TRAIL

Commr. Smith commented that this item was for about $1.2 million to expand a trail from where the Board originally agreed to a location one mile north, and that he would rather see this $1.2 million spent on resurfacing roads. He opined that since this trail was not originally approved in this design to go one mile further, it would be better to use this funding for road infrastructure rather than trails, noting that if it had originally been designed to go that far, then he would have been okay with it; however, he thought that since it was a new addition, the funding should go towards infrastructure.

Commr. Campione mentioned that there was a request received from the Lakeview Terrace community to not end the trail short of Lakeview Terrace so they could utilize the trail for the purpose getting back and forth to the City of Umatilla, and that even though the design continued on, a decision was made not to build that far.

The Chairman opened the floor for public comment.

Mr. Mike Stephens, Chairman of the Friends of Lake County Trails, confirmed that the design had been done, and that it went about three miles from the City of Umatilla to the edge of the forest and through the Altoona area on County Road (CR) 42. He mentioned that the original piece that was decided on was financially constrained, and that the piece currently being constructed ended across the street from the Silver Beach Heights subdivision in a sinkhole in the woods and did not go anywhere. He commented that when the residents and management of Lakeview Terrace found out about this, they submitted letters, as did the Olde Mill Stream Recreational Vehicle (RV) Resort, and said that he also supported it. He opined that this would give the trail a logical place to end and a logical place to connect, as it would go from the City of Umatilla downtown area to Lakeview Terrace, and noted that it would go past the Olde Mill Stream RV Resort and not just end in the woods. He opined that there would be an additional mobilization cost and inefficiencies of having a contractor come back at a later date to finish it, noting that the contractor was there currently building the trail. He remarked that there were about 600 residents of Lakeview Terrace, and opined that there were younger residents moving there that were looking for these types of amenities. He opined that this would be a great place to have a connection, and said that there currently was not connection. He related that the trail had been designed from the City of Umatilla to East Altoona Road, which was less than a mile past Lakeview Terrace, and that the rest of the section going into the Ocala National Forest had previously gone through a project development and environmental (PD&E) study. He commented that they could currently apply for Shared-Use Non-Motorized (SUN) Trail funding because this was a SUNTrail eligible project, and hoped that this section could soon be done, obtaining construction funds in the future. He relayed that he would like to see the County build everything that had been designed; however, he understood about the financing.

Commr. Morris inquired if there was any financial participation from Lakeview Terrace.

Mr. Stephens indicated that he had not asked for any.

Commr. Morris opined that since it would support 600 of their residents, the County could ask if Lakeview Terrace would not mind donating some funding to help the cause, noting that he had an issue with spending $1.2 million on the trail.

Mr. Stephens mentioned that they paid taxes, which would support it, and that since this was a sales tax transfer, it was not an additional budget item, as it would just be moved over to cover the cost. He commented that many of the surrounding Counties used sales tax for the long term funding of trails, and opined that trails had a multiplicative effect by bringing additional sales for businesses that could drive the sales tax number higher.

Commr. Parks relayed his understanding that this funding was a transfer from the East Lake Sports and Community Complex, which was funded through sales tax.

Commr. Campione remarked that both of those projects were in Commission District 4, and opined that the funds could be spent on the East Lake Sports and Community Complex or on the trail. She opined that the trail could have more resident participation if it did not just stop in the middle of the forest on the way to the Altoona area, and that it could end at a logical place. She commented that the East Lake Sports and Community Complex improvements were moving

into the next phase, and that they had completed ballfields, structures, and improvements there, noting that it was being used. She opined that funding the trail would be a way to complete a project, noting that it would go all the way to Altoona. She remarked that even though she was in favor of having funds for road resurfacing, this funding was already going to a recreational use, and opined that it would make more sense to open up the trail. She opined that the more a trail was used, the better it was, and that ending it in Lakeview Terrace in the Altoona area gave the trail a much greater chance of being utilized until the County moved on to the next segment of the trail.

Commr. Smith questioned if this $1.2 million could be used for infrastructure and road resurfacing.

Ms. Melanie Marsh, County Attorney, indicated that it could.

Commr. Smith opined that even though people from Lakeview Terrace had made requests, there had been more requests for road resurfacing. He opined that the County was at a critical point where they had to start fixing infrastructure and roads, and that since this funding came from East Lake Sports and Community Complex, it could be used to fix a road going there or to a road in Commission District 4 rather than on a trail. He stated that he was not comfortable spending $1.2 million on one mile of trail when it could be spent on one mile of resurfacing.

Commr. Campione relayed her understanding that there would be discussion later in the current meeting about sales tax in general, and wondered if Commissioner Smith would want all of it to go towards roads, noting that the Board would be discussing the park in Commission District 3.

Commr. Smith commented that he was just referring to this item.

Commr. Parks related that he and Mr. Stephens had discussed finding a continuous funding source for trails, and hoped that there would be some discussion on that.

Mr. Stephens reiterated that trails had a multiplicative impact, as trails drove business sales, which provided more sales tax to be used, and that many of the surrounding Counties were using sales tax specifically for trails because they understood the impact. He opined that the State understood the impact of trails because most of its revenue came from sales tax, and that the State was putting $50 million into trails every year with a $200 million injection just a couple of years prior because they understood that this drove more sales tax that could be used for other projects. He indicated his understanding that under the sales tax program approved on the current day, there was $8 million in road work being funded from sales tax, opining that the $1.2 million from this item may not even fund a feasibility study for a road. He reiterated that this funding would end the trail at a logical place and bring more people into the City of Umatilla, and opined that to have an impact, small trails had to be connected; otherwise, he opined that the trail would not be used as much and would not have an impact.

Commr. Smith pointed out that when this trail was approved, it was approved to go to a certain point, and that this had been supported by Mr. Stephens.

Mr. Stephens commented that he was not aware how far it was going until after the fact.

Commr. Campione stated that she had thought that it would go to a place where people could utilize it, and opined that the ending caught many off guard.

Mr. Stephens remarked that when it just ended in the woods at a large sinkhole, it surprised many people, and that many people wondered why it did not go the additional mile to Lakeview Terrace to connect those residents and have that use.

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

Commr. Campione mentioned that many did not realize that it was not going to make it to the Altoona area, and asked that the Board would take this into consideration. She commented that the County had done much road resurfacing and was continuing to do this; however, she opined that if this was prioritized over every recreational use, then the Board could decide that this was the direction to go. She opined that since this funding was going to go to the park, it made more sense to shift it over to another recreational use, and said that her request on behalf of the people in the Lakeview Terrace community was to allow this trail to move forward.

Commr. Parks commented that he was in favor of it because it was coming out of the East Lake Sports and Community Complex funding, and that even though there were many road issues, there would be much discussion in the coming year on how to fund the roads.

Commr. Sabatini stated that he would support the trail because it would frustrate the purpose of the project if it was shortened, and opined that the County had to do this or not do any of it at all because it would not be used by the elderly residents in this vicinity.

Commr. Smith clarified that the trail was not shortened, and that the Board approved a certain amount of funding to go to a certain point.

On a motion by Commr. Sabatini, seconded by Commr. Parks and carried by a vote of 3-2, the Board approved to authorize the Office of Procurement Services to execute the agreements and supporting documentation related to the North Lake Trail - Beach Street to Lakeview Terrace Drive construction project amendment (Contract 26-702) to Bulldog Sitework, LLC, and of a budget transfer in the amount of $1,226,479 from Improvements Other than Buildings to Infrastructure.

Commr. Smith and Commr. Morris voted no.

PRESENTATION ON THE 2050 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE

Ms. Kathleen Dial, Executive Director for Development Services, stated that Mr. Kelley Klepper, Vice President for Kimley-Horn, would give an update and executive summary on the 2050 Comp Plan, and that he would discuss some details, proposed changes, and things they needed more direction on.

Mr. Klepper commented that he would provide an overview of where they were and what they had been working on and to obtain some Board direction, noting that they had been working diligently and had held a couple of stakeholder meetings, including with the Lake 100, to solicit and receive input. He mentioned that even though they did not have a final revised draft, they had a substantial guidance document and were at the point where they needed to obtain the last pieces of information, noting that at the end of the presentation, they would provide an update on

something else that was linked to the Comp Plan and was extremely needed, beneficial, and desired by this group. He stated that they would go through an overview of the schedule, the community engagement, some highlights, and provide opportunity for feedback and guidance from the Board to ensure that they got it right. He remarked that they had thought they would be ready to transmit in the summer or third quarter of 2026; however, because of the property tax referendum and some other issues, this could wait until after the November 3, 2026 election, and they would be ready to transmit as soon as the Board said to. He relayed that the target was the first and second quarters of 2027, allowing the final information and ideas to be fixed if the property tax referendum came into play, such as some changes with the capital improvement plan (CIP). He opined that core policies and discussion items laid out in the current Comp Plan probably would not change because this was a policy document that did not get into the details, as did the Land Development Regulations (LDR). He commented that even though some of the things they were proposing may be affected, most of this document would stay fairly intact with some additional edits, information, and updates, and that they had been working closely with staff, including the County Attorney's Office, to correct some things and get some perspective regarding Senate Bill (SB) 180, which was still an issue, noting that they had been identifying those items so that they could keep a running tally of them as they were going through this process. He remarked that they had done public outreach and had provided a series of three workshops around the county, noting that Lake 100 provided some additional thoughts in the third meeting. He commented that they had been working closely with that economic stakeholder group because the vast majority of Lake County was residential, which could possibly be impacted by the property tax referendum, and that they wanted to focus more on economic development, business parks, and employment centers moving forward. He stated that they had a number of meetings across the board and continued to meet biweekly with staff, including with the Public Works Department, as they had been facilitating those items. He mentioned that they were going back through the online surveys, and that they also met and had a separate survey for students, opining that they had a little different perspective than the retirees, giving them a well-rounded diversity of information coming back. He related that coordination with municipalities continued to be a large item, as they all provided some level of services throughout the county, noting that the County did not provide water or wastewater services. He commented that there may be some questions when looking at some of the new land use designations, such as how they interacted with what the County currently had versus what was going on in the Cities, and that the goal of a couple of those new designations, which would not be physically mapped at this point, would be tools and options available to the County. He mentioned that they tried to provide a bridge or transition for several of them so that the automatic response would not be to annex into a municipality, and opined that it would be easier if the County could keep some control or guidance at the County level. He remarked that one of the highlights involved initial reviews, which included the following: the five year CIP, which was possibly subject to change in November 2026; a new future land use (FLU) designation to support mixed-use; coordination with Cities to provide public facilities; moving some development requirements to the LDR; and reorganizing for a more logical flow by working closely with the County Attorney's

Office. He opined that this would make it more of a succinct, flowing document versus having hit-or-miss and redundant policies across the plan, noting that when there was a duplication of policies between multiple elements, there was a risk that one portion could be updated in one area and not in the others. He commented that some of the changes included the following: removing the Urban Transition FLU and combining that information with Urban High Density, opining that there was much similarity; establishing a Regional Economic Center FLU to replace the Economic Overlay, making this a defined land use designation that would be housed within the FLU but referenced back to the economic development element; clarifying and updating the transfer of development rights (TDR) process; and expanding some transportation policies related to the multimodal transportation that the County already had. He mentioned that the FLU perspective included additional protection measures for the Green Swamp and other areas of critical State concern, ensuring that they had effectively protected those areas consistent with the vision of the community and State law, and that they revised Urban High Density, ensuring that it was designated as a TDR receiving area, which would provide that initial guidance to where there was infrastructure such as roads, water, wastewater, and stormwater. He related that the new FLU designation of Mixed Use included the following: a broader range of uses while supporting smart growth principles, such as Wellness Way; a way to meet what the County was trying to do for an overarching master plan process; a higher design, which was infrastructure based; a true mix of uses, such as residential, nonresidential, and open spaces; and areas where this would not be applied because of State law and protection of critical areas. He recalled that the Board had a presentation by Dr. Evangeline Linkous, Program Director for Masters of Urban and Regional Planning with the University of South Florida (USF), about TDRs and other studies that were ongoing, and asked what they could envision for mixed use in relation to TDRs. He said that they were trying to develop a framework that would support TDRs and those receiving areas where there was supporting infrastructure. He also stated that in coordination with staff, Lake 100, and the County's economic developer stakeholder group, it was decided that the County needed a new FLU for Regional Economic Center, and that they created something that would further support the County's diversification away from industrial or commercial and get to the heart of employment. He mentioned that even though the County had a targeted list of industries and businesses they were trying to attract, there was not one FLU that could be used which would cover all of that without modifications. He relayed that they created a designation that could be used as an economic development tool without trying to force a square peg into a round hole on some of these items, and that it would involve local control and local discussion. He remarked that this was not mapped on any properties, and that if adopted by the County, it would be a tool that could be used towards those processes.

Commr. Campione questioned if the County was going to postpone moving forward until after November 2026, noting that this was just an overview of where they were currently in the process. She opined that if there was a decision to make, then it could be delayed, and that they would at least know what they were proposing.

Mr. Klepper commented that even though there were many more slides with information, there were some items that were not being addressed, and that much time could be saved by just discussing the two new land use designations and the TDR proposals.

Commr. Campione opined that one of the most important things from the vacant land analysis that was done was that there was not a need for increases in density, noting that they looked at all of the existing land use maps in the Cities in relation to the County's map. She emphasized that what they were discussing on the current day was not an increase in density, and that it was a redesignation of land use categories, potentially shifting density from one land use category to another.

Mr. Klepper confirmed this, and elaborated that they were going to be taking density from one area and moving those density credits into designated areas only, noting that the goal was to preserve additional rural lands that may otherwise be subject to sprawl and suburban development. He commented that a one unit for one unit swap was not cost effective, and that they needed to look at some of the densities and intensities that were being transferred.

Commr. Parks hoped that there would be a large change, opining that even though there were some good things about the current Comp Plan, unless the County changed the Comp Plan in the correct way, there would be many of the same issues with rapid growth. He opined that since there were about 50,000 overallocated units, there should be no reason why any City or the County would increase the number of units unless it was withdrawing or debiting that tab, and that there could be a way found to make it work by directing the growth inward. He opined that the County as a whole did not need to be adding additional units through a Comp Plan change or within the cities, and that there needed to be a partnership to do this. He remarked that the TDR was a tool to do this, and hoped that there would be better planning with the County and the Cities to ensure that the growth was directed inwards. He opined that if this was not changed, then they would continue to get what they were currently getting, and that since people would continue to move into the State of Florida, as there were many great reasons to move there, there were places where density was going to have to be higher than four units per acre in the cities, such as in mixed use areas where there was an internal rate of capture with less driving and shorter trips, which he opined was key to all of this. He also opined that the rural boundary line should be on the map.

Mr. Klepper mentioned that they had discussed with staff the creation of parcels for family members that allowed an increase in density by giving a parcel of land to a family member who then sold it, making it not a family owned parcel, and that this was one of the things they were trying to address. He stated that they wanted to strengthen the wetland policies, and that there was a potential discussion on the use of Florida Friendly versus Florida Native species, ensuring that there were policies guiding the Wekiva River Protection Area and other conservation areas. He commented that they wanted to move those into the conservation element, which was where they had the Green Swamp Area of Critical State Concern protection policy, and that they could put it under one large umbrella at that point. He related that regarding the economic element, they had been working closely with staff to make some additional updates, and hoped that Lake 100 would provide some additional thoughts, noting that the goal was to diversify the economy and tax base

through land use innovation, industry attraction, and business development by creating a new employment land use with diversification in some of the existing land use components. He mentioned that this could be used as a tool, and that it could be placed on the table for discussion. He relayed that they were currently working to revise and finalize some things related to the new policies, including a new goal for promoting balanced economic growth, and that they were trying to improve the County's ability to overcome the property tax referendum issue. He remarked that the current Comp Plan called out an extravagant number of residential properties, and noted that there was a large amount in existence on the current day. He commented that they did not see how to move the ratio and be more sustainable from an employment and diversification standpoint, and noted that there were 67 other counties competing for the same businesses. He asked where those industries and businesses could be built currently, and inquired if the County had the tools, stating that this was the reason they started to identify the new land use designation. He mentioned that regarding transportation, they worked with staff on some additional policies that were consistent with the County's long range transportation plan serving both motorized and non-motorized conveyance, and that they looked at techniques to protect natural resources so that roads could be better designed to improve the environments there, as well as revising the policy regarding wildlife crossings. He related that building off the long range transportation plan and the safe streets initiatives were for providing safety for all users, and that they looked at those elements that would potentially improve transportation safety at all levels, such as pedestrian and vehicular. He stated that there were no significant changes based off housing, and that recreation and open space did not need to be touched, opining that the County did an amazing job in active and passive recreation as well as open space preservation. He mentioned that they talked about adding onto the greenways and referencing the blueways, which was another tool from the State and the Federal Government, and that since the lakes were linked, there were connections and much distance one could go without moving a kayak to another location. He commented that regarding utilities, they added a reference to the Distributed Wastewater Treatment System (DWTS), which was consistent to the Florida Statute, and that there was coordination with the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) regarding septic to sewer; additionally, there was a new policy regarding nutrient reduction and nutrient loading. He reiterated that one item that may be changed after November 2026 was the five year CIP, and that this depended on the outcome of the property tax referendum and the direction the County took at that point. He relayed that they had a kick-off in the prior week to start the LDR update process, and that one of the goals was to not have gaps in between the Comp Plan and the LDR, opining that there were a couple of targeted items that needed to be done sooner than the full LDR update. He remarked that there were many departments that they were coordinating with to ensure that while they were discussing this portion of the process, they knew who his team was and what they were doing, as well as what staff was working on based on Board initiatives and direction so that those documents could come together in a unified front at the end of the process, noting that this was where they had been making a list of items coming out of the Comp Plan that needed to go into the LDR. He commented that they

had identified three core topics that they would be bringing back sooner rather than later as they progressed with the LDR update.

Commr. Smith indicated his understanding that they were coordinating with the Cities, and opined that sometimes the State Legislature did some things that the County did not expect. He wondered if they anticipated going back to the Cities whether the Amendment 3 property tax referendum passed or not to see if anything had changed in their plans that would affect the County's plans.

Mr. Klepper confirmed this, and mentioned that Ms. Barker and Ms. Dial would also speak with their counterparts in the Cities to discuss the outcome.

Commr. Smith opined that it would be very important before the County made any decisions in the Comp Plan to see how the Cities would react. He remarked that even though Comp Plans were revised every 30 years, he would like to suggest a policy of reviewing and revising it every 10 years to see if things had changed, opining that there would not need to be an in-depth revision as was being done currently.

Mr. Klepper commented that the County was required by Florida Statute to review the Comp Plan at least once every seven years, and that they highly encouraged this as certain items were passed, such as a property tax referendum, opining that the County could hold a work session to see how it affected what they were doing.

Commr. Campione mentioned that the seven year updates had been occurring for a long time, and that this was how they ended up with some different land use designations through the years, opining that it was a good opportunity to review and fix issues that arose.

Commr. Parks opined that there should be a check or analysis that tied development decisions to the County, such as being aware of how the water supply would be affected, and that since water supply plans were currently required by the water management districts, this should be directly in the Comp Plan. He opined that there should also be an economic analysis, and that it would be helpful for the County to know what the economic strain could be to the taxpayers of Lake County over a 20 year period to help with decision making, such as maintaining the roads and 911 calls. He opined that internal rate of capture should be in the Comp Plan, and that developments should encourage a reduction in the number of trips and trip length through mixed use. He opined that Euclidian zoning was failing Lake County, and that form-based hybrid codes would be appropriate. He opined that not much of this would apply in rural areas, which was why the rural line was very important; however, he opined that it would apply where they were trying to promote the growth. He stated that the he wanted to promote targeted industries, creating an easier path for them to navigate the Comp Plan and code processes to encourage them to come to Lake County, and that he would like every incentive possible for those targeted businesses to be in Lake County.

Commr. Campione opined that there should be a dark green line around the current rural land uses, and that unless somebody who was completely innovative came in with a water and sewer concept that fit everything the County had in mind, including job creation, some of the land uses discussed should be City land uses. She opined that if a rural boundary line was there, then

all of this should be happening internal to the Cities, and that even though she did not want to give the misconception that these changes were not important, the reality was that the economic development, or the shifting of residential to more economic uses, should be happening in the municipalities while the dark green line stayed intact. She opined that if this were to happen, then the County would be able to protect those parts of Lake County that needed to stay open and rural.

Commr. Parks pointed out that there were some urban areas in the County, such as Wellness Way and the Wolf Branch Innovation District.

Commr. Campione remarked that those areas were already designated, and opined that the County could make an impact by addressing what was happening in them with good land development regulations; however, she opined that the County was not looking at expanding any areas and creating more of those urban locations.

Commr. Parks opined that there was a misconception that Counties should only be rural, which was not true, and that as close as Lake County was to the metropolis of the City of Orlando, there would be urban parts of the county.

Commr. Campione commented that those areas were already on the maps, and that the County was not asking to add more urbanized areas. She opined that because they were there, the County should have better regulations because they were currently all over the place and did not line up with the Comp Plan, noting that the County was trying to fix that and make everything consistent. She opined that regarding intergovernmental coordination, the largest issue that needed to be addressed, either through the Comp Plan or intergovernmental agreements, was connectivity to County maintained roads, and that if Cities were going to expand and annex lands on county roads, then there had to be a level of control to deny it unless it met certain standards, including contributions to enhance those roads and bring them up to the standards they needed to be. She opined that this would be one of the most important things to accomplish in this Comp Plan, along with interlocal agreements, and that this was a way to ensure that those county roads were being addressed by the Cities that wanted to expand on them. She opined that since the County could not stop a City from expanding, this could be used as leverage, and that if a City wanted to expand, then it would have to fix the road and bring it up to standard.

Commr. Smith agreed, and mentioned that something else he wanted to see in the Comp Plan was personal property rights protection for the surrounding property owners of a person who was selling land, opining that this should be considered for the Comp Plan so that people knew that the BCC was aware of the property rights of people selling land and the people around them.

Commr. Campione opined that the family density exemption for family lot splits had been abused, and that it needed to be fixed. She asked if there was any action the Board would need to take at this point to honor the request made in the letter received from Lake 100.

Commr. Morris inquired if there needed to be a motion to extend the timeline.

Ms. Barker answered that the Board needed to approve the revised timeline as present by Mr. Klepper.

Ms. Marsh relayed that staff also wanted confirmation to do a reorganized clean version of the Comp Plan instead of continuing to work off a very large document with underlined areas and strikethroughs that was difficult to read.

Commr. Parks asked how long they were extending the timeframe.

Mr. Klepper replied that it was about four to five months, and noted that they wanted to give enough flexibility for the Board.

Ms. Marsh clarified that the transmittal would be sometime between January and April 2027.

Commr. Smith stated that he would like to see the timeline say November 2026 to January 2027 for revising and finalizing the draft, opining that the County would not know anything until after November 3, 2026.

Mr. Klepper remarked that they were currently working through comments with the County Attorney's Office that would not be affected by the passing of Florida Amendment 3, and that they could be getting that information done. He stated that there would also be other things for when they got past November 2026, including coordination with the economic development stakeholders such as cleanup, addressing questions, and reorganization, opining that they needed to continue to move forward with those items; otherwise, he opined that they may not be ready by April 2027.

Commr. Smith expressed concern about the December 2026 timeline for a finalized draft, opining that there would not be enough time to finalize if things were strategically more difficult than anticipated. He questioned if it would be better to have this timeline in January 2027, and relayed his understanding that the timeline said that they would have a finalized draft by December 2026 and a transmittal in January.

Commr. Morris clarified that the timeline said January to April 2027.

Commr. Smith opined that they should have another month.

Commr. Campione wondered if this was because of Amendment 3, and asked if there was an example of something in the Comp Plan that would change as a result of Amendment 3.

Commr. Smith commented that if Amendment 3 passed, then the Cities would have to find a way to fund their operations, which he opined may completely change TDR designations or other functions, and that he just wanted to give them an extra 30 days to have something valid to bring back to the Board as a finalized draft; otherwise, he would be expecting a finalized draft at the end of December 2026.

Commr. Campione opined that this would not change the County's Comp Plan.

Mr. Klepper related that they were there at the discretion of the Board, and that they would be providing updates to staff. He opined that they would know fairly soon after November 3, 2026 whether or not any of this was realistic, and that besides the CIP, there was not much that may be changed as a result of the passing of Amendment 3. He opined that they were not going to change the densities, land use allocations, connections, safe streets for all, or those kinds of items, and that any changes would be on the capital side of the policies.

Commr. Morris commented that he did not have any issues with another month if it would make them more comfortable, and inquired what date the County would have to transmit by.

Mr. Klepper answered that it would have to be adopted by October 2027.

Ms. Dial clarified that the County had an extension currently with the State until November 2026, and that they would send them an update to extend out for another 12 months, opining that the important thing was to have this correct when it was transmitted and to be able to defend it to the State for adoption. She opined that there was time, and said that they would like to publish this in a final format on the website to the public and to the economic stakeholder group for a 30 day period to receive comments on it before it was brought forward to the Planning and Zoning meeting for the first public hearing. She opined that there were policies that needed to be in the Comp Plan for economic diversity no matter what happened in November 2026 because the County needed the diversity, and that even though the CIP may be subject to change, they wanted to include those goals, policies, and objectives for the economic resiliency that was in the plan.

Commr. Smith asked if Ms. Dial was comfortable with the December deadline.

Ms. Dial answered that the January to April 2027 transmittal hearing was flexible because this was quarter one of 2027, and opined that if they were not ready to publish a final draft in January 2027, then this item could be brought before the Board to extend it to May 2027; however, if the Board wanted to change this date to January to May 2027, then this would give them more flexibility.

On a motion by Commr. Morris, seconded by Commr. Parks and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved the revised timeline, extending the transmittal hearings to go from January to May 2027, and doing a reorganized clean version of the document.

PUBLIC HEARING: INFRASTRUCTURE SALES TAX PROJECT PLAN

Ms. Jaime Stewart, Director for the Office of Management and Budget, related that the revenue projections in the current year included $1.3 million in carryforward from Fiscal Year (FY) 2026, and noted that the totals by category per year in the five year plan included the following: public safety was $7.2 million; quality of life was $6.6 million; public works was $8.7 million; other public infrastructure was $1.1 million; and the debt service was $2.2 million for a total of $26.1 million for FY 2027 and an aggregate total of $139 million for the five year plan. She stated that the five year public safety plan included the following: $1.8 million for fire apparatus, vehicles, and equipment; $1.5 million for the Fire/Emergency Medical Service (EMS) station renovations; $1.5 million for the Lake County Sheriff's Office (LCSO) vehicles and equipment; $1.1 million for the medical transport vehicles and equipment; and other items for a total of $7.2 million for FY 2027 and an aggregate total of $45.2 million for the five year plan. She commented that the quality of life projects included the following: South Lake Regional Park for $1.8 million; Golden Triangle Regional Park for $1.5 million; East Lake Sports and Community Complex improvements for $1 million; and various other park improvements for a total of $6.6 million for FY 2027 and an aggregate total of $36.1 million for the five year plan. She relayed that the five year plan for public works projects included the following: the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) grant match; the resurfacing and road improvements;

bridge reconstruction; landfill renovations; solid waste equipment; and others for a FY 2027 total of $8.7 and an aggregate total of $41.3 million. She remarked that the other public infrastructure projects included the capital building construction and renovations for $1 million and Information Technology (IT) enhancements at $125,000 for a FY 2027 total of $1.1 million and an aggregate total of $6.6 million. She mentioned that the five year plan for debt service included the following: road resurfacing debt of $868,000; the animal shelter debt of $620,000; and the public safety radios for $1.3 million, noting that with the revenue from the municipalities for their portion, the total for FY 2027 was $2.2 million and the aggregate total was $9.8 million.

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 asked to see the quality of life chart, and then inquired if there was anything else the Board wanted to look at or discuss, such as the allocation of the funds.

Commr. Parks opined that the penny sales tax for roads was a great discussion to have until the formula changed, which would be looked at in a couple of years, and that with renewal, there could be significant changes there, noting that the County was allocating some of this for roads.

Commr. Campione recalled that when this was initially adopted, there were many public meetings and much public input, and that they received a wide variety of priorities from the public, such as roads, public safety, and quality of life projects, opining that the County had achieved this by spreading these funds across the board. She wondered if anyone wanted to review the quality of life projects and reallocate funds to transportation.

Commr. Smith indicated that he did not want to do this yet.

Commr. Morris opined that it might fix itself in November 2026.

On a motion by Commr. Parks, seconded by Commr. Sabatini and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved the Fiscal Year 2027 Infrastructure Sales Tax Project Plan.

RECESS AND REASSEMBLY

The Chairman called a recess at 10:33 a.m. for five minutes.

PUBLIC HEARING: ORDINANCE 2026-37 CEMETERIES

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 SECTIONS 3.08.00 AND 3.01.04(10), LAKE COUNTY CODE, APPENDIX E, LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS, ENTITLED CEMETERIES; PROVIDING FOR ADMINISTRATIVE REZONING OR LAND USE APPROVAL IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 267.21, FLORIDA STATUTES; 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 commented that these were changes that were required by State law.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

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

On a motion by Commr. Sabatini, seconded by Commr. Smith and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved Ordinance 2026-37 amending Sections 3.08.00 and 3.01.04(10), Lake County Code Appendix E, Land Development Regulations, entitled Cemeteries. Required by HB 425 (2026).

PUBLIC HEARING: ORDINANCE 2026-38 SITE PLANS

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

AN ORDINANCE OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF LAKE COUNTY, FLORIDA; AMENDING SECTION 14.09.01, LAKE COUNTY CODE, APPENDIX E, LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS, ENTITLED SITE PLANS; SIMPLIFYING APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS; CLARIFYING APPLICABILITY OF REQUIREMENTS FOR MAJOR AND MINOR SITE PLAN REVIEW; 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 explained that this ordinance was making minor changes so people would understand what qualified as a minor site plan versus a major site plan.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

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

On a motion by Commr. Sabatini, seconded by Commr. Parks and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved Ordinance 2026-38 amending Section 14.09.01, Lake County Code, Appendix E, Land Development Regulations, entitled Site Plans.

PUBLIC HEARING ORDINANCE 2026-39 RURAL CONSERVATION SUBDIVISION DESIGN STANDARDS

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 CHAPTER XVII, LAKE COUNTY CODE, APPENDIX E, LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS, ENTITLED RURAL CONSERVATION SUBDIVISION DESIGN STANDARDS; CLARIFYING CERTAIN PROVISIONS AND REQUIREMENTS; REFINING THE APPROVAL PROCESS; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; PROVIDING FOR INCLUSION IN THE CODE; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Ms. Marsh mentioned that this item was discussed at a previous meeting, and that the request was to bring back some language to replace density bonuses with density bonuses using TDRs, noting that the current bonuses were for open space and public space. She commented that the new language was available for review, which was in purple, and that the Board could accept this version as it was or remove density bonuses altogether.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

Ms. Katherine de Jongh, a resident of Lake County, expressed concern about TDRs, and opined that since the Comp Plan language would be encompassing TDRs, adding it in the current ordinance would be premature. She opined that TDRs would add an avenue for increased density in rural conservation areas, and that there was not an abundance of rural areas set aside. She mentioned that the BCC had the discretion to award density bonuses, and opined that even though this would profit developers and bring in more tax revenue, the taxpayers would pay the largest price for having more homes because of the additional infrastructure needed to support these

increases. She opined that even though much time had been invested in the new Comp Plan, it should be tabled, and that since residents were frustrated with traffic and increased building, there should be a compromise to balance what the residents wanted and what would come. She opined that the priority should be to Lake County and its residents, and that investors that came in did not live in Lake County.

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

Commr. Parks stated that he was in favor of the new language in purple, noting that the code for the conservation subdivision was optional. He opined that if the conservation subdivision was a requirement, which he was in favor of, then this could be taken out; however, he opined that there was less of an incentive for anybody to do a conservation subdivision. He opined that since this would not add density, as it would be moving density from one part of the county to another, it would not encourage increased density, noting that Lake County was overallocated. He opined that even though there would be some changes to the TDR codes through the Comp Plan, it was good policy for conservation at this point, and that it would limit density and move it around as opposed to adding it. He opined that there needed to be some kind of incentive, and that without it, they may not see another conservation subdivision design used.

Commr. Smith relayed his understanding that this was a change to what was already in the current code as a rural conservation subdivision, and noted that it allowed densities that he did not approve of. He opined that there should not be any density bonuses in a rural conservation area, and that the County should do something different than what was currently in the code; however, if this was the best that could be done currently, then he was okay with it.

Commr. Campione questioned what land uses rural conservation design subdivisions were allowed to occur in.

Ms. Marsh indicated her understanding that they were allowed in all land uses other than Urban, and that it was optional. She related that the existing code required a minimum of open space in rural transition areas, such as the Ferndale area, the Wekiva River Protection Area, the other Rural Protection Area (RPAs), and the Green Swamp.

Commr. Campione relayed her understanding that in each of the land uses, homes could be clustered to create their own version of a rural conservation design, noting that this could be done anyway.

Commr. Parks reiterated that to use the conservation subdivision was optional, and wondered what incentive there would be for tract home builders to do this if they could just go through straight zoning and the lack of good code.

Commr. Campione opined that the issue was incentivizing developers by giving them more lots.

Commr. Parks explained that it was debiting the tab of the total overallocation; otherwise, the County could make the conservation subdivision mandatory, which he would be in favor of. He opined that when the County changed the codes, then the language in purple could be taken out or some other TDR program could be done.

Commr. Campione commented that she would rather address it later and potentially make it mandatory in certain instances; however, during this gap, she would not want to be incentivizing adding density as a result of the conservation subdivision design. She remarked that it was used in her district, and opined that it had opened the door for a project that should never have happened. She stated that this gave her a bad feeling about the conservation subdivision design, and that she would not support adding this language. She mentioned that even though she understood what the purpose was in theory, she was not comfortable with the practice.

Commr. Smith indicated his understanding that developers could continue doing this with what was allowed in bonuses on the current day, and that the language in purple would change the density bonuses to a TDR system at a future date.

Ms. Marsh remarked that this was correct if the language in purple was approved.

Commr. Smith stated that this was why he was in favor of it, noting that adding this language would reduce the number of homes a developer could have. He relayed his understanding that this plan was already in place using old density bonuses, and that the new language would take away the old density bonuses and change them into a TDR system, which would be outside of an RPA.

Commr. Campione thought that the Board eliminated density bonuses when doing the rural conservation design.

Ms. Marsh clarified that this was in a previous draft, and that at some point with Board discussion, the density bonuses were left in, noting that since they had been working on this ordinance for many months, there were many renditions of it. She mentioned that a previous discussion with the Board indicated that the density bonuses would stay in, pending somebody adding it to a motion to remove it entirely.

Commr. Campione passed the gavel to Commissioner Parks.

Commr. Campione made a motion to remove density bonuses.

Commr. Smith seconded the motion.

Commr. Parks commented that he was supportive of the language in purple, opining that nobody would use the conservation subdivision design with 50 percent open space without density bonuses. He stated that he viewed removing the density bonuses as a step backward from what the County was trying to do with growth management.

Commr. Smith disagreed, and pointed out that there was a situation near the Town of Howey-in-the-Hills where even though the developer wanted density bonuses, when they were denied, they decided to still build with what they were allowed. He remarked that he did not like the density bonuses to begin with, and that since this was a motion to remove density bonuses completely, he was in favor of that.

Commr. Parks asked how the County would address the overallocation with the current codes, and said that there was a large number of extra residential density approved in the county.

Commr. Smith opined that one unit per acre was still one unit per acre no matter how it was designed, and that the rural conservation design standard did not change the density of the

land, as a developer still had to abide by the one unit per acre, noting that it just made it possible to cluster to homes together.

Commr. Parks pointed out that the rural conservation criteria required much more open space than straight zoning.

Commr. Smith opined that this made the area a more beautiful place to live, and that if one wanted to live in Lake County, this would be a bonus.

Commr. Parks opined that there was no incentive for that.

Commr. Campione remarked that the developer near the Town of Howey-in-the-Hills went forward with the project, opining that this design worked for them at that location. She commented that in the future, she would be in favor of creating a way to incentivize this; however, she did not want to incentivize it by adding density.

Commr. Parks indicated his understanding that there were other concessions made for the development near the Town of Howey-in-the-Hills to make up for less density.

On a motion by Commr. Campione, seconded by Commr. Smith and carried by a vote of 4-1, the Board approved to remove the language allowing density bonuses.

Commr. Parks voted no.

Commr. Parks commented that there needed to be another motion to adopt the rest of the code.

Ms. Marsh clarified that there needed to be a second motion to adopt the remaining changes in red, green, and blue.

On a motion by Commr. Sabatini, seconded by Commr. Smith and carried by a vote of 4-1, the Board approved Ordinance 2026-39 amending Chapter XVII, Lake County Code, Appendix E, Land Development Regulations ("LDR"), entitled Rural Conservation Subdivision Design Standards, with the removal of the language allowing density bonuses.

Commr. Parks voted no.

<u>FIRST PUBLIC HEARING: TEMPORARY MORATORIUM FOR DATA CENTERS</u>

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, ESTABLISHING A TEMPORARY MORATORIUM FOR THE CONSTRUCTION, OR EXPANSION OF, AND FOR THE ISSUANCE OF BUILDING PERMITS, DEVELOPMENT ORDERS, OR THE REZONING OF PROPERTY FOR DATA CENTER FACILITIES WITHIN THE UNINCORPORATED AREAS OF LAKE COUNTY; PROVIDING FOR REPEAL OF CONFLICTING PROVISIONS; 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 indicated that this was a first reading only, and that there was an errata sheet with an additional exception to the definition of data centers requested by Comcast, noting that this ordinance was based on a version that Commissioner Sabatini brought forward from Citrus County, which did not include any exceptions. She related that if this was approved on the current day, then this would come back for a second reading in September 2026.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

Mr. Rick Carlins, a resident of the City of Fruitland Park, asked how long the moratorium would be for, and said that he would also like to know more about the restrictions. He stated that he was in favor of the moratorium on data centers, and that he would like to see a permanent ban on data centers. He opined that personal information was being collected in many different ways, including cell phones, emails, and credit card information, and that all this information was being stored in data centers, which were analytical and were reasoning out predictive behavior. He opined that this was no way to live, and said that he did not want information being gathered and logged about him. He opined that this was what the license plate readers (LPRs) and Flock Safety cameras did, and that data centers were necessary for the government to monitor people. He opined that one would have to behave a certain way to avoid being harassed, and said that since he did not want to comply, speaking out against data centers was the only way he knew to resist.

Ms. Marsh commented that the terms of the ordinance would be not to exceed a 12 month moratorium, and that it would require the Board to engage in a study and evaluation period. She elaborated that there were six different items that would need to be studied and brought back, and that the Board would then determine what regulations would be imposed, if any, and how it would be handled.

Commr. Campione inquired if there was something that designated different data centers, noting that hospitals required data centers.

Commr. Sabatini explained that the ordinance defined the different kinds of data centers, and that the moratorium was against large load data centers that had to do with external data processing and storage versus a company, such as a telecom company, that had technology which could be defined as a data center that was purely internal for communicating with their own people and apparatus, opining that the ordinance did a good job with this.

Commr. Campione confirmed for the public that the ordinance excluded those types of operations that were related to any organization with a certain amount of data that they had to have access to and process.

Ms. Marsh stated that there would be four exceptions to the definitions, including the County, who had a server system, the Emergency Operations Center (EOC), and hospitals, noting that these were defined in the exception part of the ordinance.

Commr. Campione mentioned that in the following 12 months, the County would be studying whether there was something in between the exceptions and a large load data center that they needed to create criteria for, noting that the County would not know this until the 12 month period was used to study, do research, collect information, and visit locations.

Commr. Parks wondered if the County could determine that anything above the four exceptions would have to come to the BCC for a conditional use permit (CUP), opining that this would allow every concern to be weighed, such as water and energy, on a case by case basis.

Ms. Marsh commented that in between the first and second reading, she could work with the planning staff to amend the zoning matrix to add data centers as a category as a conditional use in whichever appropriate zonings it would be, and that this ordinance would have to track separately because it would have to go to the Planning and Zoning Board and then come back to

the BCC for two hearings, noting that this could be adopted first before getting the other back to the Board.

Commr. Sabatini mentioned that he was in favor of Commissioner Parks' idea; however, he opined that the Board should create the moratorium and then broaden it because it would take about six weeks to go through the Planning and Zoning Board.

Commr. Parks asked how quickly this could be done.

Ms. Marsh replied that it would not go to the Planning and Zoning Board until October 2026, and that this would require them to draft it in the following week in order to get it reviewed and advertised on time, noting that it would not come back to the BCC until November or December 2026 depending on when the meetings were.

Commr. Campione opined that if the moratorium was adopted, then it would be there and could be revisited anytime in that 12 month period if a CUP with certain criteria was decided on, and that something would be in place saying that Lake County was not ready to even consider a data center.

Mr. T. Scott Walker, a resident of Commission District 1, encouraged the Board to review and take caution, and questioned how the County could control what information the data center would gather. He expressed concerns about the Chinese media stirring up the public against data centers, and he wanted to ensure that the County did a review. He opined that a temporary moratorium would be an advantage, and that it could be discussed in the future.

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

Commr. Morris opined that there was good and bad on everything the Board made a decision on, and opined that the negative side of a moratorium would be an economic impact. He relayed his understanding that people who came to the county to do site selections for large corporations would not even consider any county that had a moratorium for anything.

Commr. Sabatini opined that this was a heavy claim, and said that he did not agree with it.

Commr. Smith indicated concern with the consumption of power and water that a data center used as well as the noise produced, and opined that there was no definition of what this moratorium would restrict. He opined that if he had a spot with three servers that did not use water and used minimal power, and if he wanted to use them for weather tracking, there would be a moratorium against it, and said that he had an issue with that because there was no definition of a data center. He opined that if it said there was a moratorium of data centers using 50,000 kilowatts or more and 500,000 gallons of water per month, then there would be specific criteria for a data center that the County was doing a moratorium on, noting that he would be in favor of it. He stated that he could not support a moratorium on a data center because of the different ideas of what a data center was, opining that a data center could be a five story building with light everywhere or two servers in a room. He commented that if they wanted to add specific noise requirements and limit power and water consumption to the ordinance, then he would consider that; however, he could not consider the ordinance the way it was written currently.

Ms. Marsh remarked that the exemptions included the following: data centers, server rooms, computer rooms, IT facilities owned or operated by a business, governmental agency, educational institution, healthcare provider, or nonprofit organization for the primary purpose of supporting the entities' internal operations, information systems, cybersecurity, communications, business applications, or data storage; facilities used primarily to host enterprise IT infrastructure, cloud services dedicated to a single organization, disaster recovery backup operations, or routine business computing; incidental or ancillary artificial intelligence (AI) applications that supported the operations of the owner or operator and were not offered as commercial AI computing services to third parties; and the errata sheet added a structure, facility, or use that shall not be deemed or classified as a data center where its primary purpose was the provision of communications or telecommunication services, such as wire line or wireless broadband, fiber optic, internet, or network connection services or the operation of emergency communications infrastructure, which would not be subject to the zoning, siting, permitting, or operational restrictions imposed by this moratorium on data centers provided that the facility was not designed, constructed, or operated for large scale computational processing, AI model training or inference, cloud computing, or commercial data storage services.

Commr. Campione opined that the weather tracking business would be fine.

Commr. Smith asked about Section 4.1 regarding the definition of a data center.

Ms. Marsh stated that the basic definition there included data center facilities and utilities that would be a building, a dedicated space within a building or a group of buildings housing computer systems and associated components, such as telecommunication and data processing systems to be used for remote storage processing or distribution of large amounts of data, including computational intensive application, such as cryptocurrency mining, AI computing, weather modeling, genome sequencing, application hosting, cloud storage, video and technical streaming services, etc. She commented that such facilities may include air handlers, power generators, water cooling and storage facilities, utility substations, and other infrastructure to support operations.

Commr. Campione mentioned that Section 4.2 said that "notwithstanding the foregoing, the following shall be exempt," noting that if a business met one of those exemptions, then it could probably do it, including weather modeling.

Commr. Smith indicated his understanding that the data center issue came up because of the environmental impact, including the power and water, and that none of that was mentioned in the ordinance as a cap or a starting point.

Commr. Sabatini opined that these carve-outs were very intelligently discussed, noting that every stakeholder came forward, which included lobbyists and companies, such as Comcast, and that nobody had any issues with any of the infrastructure currently in existence because they were not for third parties or storage units for large emerging parts of the economy. He opined that the County did not need to invoke those specific terms to have an ordinance that dealt with terms, and that even though it was not modeled on that definition, it completely protected the things mentioned by casting a broad net and then carving out those sections that focused on types of

computing that no one had any issues with. He opined that it was the best ordinance in the state, as it was very streamlined and thoughtful, noting that he had looked at several others.

Commr. Campione opined that the things the residents of Lake County were concerned about included vibrations, a strain on the water resources, lights, noise, and the large draw out of the electrical grid; however, figuring out what the maximum acceptable limit would be, what would be allowed, and what could be included as conditions addressing water was what the 12 month moratorium was for.

Commr. Morris questioned who would determine those things.

Commr. Sabatini relayed his understanding that the County Attorney's Office would do this.

Commr. Smith indicated his understanding that the State already had criteria of what was considered high usage, and that the County could use that criteria in this ordinance; however, since it was not included, he would not approve it. He inquired if using 75,000 gallons of water was high usage.

Commr. Campione commented that whatever was in the State Statute was turned over to the water management districts.

Commr. Sabatini opined that it was very relative, and that golf courses and other types of uses were much higher than many people thought. He mentioned that this would be a starting point and would pause any development, and that those ideas could be incorporated into the permanent ordinance.

Commr. Morris asked if an AI data center would have to come before the Board for approval if they applied for a permit on the current day to build in Lake County.

Ms. Marsh answered that they probably would not if they wanted to build in an industrial zoning district because it would be a straight zoning.

Commr. Parks opined that this was a great ordinance for a moratorium, noting that it had the four exceptions. He opined that within two months the County could create a conditional use requirement for anything not in the exceptions, and that there would be some flexibility with it evolving. He mentioned that he was planning to visit some data centers in October 2026 and explore the subject more, and opined that if there was a CUP ordinance, then the County could adjust at that point without having to go back and change codes. He opined that since there would be more information, this might influence each particular case, and that this could result in more protections.

Commr. Sabatini inquired if Commissioner Parks supported a moratorium until this idea could be written into a document.

Commr. Parks stated that he wanted to be careful about a moratorium, and that moratoriums had been discussed in the past, opining that there was a negative business connotation with it. He opined that the County should just move forward with a conditional use ordinance within a couple of months.

Commr. Sabatini pointed out that this ordinance would provide a moratorium on data centers on the current day, and opined that proposing a new ordinance several months from the

current day was a completely separate subject. He opined that there had been several interesting ideas from the Board that could be incorporated into a permanent ordinance that would come after the temporary moratorium; however, he opined that the Board should not pause passing the temporary moratorium to protect Lake County on the current day because of ideas about what an ordinance should look like months in the future.

Commr. Campione opined that if the Board did not move forward with the moratorium, then the County could receive an application for a data center in an industrial zoning, and that if the Board voted to wait to get a CUP in place, then there would be a gap.

Commr. Parks suggested doing a two month moratorium.

Commr. Sabatini opined that if this was what it would take to pass the moratorium, then he would be in favor of it even though he wanted a 12 month moratorium.

Commr. Parks commented that he was more in favor of the CUP because it would give the County more protection, opining that it would not take long to do that.

Commr. Smith questioned why the Board would be concerned about a data center that went into an industrial park if they would be using no more water and electricity than others, which he opined was the reason this was an issue.

Commr. Campione opined that a data center would use more water and electricity.

Commr. Smith relayed his understanding they would not be able to do this in an industrial park unless it was a three phase industrial park, such as the Christopher C. Ford Commerce Park; however, he opined that the industrial park off CR 561 would not be able to house a large data center with a large consumption in the City of Tavares. He reiterated his concern that there was no definition of a data center, opining that everyone there had a different idea of what it meant.

Commr. Sabatini opined that of all the moratoriums in the State of Florida that were currently in place, some of which included actual bans, this had the most articulately crafted set of definitions, bifurcations, exceptions, and carve-outs in the whole state because staff looked at all of them and incorporated every element to make a reasonable ordinance that was not over-broad.

Commr. Campione opined that if a data center came in under the State threshold, then the residents of Lake County would be very upset that the BCC did not have a moratorium in place, and that if all that could be passed on the current day was two months, then this would be the responsible thing to do. She said that between now and then, she would come up with a definition of a data center, and asked that the Board would agree to two months to get some protection in place.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

Ms. Janet Erne, a resident of Orange County, commented that she came on behalf of friends and family in Lake County to address the topic of the data center moratorium. She opined that there was much that was still unknown about the effects of these giant installations, and that what they were learning was not very good. She opined that even though they were told that these large installations would benefit the economy while adding jobs, this was only true on a temporary basis, and that this temporary benefit would be far outweighed by negative impacts, including water

resources and a potential loss of jobs brought on by AI. She expressed appreciation to the Board for supporting a moratorium, and stated that she would like to see a ban in the future.

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

On a motion by Commr. Sabatini, seconded by Commr. Campione which failed by a vote of 2-3, the Board did not approve an ordinance establishing a 12 month moratorium on the construction or expansion of, and on the issuance of building permits, development permits, development orders, or the rezoning of property for data center facilities within the unincorporated areas of Lake County.

Commr. Parks, Commr. Smith, and Commr. Morris voted no.

Commr. Sabatini made a motion to approve a 60 day moratorium.

Ms. Marsh asked that the moratorium be until the end of December 2026 because 60 days would not be enough time to take the ordinance to the Planning and Zoning Board and then bring it back to the BCC.

Commr. Sabatini amended the motion to approve this ordinance for a moratorium to January 1, 2027.

Commr. Campione seconded the motion.

Ms. Kristy Mullane inquired if this was for item one only.

Ms. Marsh clarified that item two was to have the second public hearing of the proposed ordinance at 9:00 a.m. rather than at 5:05 p.m.; however, this could be done as a separate motion.

Commr. Morris inquired if it would take the same amount of time to write a conditional use requirement on this subject.

Commr. Parks indicated his understanding that the conditional use ordinance could be done in October 2026.

Ms. Marsh explained that she could take something to the Planning and Zoning Board in October 2026, and that it would come to the BCC in November or December 2026, depending on when the BCC meetings were.

Commr. Parks opined that there could be the four exceptions, and that everything else could be in the conditional use. He opined that if the County had a moratorium for a long period of time, there could be an effect in the business world.

Commr. Campione opined that this had traditionally applied to building moratoriums, such as a blanket moratorium; however, many jurisdictions were doing moratoriums while they obtained more information and figured out the parameters. She opined that having a moratorium for a data center would not keep the County from being able to recruit other businesses to Lake County.

Commr. Parks opined that the CUP would be stricter in many ways and would be better because the County could obtain more information on data centers as they came before the Board.

Commr. Sabatini opined that the ordinance would not come into effect until three or four months from the current day, and said that he looked forward to having that discussion; however, he was in favor of a moratorium that could be put into law on the current day.

Commr. Parks opined that if the Board approved a moratorium for 90 days, then it could come back by the end of the year, and that a CUP ordinance could be done.

Commr. Sabatini amended the motion to 90 days.

Commr. Campione seconded the amended motion. She opined that if the gap was left open, then it was opening the county up to something that could be potentially catastrophic, and that people would be very unhappy about it.

Commr. Smith stated that he would not support 90 days, opining that if one applied for a permit on the current day, it could take longer than 90 days to get through the process. He commented that he liked the idea of the CUP because it would make everything come before the Board, and that if the Board wanted to place a pause on building data centers until the CUP had been satisfied, then he would be okay with that; however, he was not in favor of a moratorium. He stated that he would like to see no additional building permits for data centers until the CUP process was done.

Commr. Sabatini relayed his understanding that this was in the ordinance.

Commr. Campione opined that if an application was put in the following week, then there would be a Bert J. Harris, Jr., Private Property Rights Protection Act situation, and that this was what the County wanted to avoid, noting that one had a right to get through the process as soon as the application was submitted.

Commr. Smith opined that there was still no definition for a data center in the ordinance.

Commr. Parks opined that the ordinance could be referred to as a pause.

Commr. Sabatini remarked that he was fine changing the word if that was what it would take to get a pause put in place.

Commr. Campione asked if there was a way to phrase it to where they would not accept applications.

Commr. Smith opined that it could say that the County would not accept any applications for building computer systems until the CUP process had been done.

Commr. Sabatini amended the motion to pass this ordinance replacing the word "moratorium" with "pause" throughout it for the second reading to last for 90 days.

Commr. Campione wondered about the terminology because of a statutory requirement for moratoriums.

Ms. Marsh indicated her understanding that there was not a statutory requirement to use the word "moratorium," and that she could find something that worked with the development orders and find another term.

Commr. Sabatini amended the motion to include terminology similar in nature to the word "moratorium" to incorporate for 90 days upon second reading.

Commr. Campione seconded the motion. She relayed her understanding that when the ordinance came back for the second reading, it would have the language the Board would use.

Commr. Parks indicated his understanding that the 90 days was built into it from the current day.

Commr. Sabatini clarified that it would be 90 days from the passage, which would be after the second reading.

Ms. Marsh commented that it would come back September 8, 2026.

Commr. Sabatini stated that 90 days would be December 8, 2026.

On a motion by Commr. Sabatini, seconded by Commr. Campione and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved an ordinance establishing a temporary moratorium on the construction or expansion of, and on the issuance of building permits, development permits, development orders, or the rezoning of property for data center facilities within the unincorporated areas of Lake County, with the change in language from one year to 90 days and the removal of the word "moratorium."

Ms. Marsh remarked that there was one more part of the agenda item, and that the second reading under Florida Statute had to be at 5:05 p.m. unless that requirement was waived to be at 9:00 a.m. or soon thereafter on September 8, 2026.

Commr. Sabatini questioned why that was required.

Ms. Marsh answered that where the conditional, permitted, or prohibited uses were being changed, the statute required it.

Commr. Sabatini made a motion to waive the requirement.

Commr. Parks seconded the motion.

Commr. Campione commented that she was more inclined to do it at 5:05 p.m. because it would be more accessible to the public as an issue of great public concern.

Ms. Barker mentioned that on September 8, 2026, there would be a 5:05 p.m. budget public hearing, and that the Board would be there anyway, noting that they could add it to the agenda.

Commr. Sabatini withdrew the motion.

Commr. Parks withdrew the second.

REGULAR AGENDA

LAKE COUNTY SPORTS AND EXPO CENTER

Commr. Smith recalled that he, Ms. Barker and Ms. Marsh had a meeting with the group proposing a public-private partnership (P3) regarding the fairgrounds.

Ms. Barker recalled that there had been approval from the Board to move forward into a P3 with American Event Management (AEM), and that Mr. Corey Warner, President for AEM, had since brought in partners, which was the Nicholas family of companies, to take over the financial assurance and the oversight of the project. She indicated that since a new company had come to the table, staff was seeking Board approval, or not, to move forward with a new P3 agreement proposal submitted to them in the previous week by the Nicholas family of companies to not only design and build the event center at the new fairgrounds site, but also to manage, operate and maintain the facility after it opened. She said that the Nicholas family of companies had three main entities that would likely enter into this structure at some point, which included the following: Nicholas and Associates, which would do construction management and the design/build; Wingspan Development Group, who did mixed-use, sports and recreation, and multifamily projects; and the Spectate Group, which operated arenas and recreation centers nationwide. She

relayed the following information about the Nicholas Family of Companies: the company was founded in 1978; completed $3 billion in public entity construction in the past 15 years; had $350 million in annual in-place construction for public entities; constructed more than 75 athletic projects; had $400 million in aggregate bond capacity; 90 percent of work was completed under the construction manager delivery model; and to date, there were no claims or litigation. She also said that the Nicholas and Associates proposal for the design and build of the events center included the following: a 128,000 gross square foot event center; a $10 million maximum County contribution; the Nicholas Company would staff, operate and maintain the facility; the net profit distribution would be 60 percent to Nicholas and 40 percent to the County; two months would be reserved annually for the County Fair and the Renaissance Faire; the County would provide a ground lease to Nicholas with a term of the construction period plus 29 years; the County would retain the fee title throughout; and the leasehold improvements would transfer to the County at the expiration of the lease.

Commr. Smith displayed some concepts that were brought forward, and said that one included a 20 court indoor volleyball area, opining that volleyball was a large sport. He showed an indoor rodeo area within the same space, noting that it had been reviewed by the Professional Rodeo Cowboys Association and that the size met their criteria. He also commented that there was a trade show/expo center, and that the building would be multi-use and be able to split and do multiple shows within the same weekend. He opined that the Nicholas group seemed very committed and professional, and that they were putting a substantial amount of their own funding into it. He requested that the Board move forward with at least having staff work on the P3 to come back to the Board for approval.

Commr. Morris made a motion to approve this.

Commr. Smith seconded the motion.

Commr. Parks relayed his understanding that they would come back and review the actual P3 agreement, and he asked if the capital outlay up to $10 million was all at once.

Ms. Barker replied that it would be on a drawdown basis during the construction process, and that $10 million would be the County's maximum contribution; furthermore, this was already earmarked.

Ms. Marsh clarified that this was just the beginning step of the P3 process, and that the County had to start over since it was a different company and proposal, noting that there would be two public hearings and some advertising requirements prior to the Board approving a final agreement.

Commr. Campione inquired if it would not have to go back to the process where they let other vendors apply.

Ms. Marsh explained that the statute had two processes, and that they had to have two public hearings and had the option of putting it out to bid to see if anyone else was interested, or they could publish it in the Florida Register. She said that because of the timeframe with the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services (FDACS) grant, the County was opting

more for doing two public hearings and publishing it in the Florida Register; however, if the Board preferred, they could put it out to bid and go through that process in lieu of the publication.

Commr. Campione asked if they were doing this a year prior, recalling that nothing had happened.

Commr. Smith responded that they did not have the Nicholas group, and that they had AEM. He elaborated that the County had moved more toward the Nicholas group a few months prior, and that the Nicholas group was also doing Lake-Sumter State College (LSSC). He indicated that there had been a pause on this item because the County did not have this kind of group to begin with, and that they did not move forward with the P3 agreement until they were sure that the citizens of Lake County were protected from anything that may go wrong.

Commr. Campione expressed opposition to this, opining that it was a major financial decision and that it was being rushed. She opined that the Nicholas group was looking at this as a way to make much funding because they would turn over all of these improvements to the County 30 years in the future. She opined that the County had to put this out to others and see if there was someone else who wanted to do it, and said that she did not want to lose the grant in the meantime. She was unsure why the County would not try to move forward with a site plan, get utilities in place, and review what other options they had. She recalled that the Board had discussed an arena, opining that it made much sense and that they could still do this without losing time; furthermore, they would keep the grant funding and have something in hand if all of this fell through.

Commr. Sabatini said that he was against the current item, and that he would like more applicants. He opined that he was fine if they needed to take more steps to create a vision which would entice other applicants to apply, though he would not feel comfortable moving forward with this item until they had a broader reach.

Commr. Campione questioned why they did not move ahead in such a way to have something in hand, and opined that if this had been done a year prior, they could potentially have utilities to that site, a site plan, and an arena with grant funding they already had. She opined that this could start generating funding immediately, and that there was no reason why they would not still be able to do something like this in the long run.

Commr. Smith did not think that this was rushed, opining that there was much time spent onsite and reviewing different concept plans, including talking to the City of Tavares about getting their partnership to bring the infrastructure there. He clarified that the current item was just to move forward to have someone review the P3 agreement, and that the agreement could be changed. He then asked if they could do both items simultaneously, and said that he was fine with taking it out to bid because he did not think anyone else would apply. He also opined that they would not lose any grant funding, relaying his understanding that there may be a plan with the City of Tavares with the utilities and the grant funding. He inquired about the criteria for the grant funding.

Ms. Barker replied that the County extended the grant for an additional year until the end of June 2027, and that they had to expend the funding by that time.

Commr. Campione opined that they could draw up a plan, and still leave a large arena on the footprint and have a facility which could be used as an outdoor place for barrel racing and rodeos. She opined that the arena could be an expensive facility.

Commr. Smith recalled that there was concept plan from a group that come in three years prior, and that phase one was $110 million for a 55,000 square foot building and infrastructure. He reiterated that much work had been put into this by staff and himself.

Commr. Campione asked what happened from the previous year to the current time with the company that was supposed to be able to do these things.

Commr. Smith responded that the financials did not meet the criteria.

Commr. Sabatini inquired how this shifted from the original entity to this organization, and how Commissioner Smith would describe the relationship between the original applicant and the new organization.

Commr. Smith believed that the original applicant had the management experience but could not come up with the amount of the bond and financial items that were required, and that the Nicholas group came in and asked for a step in so that if anything happened to the original applicant, they would step in. He said that he was unsure if the Nicholas group would use their group, noting that he had not seen the P3 agreement yet.

Commr. Sabatini opined that it was too large of a decision to make at the current time, and that the better idea was to allow more applicants to show proposals in a formal way.

Commr. Campione reiterated that she did not want to lose the grant funding, opining that they could get utilities to the site and do a design. She remarked that if the County ended up with nothing else than the fairgrounds property, they could have an arena with many uses and which could be a revenue producer. She indicated that she felt slightly deceived from what had been represented a year prior, and she opined that this was slightly too roughshod.

Commr. Smith opined that this was because Commissioner Campione had not seen the details, and that the issue with putting a building there was that it may affect the design for the ultimate project. He expressed support for letting staff work on the P3, noting that since he had not seen it yet, he may not like it; furthermore, it would have to go through two public meetings, and if the Board wanted to use the funding for infrastructure and putting a building there, they could ensure that it would not be in the way of the future plan. He also clarified that there was no intention of deception on his part to the Board or the citizens, opining that he had been upfront. He said that the Board could not talk to each other in private, and that he would like to move forward with the P3 and see what they could get.

Commr. Parks indicated his understanding that these concerns could be addressed, and that the current item was an update with some direction.

Ms. Barker confirmed that they were looking for direction regarding if the Board would like to pursue a new P3 process with Nicholas and Associates.

Commr. Campione added that this was the Florida Registry version rather than going out to bid.

Commr. Parks asked if the County could get more information on the proposal, and at the same time move forward with what the Chairman had said about using the grant funding.

Ms. Barker relayed her understanding that Commissioner Parks was looking for staff to pursue the P3 agreement concurrently with pursuing a request for proposal (RFP) for design services.

Commr. Parks opined that if they had a parallel track and staff was able to bring this back to the Board, then they may be able to make more of an informed decision. He opined that the Nicholas group was good, and said that he respected the question of whether this should be rebid; however, since time was of the essence, he questioned if they could also look at the current item.

Commr. Campione opined that if three Commissioners were comfortable with going down this road, they could potentially tie up the contract and spend the grant funding by June 2027.

Commr. Morris asked if the City of Tavares would have the infrastructure.

Commr. Campione replied that the County had to fund it, and opined that this was supposed to happen one year prior.

Commr. Smith mentioned that much sitework had to be done regardless of what they did. He also indicated that the Board had previously given him the ability to go through this process one year prior.

Commr. Campione opined that this was not what had happened.

Commr. Smith indicated that he was fine with addressing these items in parallel.

Commr. Campione said that someone who did site design could look at whether there was a way to locate an arena in such a way to also have a livestock pavilion. She opined that if this was the future fairgrounds and they had a large expo building, they would not be able to have livestock sales inside the building when the fair was occurring. She opined that it could make sense to have an outdoor arena, and that it could be designed with a phase one and phase two. She opined that having a rodeo inside the building meant that whenever there was a rodeo, it would not be anything else, and that they could be limiting themselves with the only place for the livestock pavilion being inside that building.

Commr. Smith mentioned that they needed recreational vehicle (RV) parking for people who came in for rodeos.

Commr. Campione relayed her understanding that they could have places for them to connect, or ones where they did not connect, and that someone laying it out could do it in such a way that it could function in multiple ways depending on whether the fair was operating. She was unsure if they needed a large under-air building to have a nice place for once per month barrel racing events, and opined that there was possibly room for a win-win; however, they did not want to lose the grant funding.

Commr. Smith did not think that they would lose the grant funding, and he said that the concept included RV parking with connections, along with a parking lot. He also believed that there were possibly some outside buildings, and opined that they could do what was best for the county if they began these processes simultaneously.

Commr. Campione relayed that she had seen multi-use facilities, and opined that it was a large production to make that change. She opined that the group would do what made them the most funding, and that much thought needed to go into what made the most sense for Lake County and residents.

Ms. Marsh said that staff could put it out to bid, and that the other part of this agenda item was seeking permission to retain Mr. Scott Cole, with GrayRobinson, noting that Mr. Cole had much experience with P3 agreements and that it would be more efficient for him to help the County review this and work on the contracts which needed to be turned around quickly.

Commr. Smith relayed his understanding that they could do a P3 agreement and send it out to bid.

Ms. Marsh confirmed this, adding that the bidding process was built into the P3 process.

Commr. Campione summarized that they were discussing utilizing the consultant attorney with expertise in P3s and going out to bid.

Ms. Barker added that it would also be to move forward with an RFP for design services that would be focusing on a site plan, including an event center and an open-air arena at a minimum.

Commr. Morris agreed to this.

Commr. Smith seconded this.

On a motion by Commr. Morris, seconded by Commr. Smith and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved the following: moving forward with working on a P3 agreement, sending it out to bid rather than placing it with a registry; securing the services of Mr. Cole to assist with the P3 agreement; and putting out an RFP for design services for the site plan for an open-air arena, as well as an event center, as a parallel track.

INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT WITH CITRUS COUNTY

Ms. Marsh explained that LifeStream Behavioral Center had existing bonds for facilities in Citrus and Lake Counties, and that they wanted to refinance those bonds and do some additional improvements in both counties. She added that rather than having two bonds issued in two different counties, they were requesting Lake County to sign an interlocal agreement with Citrus County which would allow Citrus County to issue those bonds on behalf of both Counties.

Commr. Campione mentioned that Lake County residents would receive the benefit.

Ms. Marsh confirmed that this was correct for the facilities there.

On a motion by Commr. Sabatini, seconded by Commr. Morris and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved the following items: adoption and execution of Resolution 2026-96 approving the execution of an Interlocal with Citrus County in connection with the issuance by Citrus County of its Industrial Development Revenue and Refunding Bond (Lifestream Behavioral Center, Inc. Project), Series 2026, to finance certain behavioral health treatment facilities and approving the issuance by Citrus County; and an Interlocal Agreement with Citrus County.

ADVERTISE ORDINANCE REGARDING ADMINISTRATIVE FEES

Mr. Mike Fitzgerald, Director for the Office of Planning and Zoning, said that this item was a request to advertise an ordinance, entitled Administrative Fees, amending Section 22-17, Lake County Code, to address the administrative fees related to the processing and collection of impact fees. He stated that it would remove the current hardcoded fee out of the code and move it into the fee schedule which would be adopted with the budget, and that it also included a cap of five percent of the total impact fees collected.

Ms. Marsh added that if this was approved for advertising, it would come back in September 2026 for adoption.

On a motion by Commr. Smith, seconded by Commr. Parks and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the Board approved to advertise an Ordinance repealing and replacing Chapter 22, Article I, Section 22-17, entitled Administrative Fees.

REPORTS

COUNTY MANAGER

OFFICE CLOSURE FOR LABOR DAY

Ms. Barker remarked that County offices would be closed on September 7, 2026 in observance of Labor Day.

COMMISSIONERS REPORTS

COMMISSIONER SABATINI – DISTRICT 1

FLORIDA ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES TECHNOLOGY CONFERENCE

Commr. Sabatini mentioned that in the following month, he and Commissioner Parks would attend the Florida Association of Counties (FAC) Technology Conference, and encouraged everyone to come, opining that there would be a lively conversation about AI.

BICYCLE

Commr. Sabatini relayed that he felt inspired to buy a road bike as a result of a prior trail discussion.

COMMISSIONER PARKS – VICE CHAIRMAN AND DISTRICT 2

ISLAMIC CENTER OF CLERMONT

Commr. Parks commented that the Islamic Center of Clermont was scheduled to be on the Planning and Zoning agenda for the September 1, 2026 BCC meeting, and that since there were many concerns, such as traffic, he had met with the applicant and they had withdrawn the application.

COMMISSIONER SMITH – DISTRICT 3

MEETING WITH THE CITY OF TAVARES

Commr. Smith stated that he attended a meeting with the City of Tavares for economic development, which included the trail between the Cities of Tavares and Mount Dora, opining that it would be phenomenal.

DISCOVERY GARDENS

Commr. Smith related that he visited the Discovery Gardens and learned about the master gardening program, and encouraged those who did not know about it to go the Lake County Agricultural Center and look up the Discovery Gardens, opining that they had done a great job

there. He mentioned that they had a master gardening program that taught residents to garden, and opined that it was fantastic what the University of Florida Institute of Food and Agricultural Services (UF/IFAS) and Lake County were doing to help with native Florida plants and teaching people about fertilizers and water.

COMMISSIONER MORRIS – DISTRICT 5

PRIMARY ELECTIONS

Commr. Morris expressed congratulations to Commissioner Campione and Commissioner Parks for winning their primary elections.

COMMISSIONER CAMPIONE – CHAIRMAN AND DISTRICT 4

HAINES CREEK ROAD BRIDGE

Commr. Campione mentioned that work on the Haines Creek Road Bridge had begun, and asked for an update. She commented that staff had been working with multiple agencies to ensure that this was as efficient as possible, as it was only one lane and would be affected for 45 days; furthermore, she had been asked if the work could be done only at night.

Mr. Mike Olka, Engineering and Operations Director for the Public Works Department, remarked that construction had started, and that a temporary barrier had been put up to safeguard the public from the deck replacement, which was part of the short-term replacement. He mentioned that the reason the work could not be done just at night was because they were working 24 hours to condense the construction schedule, noting that this was to get the project done faster. He related that there would be a shift once they finished one side of the bridge, as they were currently working on the north side and addressing the three areas identified by the FDOT as areas of concern, including a deck hole, and that the barriers would be shifted as the contractor moved to the south side. He commented that there would be manual flagging operations to adjust the signal, and that they were replacing and shifting that temporary concrete barrier to shield everybody from the drop-off.

Commr. Campione inquired if there were signs at a location where a driver could decide to go a different route, and noted that the lake was there, requiring motorists to go through the City of Eustis.

Mr. Olka opined that detour signage would be have to be placed at the intersections of CR 44 and U.S. Highway 19 and CR 44 and Radio Road.

Commr. Campione opined that it would be beneficial for those who were not from the area or had not seen it on social media, and that it would give them a chance to decide what they wanted to do. She mentioned that she had heard from someone who was delayed 45 minutes by the traffic.

Mr. Olka commented that with the lane shift, they had to do a complete shutdown to put the barrier in, and opined that once the barrier was in place, it would go more smoothly. He stated that they got the signals in place and reduced the delay down to just a few minutes; however, they could install temporary detour routes to alert people.

Commr. Campione indicated appreciation, and opined that this would be a good thing to do.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to be brought to the attention of the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 12:31 p.m.

_____
LESLIE CAMPIONE, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:

_____
GARY J COONEY, CLERK