AGENDA MINUTES
CITY COMMISSION MEETING
CITY HALL, 501 W MEADOW STREET
MONDAY, JUNE 12, 2023 5:30 PM

1. CALL TO ORDER

The City of Leesburg Commission held a regular meeting on Monday, June 12, 2023, at Leesburg City Hall. Mayor Burry called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. with the following members present:

Commissioner Allyson Berry
Commissioner Jay Connell
Commissioner Mike Pederson
Commissioner Alan Reisman
Mayor Jimmy Burry

Also present were City Manager (CM) Al Minner, City Clerk (CC) J. Andi Purvis, City Attorney (CA) Grant Watson, the news media, and others.

INVOCATION

Mayor Burry gave the invocation followed by the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

2. PROCLAMATIONS:

A. Arlette R. Dent - Leesburg Public Library Career Online Education Graduate

Mayor Burry read a proclamation recognizing Arlette R. Dent for her accomplishment of graduating from the Leesburg Public Library Career Online Education Program.

B. Pride Month

Mayor Burry read a proclamation proclaiming June as Pride month. He encouraged residents to recognize the contributions made by the members of the LBGTQIA+ community and to promote the principles of equality, liberty, and justice in our city.

3. PRESENTATIONS:

A. **<u>Employee Service Award Recognitions:</u>**

Five Years: Ike Arriaga, Police; and Jamie Davis, Human Resources
Ten Years: Te'Rella Coleman, Recreation
Twenty Years: Taraja McBride, Electric; and Charles Padgett, Electric
Twenty-Five Years: Ryan Sapp, Fire
Thirty Years: Cheryl Raiford, Procurement

HRD Arriaga and **CM Minner** acknowledged each employee for their years of service and dedication to the city.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS:
This section is reserved for members of the public to bring up matters of concern or opportunities for praise. Issues brought up will not be discussed in detail at this meeting. Issues will either be referred to the proper staff or will be scheduled for consideration at a future City Commission Meeting. Comments are limited to three minutes.

Deirdre Griffin, 10534 Holloway Drive, Leesburg, said she has been trying to interpret the Live Local Act. She questioned the interpretation of it and asked if there would still be hearings through the Live Local Act or would it be passed through? Specifically, multi-family or rentals, will there be any legal applications that would go out for publication. **CA Watson** responded right now, that is unclear. The law came as a surprise in many ways and there will be a lot of looking into it to understand the process. The vague process they were given, which is in the statute, says it is an administrative approval process. There are no teeth in terms of what that process might mean. It states applications would not be required to go through the city commission for any type of final approval. They would only go through an administrative approval process. What that means is still unclear. It could vary from place to place in terms of procedures. Right now, it is possible for applications that qualify as affordable housing under the Live Local Act to proceed through without any kind of formal city commission hearing. Certainly, without a city commission hearing, they could not have ultimate authority in terms of approving or denying a particular application that meets the standards required for the applications. **Ms. Griffin** then asked if safety concerns override that? If there are existing safety concerns in a particular type of development, would that override what would be considered a conflict? **CA Watson** answered not necessarily. It is tricky because if the state preempts an area, then there is not much a local government can do to regulate that particular area. It is still a bit unclear exactly what the full effect of that will be and how it might be changed or modified depends on the questions that come out. There have been a number of seminars ongoing. The League of Cities is looking into the issue. They are trying to get some planners involved to help better understand and grasp what is going on. It is something that will hit the books and it will be effective July 1st. We will have to wait and see how things go. Right now, it is a wait and see. The general framework does not have much in it. It is very vague and ambiguous. It leaves a lot of questions. **Ms. Griffin** wanted to know if there are any applications currently on hold in anticipation of the Live Local Act. **CA Watson** replied none that he was not aware of.

Gary Custer, 8909 East Treasure Island Avenue, provided a city ordinance for all commission members. He stated he had presented it before. He asked for more clarification and if it was still valid and utilized? **CA Watson** responded that it is an ordinance that appears to be valid. **Mr. Custer** inquired if the ISBA overrides that because it allows the city to do a lot of other things other than what that ordinance says. **CA Watson** stated there are two ISBA's with Leesburg and in ways it facilitates the joint growth or issues between the city and the county. The ISBA provides the framework for annexing properties into the city. The city also has a comprehensive plan and the various things in the books that are evaluated in the context of that application. **Mr. Custer** said the infrastructure should come before annexing properties. The city is creating a problem by annexing and creating more traffic. Specifically, their complaint was about CR-44. **CA Watson** replied that annexation by itself does not create traffic. Annexation just brings property from one jurisdiction to another. **Mr. Custer** added that if they develop that piece of property, it will create more traffic. **CA Watson** stated once a development is approved it will. However, the county also has development approval procedures that someone could apply for. Annexation by itself does not change anything other than the jurisdiction that governs the property. The development approvals would be evaluated within the municipality under the city's code as opposed to the county codes and land development regulations. If the city allows one type of use on the property, then obviously, that would be a difference for the county. If someone has not applied for something in the county, it is hard to say what the county would approve. **Mr. Custer** mentioned that he was told that the roads are not the city's problem, it is the county's problem. **CA Watson** pointed out the issue on the roads in that area are county roads and there is a jurisdictional issue where the city does not have authority to do anything in terms of regulating or governing county roads. **Mr. Custer** asked if it would make more sense to be cooperative with the county so they can create the property infrastructure? **CA Watson** answered that is why we have ISBA's. The joint agreements between the city and the county involve other types of service arrangements where the county and the city work together on those issues when properties are brought in through the ISBA. **Mr. Custer** remarked that it was not working because they were picking different areas. If somebody comes in to be annexed into the city, they are sporadic and nothing is continuous. **CA Watson** pointed out that there are two different annexation chapters. One of them is pursuant to a joint agreement between the municipalities and the city and the standards and the procedures are slightly different from one to the other. **Mr. Custer** said the ordinance he provided should be considered every time they approve a development or annexation.

5. CONSENT AGENDA:
Routine items are placed on the Consent Agenda to expedite the meeting. If the Commission/Staff wish to discuss any item, the procedure is as follows: (1) pull the item(s) from the Consent Agenda; (2) vote on remaining items with one roll call vote, (3) discuss each pulled item and vote by roll call

Items pulled for discussion:

5.B.3 - Authorization of a contract with Brightview Landscape Services, Inc. for landscape maintenance services
5.C.2 - Approving the West Leesburg Community Development Corporation (WLCDC), American Recovery Grant Award

Commissioner Pederson moved to adopt the Consent Agenda except for 5.B.3 and 5.C.2, and Commissioner Reisman seconded the motion.

The roll call vote was:

Commissioner Connell	Yes
Commissioner Reisman	Yes
Commissioner Pederson	Yes
Commissioner Berry	Yes
Mayor Burry	Yes

Five yeas, no nays, the Commission adopted the Consent Agenda, as follows:

(Each item has its coordinated resolution number listed below the header)

A. CITY COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES:

1. Regular meeting held May 22, 2023

B. PURCHASING ITEMS:

1. Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute a Construction Services Fixed Unit Price Agreement with The Fishel Company for underground utility construction services; and providing an effective date.

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 11,331

2. Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute a Piggyback Agreement with Evoqua Water Technologies, LLC. for corrosion and odor control services; and providing an effective date.

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 11,332

3. Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute a contract amendment with Brightview Landscape Services, Inc. for landscape maintenance services; and providing an effective date.

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 11,341

Commissioner Reisman introduced the resolution to be read by title only. CC Purvis read the resolution by title only.

Commissioner Reisman made a motion to adopt the resolution and Commissioner Pederson seconded the motion.

Mayor Burry requested comments from the Commission and the audience.

Commissioner Pederson commented he only pulled this item to lay the groundwork for the salary adjustments. We are engaging this company to help with landscape maintenance and they are charging $26.15 an hour when the city's position right now pays half that. Hopefully, tonight they will approve the starting salary of $15 per hour. They may still have to do some of the work on overtime. He previously spoke with the city manager and, hopefully, this is a short-term fix while we work on the salaries, which will in turn help us get proper staff. He wanted to bring that to the public's attention and lay the groundwork for his support of salary increases.

The roll call vote was:

Commissioner Reisman	Yes
Commissioner Pederson	Yes
Commissioner Burry	Yes
Commissioner Connell	Yes
Mayor Burry	Yes

Five yeas, no nays, the Commission adopted the resolution.

C. RESOLUTIONS:

1. **Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute a Gas Service Agreement between the City of Leesburg and Troon Creek II, LLC, for the purpose of setting forth the terms under which the City will provide natural gas service to the development known as Troon Creek Preserve; and providing an effective date.**

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 11,333

2. **Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida, approving the West Leesburg Community Development Corporation (WLCDC), American Recovery Grant Award; and providing an effective date.**

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 11,342

Commissioner Pederson introduced the resolution to be read by title only. CC Purvis read the resolution by title only.

Commissioner Pederson made a motion to adopt the resolution and Commissioner Reisman seconded the motion.

Mayor Burry requested comments from the Commission and the audience.

Commissioner Connell commented that we are talking about $750,000 and of that, $500,000 is proposed for building houses. They will most likely only get three houses with that money. They have $200,000 proposed for home renovations and $50,000 for operating costs. He was concerned. This money could be used in a better effort to benefit the majority of people versus the way it is proposed to be spent. We are talking about a half million dollars to benefit three families. Somebody could brainstorm and come up with better ideas to benefit more of the population than just three families. With the $200,000 for renovations, he had not seen any guidelines, or qualifications for how anyone would receive this money. Is there a time frame for them having to stay in the house? Do they even have to live in the house or just own it? It could be rental property. What are the criteria for what can be fixed and what cannot be fixed? How much money will be allowed per home? There are numerous concerns about this and it is not spelled out very clearly. The lion's share of the money is going for three new houses which will only benefit three families. Five hundred thousand dollars could be spent equally on other things to benefit a larger number of people. **Commissioner Pederson** remarked that this is federal money. The money came from the American Recovery Act. The city received twelve million dollars. **CM Minner** added it was just under twelve million dollars. **Commissioner Pederson** continued to say it was broken down into different buckets and the decision was made to spread the money throughout the city. We approved $750,000 for the Carver Heights District and Pine Street and a portion was provided to the CDCs in an effort to spend the money throughout the entire city. He does not want to micromanage the CDCs and they have volunteers coming forward with ideas and he respects those opinions. His understanding was that they would build houses and sell them. They are not just giving houses away to anybody. They would use the proceeds from selling the house to buy more houses. They could take a vacant lot, build a house, and sell it. They would then invest the money and do it again. With renovations, they would buy the home and fix it up. They would not just buy three homes. **CM Minner** stated there are three pieces to the request. The first part is for immediate cash subsidies to go into West Leesburg CDC coffers and that would be fifty grand. The rationale for that is that the CDC operates as a subsidy to the city. About $950 per month is used for part-time employment, operational costs and applications for housing programs that the City and the West Leesburg CDC worked together on. They had some issues with that in terms of participation and getting things funded. Ultimately, they decided recently not to pay that subsidy anymore because it did not work. With that subsidy gone, the West Leesburg CDC still has the goal of doing things to benefit the Carver Heights Community. Most recently there has been talk and collaboration in Carver Heights Community about the importance of infill housing. They want to provide blight remediation, workforce housing and a way to increase property values in Carver Heights. In general, the infill housing concept is a good one. The fifty thousand dollars would be a cash request. The city would cut a check to the West Leesburg CDC to help prop up that organization. As we move forward with our budget proposal, it is intended that we do not fund them in the future. With the two hundred thousand dollars there are two prongs. One is to purchase and rehab housing and the other is to receive infill housing lots from the city to construct houses on. **Commissioner Pederson** remarked that the CDC would sell the houses, they are not just giving them away. **CM Minner** stated some of the concerns that Commissioner Connell brought up about parameters on who will receive the houses and whether they are a rental or sold. We do not have parameters for that. We have not put them into place. However, it does go hand in hand with what Commissioner Berry is trying to do. She would like to get some parameters on what inventory infill lots the city has so they can be donated to different organizations. They could be donated to the West Leesburg CDC, Habitat for Humanity, or another not-for-profit agency. They are trying to get this up and moving and wrap it into one. However, he was unable to apply Commissioner Berry's full request on the parameters to establish donations. Based on other things in the community where infill housing concepts are going, the West Leesburg CDC's request seems to be in line with those concepts. It breaks down to the rehab, which takes about $200,000 and the remaining $500,000 would be for a request to revisit later on the construction of houses that would be sold or rented. Those processes are to be determined in the future. As far as direct allocation to how the process would work, the fifty grand would be a direct immediate allocation. However, the two hundred thousand and the five hundred thousand would be based on reimbursement. The housing department, which is led by Sandra Wilson, will work with the West Leesburg CDC to make sure those funds are spent appropriately and in a timely manner and that draws are made on those. The city will not be cutting a check for seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars. **Commissioner Berry** commented that this was the West Leesburg CDC’s third approach on how they would like to use that $750,000. This is inline with what the city needs for finding homes in conjunction with the Housing Department. This would be a great move and it would be a learning process for the city on how to purchase, as well as present and find non-profit organizations for the infill lots that need to be moved. The $50,000 would be conducive for them to have operational money ready and available to be a part of and to partake in things. This would be a good move for their rationale and she welcomes the support of this arrangement as requested. **Commissioner Pederson** said a couple of meetings ago there was a lot of criticism and it went both ways. We either give lots away or we get criticized for holding them on the books and spending a lot of money to maintain them. If the request was to go ahead and give them five lots, he would be fine with that. **CM Minner** stated the lot request had been pulled. He left that in the packet so they could see the information. They can anticipate that request to come back. However, those are lots that the West Leesburg CDC is eyeing. They would like to build on those lots with this money. It would be a two-step process. The first step would be to approve the ARP funding request and then they will work on the parameters of how we donate the lots. **Commissioner Pederson** remarked that the basis of his comment was that this had been put on hold for months. He wanted to be respectful to the CDC and get this process going. That was why he brought up the five lots. **Commissioner Reisman** wanted to confirm if the West Leesburg CDC had a board or if it was just one person running it. **CM Minner** replied it has a board; Fred Griffin is their current president, but he was unable to make it tonight. **Commissioner Connell** commented that we still do not have any parameters in place on the rehab program or for the houses that are to be built, would they be sold or rented. There is nothing in place. We are considering the approval of $750,000 with no parameters or guidelines in place. They should not approve anything until they have it and are given an opportunity to review it. **Commissioner Berry** replied that the rental portion was pulled. They realized that they would not be the land-lords for the West Leesburg CDC. She asked if the Vice President, Mary Tucker, could provide further details to support their request. **CM Minner** stated the commissioner asked if there were parameters in place to guide either rental or purchases of the houses that would be constructed or rehabbed. **Mary Tucker**, Vice President of the West Leesburg CDC, stated she did not have the answer to that question. **Commissioner Berry** stated the West Leesburg CDC decided they would not become a land-lord. **Commissioner Pederson** added that there was a big debate about two months ago and they conceded because $500,000 would only purchase about three homes. They could keep buying homes, build them and flip them. That way, it would better serve more people. **CM Minner** said the commissioner had a good question about parameters and we have been in a partnership with the West Leesburg CDC and the Habitat for Humanity where we donated lots, and while we do not have a specific written parameter for the City of Leesburg, we do use other guidelines from HUD or the county that generally guides with the low to moderate income standards and the selection process. While we do not have those things in the book, those perimeters are in existence. It would be an easy issue to fix and it would just be a matter of stealing a page from HUD and putting the City of Leesburg on it. They do have broad parameters, but we do not have specific parameters. **Commissioner Pederson** reminded everyone that the whole theory of the CRA is to build homes so they can continue to build and flip. It will create a higher tax base, which generates more money. That was the whole idea of the CRA and this is a great plan. This is the third time they have looked at this. It is time to approve it and get some directions for this CDC district. **Commissioner Berry** said, with the direction of the housing department, this would be a learning curve. They would take them in the right direction. They could also follow and piggyback off the Leesburg CDC with how they do it. **Commissioner Connell** pointed out that we still do not have any parameters. There are some general guidelines that nobody has seen. Is there anything in place about the criteria for having somebody's house renovated? How much and what items are eligible? Do they have to live there or just own it? Can it be a rental? Until we get the answers, how can it be approved? **Ms. Tucker** asked Commissioner Connell if his question was if they had all the parameters to qualify West Leesburg CDC to be given the ARP money? **Commissioner Connell** said no. **Ms. Tucker** asked if the question related to the West Leesburg CDC not having all the parameters or information that was being requested. **Commissioner Connell** replied that he wanted to see the qualifications and parameters for someone to approach the CDC to renovate their house. He wanted to know how much they could get, what items were available through this program and if there was any length of time they had to stay in the home after the money had been awarded and the work was done. **Ms. Tucker** said that would not necessarily be something outside of what has been expressed. There are guidelines and people have already presented them to them. There are people already qualified and people have been hired by the city manager to take care of housing. The West Leesburg CDC is housed in the Resource Center and the president has been meeting with them to discuss these things. She does not see why there would be a question about the possibility to put these things in place. **Commissioner Connell** stated if there are parameters in place, he would appreciate it if someone could furnish those prior to the vote. That was all he was asking for.

John Christian, of the Leesburg CDC, stated he met with the West Leesburg CDC board and offered them some guidance and pointers. He does not think the board was saying the $200,000 would renovate houses. It is for acquisition of existing houses. There may be a need to renovate and they will sell that house as well as brand new houses. They are not going to rent, they are not going to go renovate his house or anyone else's house. They are going to use the standards that are already in place, as the city manager said. Lake County has a great program on affordability, so that $500,000 is for new construction and the $200,000 is for existing housing. They are not going to fix peoples' houses for $750,000. Nor are they going to go through the community fixing up houses. They are going to buy existing houses that are on the market. They will renovate that house, sell it and do it over and over again to get rid of blight and some of the infill lots in Carver Heights. **Commissioner Pederson** complimented him; stating he did a great job.

The roll call vote was:

Commissioner Pederson	Yes
Commissioner Berry	Yes
Commissioner Connell	No
Commissioner Reisman	Yes
Mayor Burry	Yes

Four yeas, one nay, the Commission adopted the resolution.

3. Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute a Lake County Water Authority Stormwater Grant Program Agreement to provide financial assistance for the Center Street Stormwater Retrofit Project Construction; and providing an effective date.

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 11,334

4. Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida, accepting and approving a plat for Villages of West Lake Unit No. 84, a subdivision of the City of Leesburg, Florida, being a portion of Section 9, Township 20 South, Range 24 East, Lake County, Florida, and accepting and dedicating to the use of the public any easements or public places shown thereon as being dedicated to the public; and providing an effective date. (Villages of West Lake Unit No. 84)

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 11,335

5. Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida, accepting a Utility Easement from DRJ Land Company, LLC, affecting the property described therein; and providing an effective date.

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 11,336

6. Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida,

accepting a Utility Easement from Robert G. Bundens, Sr. and Joann R. Bundens affecting the property described therein; and providing an effective date.

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 11,337

7. **Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida, accepting a Utility Easement to the City of Leesburg from FCC Environmental Services Florida, LLC, for the purpose of granting the City an easement over the property described therein; and providing an effective date.**

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 11,338

8. **Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida, accepting and approving a plat for Silver Lake Pointe Phase 1, a subdivision of the City of Leesburg, Florida, being a portion of Sections 9 and 10, Township 19 South, Range 25 East, Lake County, Florida, and accepting and dedicating to the use of the public any easements or public places shown thereon as being dedicated to the public; and providing an effective date. (Silver Lake Pointe Phase 1)**

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 11,339

9. **Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida, accepting an Automatic Aid Agreement for Fire Protection and Other Emergency Services between the City of Groveland and the City of Leesburg and more particularly described in the document; and providing an effective date.**

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 11,340

6. PUBLIC HEARINGS AND NON-ROUTINE ITEMS:
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN INFORMATION SIGN-UP SHEET (YELLOW) AVAILABLE

A. SECOND READING OF ORDINANCES

1. **None**

B. FIRST READING OF ORDINANCES

1. **An Ordinance of the City of Leesburg, Florida, annexing certain real property consisting of approximately 60.27 +/- acres and generally located**

north of Jackson Road, east and west of Park Lane, and west of Radio Road, lying in Section 10, Township 19 South, Range 25 East, Lake County, Florida; providing that said property so annexed shall be liable for its proportionate share of the existing and future indebtedness of said city; providing that such annexed property shall be subject to all laws and ordinances of said city as if all such territory had been a part of the City of Leesburg at the time of passage and approval of said laws and ordinances; providing that such annexed territory shall be placed in City Commission District 3; and providing an effective date. (Silver Lake Woods AX)

Commissioner Reisman introduced ordinances 6.B.1, 6.B.2 and 6.B.3 to be read by title only. CC Purvis read the ordinances by title only.

Mayor Burry requested comments from the Commission and the audience.

CA Watson pointed out that item 6.B.2 will require a vote because this is a large-scale comprehensive plan. They need to make a motion and vote to approve transmittal of the package to the reviewing agencies.

Planning and Zoning Director Miller stated this is the Silver Lake Woods project. It is a proposal for a single-family residential development located on sixty acres. It is generally located west of Radio Road and east and west of Park Lane. They are proposing eighty-five units on the sixty acres for a gross density of 1.41 units per acre. The request is a small scale comp plan amendment from Lake County Urban low density to City of Leesburg estate. The rezoning would be from Lake County Agriculture to City of Leesburg Planned Unit Development. As stated, sixty acres and eighty-five units. Twenty eight plus or minus acres of preserved wetlands. The only permitted use is single-family residential. There are three lot sizes within the PUD zoning. Fifty-two lots at fifty by one thirty, eighteen lots at sixty by one thirty and fifteen lots at seventy by one thirty. The access point will be located on the south side of the property, not on Radio Road. It is required to be a boulevard type access point with a landscape median which allows for emergency access vehicles. The sixty and seventy foot lots are located around the exterior of the property and the fifty foot lots are on the interior of the property. The homes will have two car garages. As discussed with the commission in other projects, the fifty-foot lots will have gutters to direct stormwater away from the foundation of the property. Otherwise, they have the standard PUD conditions in effect; design and architectural standards, twenty-five foot buffers around the north, east and south sides of the property, trees in every front and rear yard and darksky lighting. There will be a split rail fence on the north and south boundaries. On the eastern boundary there is an option for a six-foot PVC fence. Four tenths of an acre will be for recreation. Mr. Jerome Henin, the property owner, was there to answer any questions. **Mayor Burry** questioned it being a boulevard style and not exiting onto Radio Road. What road will it exit onto? **PZD Miller** believed it exits onto Jackson. **Mr. Henin** from the audience clarified that it would be on Radio Road. **PZD Miller** apologized for the confusion. The map at the Planning Commission was turned sideways and he got all messed up. However, this does exit on Radio Road.

Gary Custer, 8909 East Treasure Island Avenue, passed out a copy of an ordinance to the commission. He stated the ordinance should be read before approving any developments. Something really needs to be done differently.

2. **An Ordinance amending the Future Land Use Map of the Comprehensive Plan of the City of Leesburg, changing the Future Land Use Map Designation of certain property containing 60.27 +/- acres from Lake**

County Urban Low Density to City of Leesburg Estate Residential, for a property generally north of Jackson Road, east and west of Park Lane, and west of Radio Road, lying in Section 10, Township 19 South, Range 25 East, Lake County, Florida; and providing an effective date. (Silver Lake Woods LSCP)

Commissioner Pederson made a motion to approve the transmission of the packet to the state for review and Commissioner Reisman seconded the motion.

Mayor Burry requested comments from the Commission and the audience. There were none.

The roll call vote was:

Commissioner Berry	Yes
Commissioner Connell	Yes
Commissioner Reisman	Yes
Commissioner Pederson	Yes
Mayor Burry	Yes

Five yeas, no nays, the Commission approved the motion.

Mayor Burry asked if there was a date for the second reading. **CC Purvis** answered it would be July 10th. **Mayor Burry** stated July 10th would be the second reading for this item. **CA Watson** added that this item would have to go to the state for review, which may take thirty to sixty days. It should be closer to thirty days. However, he was not sure if it would be lined up for that particular meeting. **Mayor Burry** answered that if we get that back we can have the second reading on July 10th. **CM Minner** stated there would be a public notice posted about this after the review is returned.

3. **An Ordinance of the City of Leesburg, Florida, changing the zoning on approximately 60.27 +/- acres from Lake County A (Agriculture) to City of Leesburg PUD (Planned Unit Development) to allow for residential development for a property generally located north of Jackson Road, east and west of Park Lane, and west of Radio Road, lying in Section 10, Township 19 South, Range 25 East, Lake County, Florida; and providing an effective date. (Silver Lake Woods PUD)**

4. **An Ordinance of the City of Leesburg, Florida, annexing certain real property consisting of approximately 1.45 +/- acres; and generally located west of Whitney Road and north of State Road 44, lying in Section 19, Township 19 South, Range 24 East, Lake County, Florida; providing that said property so annexed shall be liable for its proportionate share of the existing and future indebtedness of said city; providing that such annexed property shall be subject to all laws and ordinances of said city as if all such territory had been a part of the City of Leesburg at the time of passage and approval of said laws and ordinances; providing that such annexed territory shall be placed in City Commission District 2; and providing an effective date. (City of Leesburg Electric Substation SR 44 Davis AX)**

Commissioner Reisman introduced ordinances 6.B.4, 6.B.5 and 6.B.6 to be read by title only. CC Purvis read the ordinances by title only.

Mayor Burry requested comments from the Commission and the audience.

PZD Miller stated this project consists of an annexation of 1.45 acres for an electric substation. It lies west of Whitney Road on the north side of SR 44. It would be a Lake County, Rural transition that would go to City of Leesburg, Institutional and Lake County, Agriculture. Under the zoning, it would go to the City of Leesburg, Public. It will be used for an electrical substation to add capacity to the area. **CA Watson** commented about the contract. They are scheduled to close on or before August 10th. Right now, they are in the due-diligence period. On August 10th it should be wrapped up assuming everything proceeds. **Mayor Burry** stated after they close the property will that be when they hold the second reading? **CA Watson** agreed. The commission and planning and zoning approvals are contingent upon that contract.

5. **An Ordinance amending the Future Land Use Map of the Comprehensive Plan of the City of Leesburg, changing the Future Land Use Map Designation of certain property containing 1.45 +/- acres from Lake County Rural Transition to City of Leesburg Institutional, for a property generally located west of Whitney Road and north of State Road 44, lying in Section 19, Township 19 South, Range 24 East, Lake County, Florida; and providing an effective date. (City of Leesburg Electric Substation SR 44 Davis SSCP)**

6. **An Ordinance of the City of Leesburg, Florida, changing the zoning on approximately 1.45 +/- acres from Lake County A (Agriculture) to City of Leesburg P (Public) for a property generally located west of Whitney Road and north of State Road 44, lying in Section 19, Township 19 South, Range 24 East, Lake County, Florida; and providing an effective date. (City of Leesburg Electric Substation SR 44 Davis RZ)**

C. NON-ROUTINE ITEMS

1. **Resolution of the Mayor and City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida, reaffirming the Mission and Vision Statement; establishing Goals for the Organization; and providing for an effective date.**

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 11,343

Commissioner Reisman introduced the resolution to be read by title only. CC Purvis read the resolution by title only.

Commissioner Reisman made a motion to adopt the resolution and Commissioner Pederson seconded the motion.

Mayor Burry requested comments from the Commission and the audience.

CM Minner said they held the Vision Workshop a few weeks ago. From that, they came up with certain mission goals. The primary thing established was that we still liked and wanted to apply our existing vision mission statements, which broke down the overall goals into five categories. From that we identified several sub-categories, such as increasing employee pay, managing the growth in south Leesburg, and doing certain recreational projects. The marketing concepts were in there too. The resolution is pretty explanatory. It is not a bible, in any case, but it is a guide to the major issues that we will work on over the next year or so.

The roll call vote was:

Commissioner Connell	No
Commissioner Reisman	Yes
Commissioner Pederson	Yes
Commissioner Berry	Yes
Mayor Burry	Yes

Four yeas, one nay, the Commission adopted the resolution.

2. City Manager Presentation of FY '24 Wage Proposal

CM Minner stated the next three items on the agenda would revert back to this. He wanted to go over the concepts. With the CBA's, we have some pay items that are significant. He wanted to lay out the groundwork on the perimeters of how we got to where we are now and the actions that will be before them and how that binds us financially moving forward. Back in the fall, this started with a request from Commissioner Connell to do an overall salary review of all our working staff. There are three categories of employees. The Police Benevolence Association (PBA), which is all the sworn officers. We have programed 72 and they are employed and remunerated by pay and benefits through the collective bargaining agreement as a unionized workforce. The other unionized workforce is the International Association of Firefighters (IAFF). The paid perimeters of their employment provisions are laid out in a collective bargaining agreement. The rest of the employees outside of the sworn officers, consist of members of the IAFF from an entry-level firefighter up to a lieutenant. Those two forces are unionized. Everybody else in the workforce is referred to as general employees. That includes the electric linemen, solid waste operators, wastewater, and recreation maintenance workers, and everybody else. They completed a comprehensive survey and we found from that survey that our general employees' pay is all over the place as far as competition. The root of the issue is because the marketplace has moved. Whether it is public or private, they have moved to the fifteen dollars an hour for base pay/entry-level positions. We have found ourselves behind on that. There is a state requirement that says every employer in the state must pay fifteen dollars an hour by 2026. However, most agencies have already implemented this and we are really struggling with our pay. It needs to be increased. If we increase that base pay, then we have a compression issue, so we have about thirty positions out of five hundred and twenty that are below fifteen dollars an hour. If we raise that number up from the base rate of $12.74, thirty or so people are affected and that creates compression. We really have to examine all of our employees on the pay scale numbers of 112 up to 142. That is entry level, mid management and supervisory type levels. They put together a process to examine that. They found out that they needed to increase a police officer's pay. In this region, we are significantly suffering with recruiting. Of the seventy-two paid positions, we have seven vacancies and that is significant. We believe it is directly related to the entry level pay not being competitive with other organizations. We continue to be behind the eight ball in recruiting compared to other organizations like the Orange County Sheriff's Office, the OPD, and other large organizations who get a lion's share of officers because their pay is in the neighborhood of sixty thousand dollars per year to start. They also found that the IAFF wages are a bit low. The proposal is to increase the police officer's starting wage to sixty thousand dollars a year. However, that creates compression. It is a sixteen percent increase that we really need to pass along to all police officers so that all our police officer positions remain competitive. He recommended the funding for this be two-fold. The first fold is that we need to recognize freezes on some positions so we can ease into the increase in the general fund. That will be talked about in more detail during the FY-24 budget sessions. As we move into FY-25 and FY-26, we recognize that we may need to add more police officers to the workforce. The goal that Chief Hicks would like to get to is ninety and as we get into the budget process we will talk about ways the new Villages property tax growth will take care of that or at least help us get there. The IAFF offered a few different proposals, but the basic proposal was a five percent increase across the board. The IAFF would like to add all hours worked as a clause in the pay contract items. What that means for us that do not regularly know CBA language, there is a requirement that if you have paid timeoff and you are required to come into work after your paid timeoff on a non-scheduled day, you will receive overtime pay. That is the perimeter in the PBA/CBA but not the IAFF. The IAFF requested that it be modified to mirror the CBA for the PBA and that cost is two point five percent. The magic number that we identify where we are not competitive in the IAFF pay is seven point five percent. Item number one and two adds up to an incremental increase for the members of the IAFF to seven and a half percent. Number three is to increase the paramedic incentive pay. We have about forty-eight firefighter engineers and the paramedic pay would be for firefighter engineers. There are twenty-four slots for paramedics. Paramedics have additional qualifications to provide emergency initial response medical treatment if needed. Chief Mera would like to keep twenty-four paramedics on pay. They are paid an incentive to get that upgrade and we pay them a bonus of thirteen thousand a year. On that payscale, there would be a four dollar increase per hour that goes on to their base pay.

The general employees are a bit more complicated about how we tackle getting the base pay up to fifteen dollars an hour. With a couple of deviations, this is the broad spectrum where the base pay is on the pay scale 112. If you work for the federal government, you would be a GSER and you would know the general scale. However, we call that pay grade 112. There are steps from 112 up to 142. Those base steps have a top and bottom. For practicality and ease of discussion, the numbers he will provide are bottom numbers. He recommends the bottom pay scale of 112 be increased to fifteen dollars per hour. That is an increase from $12.72 to $15 per hour. If you are at steps 113-142, there is a four percent gap between each step. With 113, the base scale of that would be $15 dollars per hour plus a four percent increase and so on. That would be repeated through step 142. Once that is adjusted, everybody will be moved up to $15 per hour and then we will need to tackle the compression issue. There are employees who may be on the 114 or 115 scale who are not at $15 an hour, so you cannot bump up that employee who is making in the $12 per hour range and then bump them up to just $15 per hour. We also have people who have been here longer on different pay scales who get less. So that needs to be adjusted. They also recognize longevity, so when we raise the base pay it affects longevity pay. They came up with a formulaic approach to doing that. The formulaic approach is, in your current pay grade you get one percent. If you move to the bottom of the current pay scale an employee is on, they will get a one percent bonus for every year of service. For example, for someone in pay grade 112 who has been there 18 years, that pay would then become $15 an hour times eighteen percent. That would put them at around $19 an hour. We recognize the bottom and provide longevity. We will do the same through pay scale 142. As we get to pay scale 133, we start getting into middle management and senior management. The recommendation then becomes, you get the formulaic approach or five percent, whichever is greater. With the exception of the command staff in the police department. We recognize them with the CBA agreement and the IAFF. We recognize the seven and a half percent increase for this management. It would be five percent or whichever number is greater, but the CBA affects that. There are three resolutions to come behind. The commission will consider the PBA/CBA and the IAFF/CBA resolution to accept the new pay scale. In that resolution, he asked them to not only increase the pay pursuant to these parameters, in each of the classifications, but to pay these benefits effective July 1st, which is the last quarter of FY 23. He asked that they authorize him to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the IAFF and the PBA to recognize the last of the quarter pay versus the first of the fiscal year pay.

Now, how do we pay for it? If we go ahead and start the pay increase effective July 1st, there will be no pay increases on October 1st. As the employees would have already received their increases in the last quarter of this year. They will receive their FY 24 bump three months early so they earn a little bit more money earlier, which is good for the employees and for us as an employer. We need to get to that $15 per hour minimum quicker. Hopefully, we will then be able to recruit so we do not have to use the Brightview contract which was just approved. It will also help our Chiefs with recruitment so they can fill positions moving forward. Payroll as proposed for FY 27 would be roughly twenty-seven million dollars of our two hundred million dollar budget. Those are rough numbers. This year, FY 23, we adopted about a twenty-four million dollar payroll. The increase is about twelve percent. Of the twenty-four million dollars that were allocated for FY 23, we will spend about twenty-two million. There is a two million dollar cash gap due to vacancies. We have been having trouble filling these vacancies. If we apply these changes to this fiscal year, there is cash to pay for it through the end of this fiscal year. If we do that, we will be putting the cart before the horse, because we will be committed to a higher payroll through the end of this fiscal year. In the enterprise funds, there would be a simple equation because we will not be recommending an increase in user fees beyond the COLA, which we do on an annual basis, or CPI increases, which are relatively minor. With those funds, we can shift blocks around to absorb the increase. The general fund is tricky because the general fund has two major items. There is a process that needs to be approved through the trim notice. That way, in August, folks will see what their assessments are, which is the fire assessment fee and what their taxes will be. That is the millage rate. We do not approve that until September and it becomes effective October 1st. If we cut a big check for employee pay raises, we have to tackle that. We need to increase the assessment fees and increase taxes or commit to spending cash. We do have the cash. In FY 25, if we fail to do A or B assessments or taxes, we will then be forcing ourselves into cash. We have the cash and it will be replenished. Why would we put the cart before the horse? Because we have ways out that are attractive. We have future growth coming in to pay for it and it is the right thing to do for the employees. We talked about the enterprise funds paying for themselves. We also anticipate no increase in electric rates. We will make that proposal in FY 24. He believes they will be able to lower the power costs adjustment, hopefully, in the last quarter of this year or by October 1. The recovery numbers look extremely good. In fact, he should receive the number of May in two days. All the other funds take care of themselves; the general fund does not. The first thing he will recommend, which is the next thing on the agenda, is to increase the fire assessment fee. By resolution they will consider that resolution. It will be a notice that says we are considering raising the fire assessment fees. Those numbers will be published in the trim notice which goes out in August. The other side of the taxing house is the millage rate. In July they will approve the DR-420. The DR-420 is a resolution (a state form) that says this will be your maximum millage rate and we will not tax property taxes higher than that number. We can go below it, but not over it.

If we go over it, we will have to do the whole process of advertising, which is cumbersome and difficult. When considering that resolution, it puts into place information on finances for the public. That information will be in the trim notice and the public will see what taxes and assessments are being proposed for the upcoming fiscal year, which will be adopted in September. The proposal, with these processes in mind, increases the fire assessment fee by double. It is a big number. Right now it is eighty-seven dollars and the proposal is for one hundred and sixty-five dollars per equivalent residential unit (ERU). That is for single-family homes. All the other classifications, commercial, industrial, and warehouse, are one cent per square foot. So, whatever those numbers are, we are doubling them. Everyone gets doubled. Even though we are asking to double the fire assessment fee, we can mitigate that increase because on June 1st we found out that the property taxable value growth went up twenty-three percent. That is a big jump. If that property number goes up, that means we can correspondently reduce the property taxes so the net increase is negligible. For example, the average home value in the City of Leesburg is roughly two hundred thousand dollars. After exemptions have been applied, it will be taxed to a value in 2023 of $150,000. The millage rate is per thousand, so the math is a hundred and fifty thousand dollars and if we divide that by the millage rate of 4.0192, we come up with a city tax bill of $602. At the bottom of the trim notice or tax bill is the assessment section. It includes the Leesburg Fire Assessment fee of eighty-seven dollars. In FY 23, a resident who had a house value of two hundred grand had a tax and assessment bill of $689. If you have the fifty thousand dollar exemption, that means you are homesteaded. In the State of Florida, when your house is homesteaded, that means your value can only go up three percent, even though growth is twenty-three percent on residential homes. The commercial is capped at ten percent. Then we have new growth. We have three percent growth for existing residential and ten percent growth for existing commercial, new commercial and residential. For this tax year, the home value will go from two hundred thousand dollars to two hundred and six thousand dollars less the exemption of fifty thousand dollars. So, instead of being taxed at one hundred and fifty thousand dollars, they are being taxed at one hundred and fifty-six thousand dollars. If we drop the millage rate to 3.425, the tax bill is five hundred and thirty-four dollars versus six hundred and two dollars. That is a reduction of about seventy dollars. If we add the new tax plus the assessment, the total will be six hundred and ninety-nine dollars versus six hundred and eighty-nine dollars. That is an overall increase of ten dollars or 1.37 percent. That will be the proposal to the body. The first step will be to send that resolution which gives notice to increase the fire assessment fee as described earlier. The caveat to all of this is that these are estimated numbers. 3.425 mills recommends our best estimate based on the information that was sent by the Property Appraiser's office on June 1st. We receive numbers on the first of every month. So in July, August, September, and even October, the property appraiser will update the assessed value number. He sent the commission the June 1st numbers by text and there is a copy if the public is interested. Ostensibly, our total taxable value in the City of Leesburg is 2.2 billion dollars. That number is up twenty-three percent. That is the process. Twenty-three percent is a really good number. For FY 24 we could see an even higher number because that twenty-three percent growth number does not include The Villages. It only includes ninety houses. It is estimated that by the end of this year the 470 property will be completely built. That adds another three thousand two hundred homes. They looked up some of the sale values for homes that range between four and five hundred thousand dollars and if we break that down into the taxable value less homestead exemptions, that number would be about three hundred. Using the number of three hundred and times that by thirty-two hundred times the millage rate, the total taxable value is almost a billion dollars, which is a taxable revenue somewhere around 3.3 million dollars. They believe we will be pretty close to that number next year. If not next year, it will be in FY 25 or 26. Going out into the future, the general fund is in a good position to discuss these things. One important thing he wanted to stress to the commission is that we have to approve the CBAs and we have to modify the general wage earnings for the general employees. This needs to go into effect July 1st. We have the cash and we have a reasonable taxing vehicle to figure out how we will pay for it in FY 24. We have some backstops where we know the cash and revenue are in case we do not do A or B. As we get into July and the budget sessions, these numbers will tighten up. The other side of the equation is the commission may not want to lower taxes that much, but we can have discussions about that during the budget sessions. Those dates are July 6th, 11th and 13th. We will drill down into these numbers as always. We will have the July numbers from the property appraisers office so we can drill down into what the rollback is, what the increase is and what the decrease is. We will get it all figured out. We are in a really good position today to deal with the PBA/CBA, the IAFF/CBA and the general employees increase in pay effective July 1st.

Mayor Burry asked about the fire assessment fee, is it country-wide and where does that put us, because doubling it sounds like a big thing. **CM Minner** answered it was an important thing to bring up. Why would the city want to double the fire assessment fee and lower taxes? The state statute lays out that an assessment is different from a tax. He knows the saying, if it walks like a duck and looks like a duck, it is a tax. However, legally and strategically, an assessment is different and it allows you to do different things. The fire assessment fee in the State of Florida allows you to capture fire service costs in an assessment. You are measured by the percent collected. In our case, right now, we under collect in our fire assessment fees. We need to free up as much general revenue as we can so that we can spread that millage revenue around to all the general services a municipal corporation provides. If we isolate the fire assessment fee, we would have a better taxing structure. The current fire assessment fee is eighty-seven dollars per ERU and we capture forty percent of the available costs that the state statute says we can capture. If we double that, those numbers are just doubled and it would go up to one hundred and sixty-five dollars and, in turn, we would capture eighty percent. It isolates the fire service cost to an assessment fee that everybody pays pursuant to the rates being considered. Secondly, it frees up availability, so when the new villages' revenue comes into the community, we are free to have more of that to spend on different general services. The recommendation is threefold and he is sure they will have to toy with it. It will basically look like a police surcharge and even though the commission has not discussed the police growth surcharge reduction and putting money away for capital improvements, that will be laid out during the budget workshops. We would isolate that service and maximize the new money coming in. When we entered into the agreement with The Villages, we agreed that fire services would be provided by The Villages Fire Service District. We agreed that we would pay them one hundred and sixty dollars per ERU. That money was going to come out of two places, the existing fire service assessment, which is eighty-seven dollars. We would then grab some of the new village's revenue and marry it. We would cut a check to the Village's Fire District, not The Villages. They are two separate entities. We agreed to that in principle and it was a good deal at the time because we saw the numbers. The delta of one hundred and sixty dollars minus eighty-seven dollars times the number of houses is about two hundred and thirty thousand dollars. By eliminating the delta, we will not have to pay that delta difference to the Fire Service District, so that allows more ad valorem revenue to stay in the city's pocket or be reassigned as we go forward. The typical Lake County and Statewide fire assessment fee collects somewhere between eighty to one hundred percent of the available fire services at a rate north of two hundred dollars. There are only two communities in Lake County that do not have a fire assessment fee, Clermont and Eustis. They have zero, but there are other communities like Groveland which have a tiered system that ranges from two hundred and twenty-five to two hundred and seventy-five. Tavares and some of the other communities, like Fruitland Park, hang around about two and a quarter. At one hundred and sixty five, we would hang out at eighty percent. Even though that is double, we see all the effects and it is a competitive fire assessment fee.

3. Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida relating to the provision of Fire Protection Services, Facilities and Programs in the City of Leesburg, Florida; Imposing Fire Protection Assessments against assessed property located within the City for the Fiscal Year beginning October 1, 2023; Approving the Rate of Assessment; Approving the Assessment Roll; and providing an effective date.

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 11,344

Commissioner Reisman introduced the resolution to be read by title only. CC Purvis read the resolution by title only.

Commissioner Reisman made a motion to adopt the resolution and Commissioner Pederson seconded the motion.

Mayor Burry requested comments from the Commission and the audience. There were none.

The roll call vote was:

Commissioner Reisman	Yes
Commissioner Pederson	Yes

Commissioner Berry	Yes
Commissioner Connell	Yes
Mayor Burry	Yes

Five yeas, no nays, the Commission adopted the resolution.

4. Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida, authorizing the ratification of the Collective Bargaining Agreement with the Florida Police Benevolent Associations, Inc. for Officers/Detectives and Corporals/Sergeants; and providing an effective date.

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 11,345

Commissioner Reisman introduced the resolution to be read by title only. CC Purvis read the resolution by title only.

Commissioner Reisman made a motion to adopt the resolution and Commissioner Pederson seconded the motion.

Mayor Burry requested comments from the Commission and the audience. There were none.

The roll call vote was:

Commissioner Pederson	Yes
Commissioner Berry	Yes
Commissioner Connell	Yes
Commissioner Reisman	Yes
Mayor Burry	Yes

Five yeas, no nays, the Commission adopted the resolution.

5. Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida, authorizing the Ratification of the Collective Bargaining Agreement with the Professional Firefighters of Leesburg Local 2957, IAFF, AFL-CFO-CLC; and providing an effective date.

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 11,346

Commissioner Reisman introduced the resolution to be read by title only. CC Purvis read the resolution by title only.

Commissioner Reisman made a motion to adopt the resolution and Commissioner Pederson seconded the motion.

Mayor Burry requested comments from the Commission and the audience. There were none.

The roll call vote was:

Commissioner Berry	Yes
Commissioner Connell	Yes
Commissioner Reisman	Yes

Commissioner Pederson	Yes
Mayor Burry	Yes

Five yeas, no nays, the Commission adopted the resolution.

6. Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida authorizing approval of the Revised Pay Scale for the General Employees, payable effective July 1, 2023; Authorizing the City Manager to enter into Memorandums of Understanding to implement agreed wages to the PBA and IAFF effective July 1, 2023; and providing an effective date.

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 11,347

Commissioner Reisman introduced the resolution to be read by title only. CC Purvis read the resolution by title only.

Commissioner Reisman made a motion to adopt the resolution and Commissioner Pederson seconded the motion.

Mayor Burry requested comments from the Commission and the audience.

CM Minner mentioned that this vote is the one that says we are going to implement the general employees' pay and then we are going to make the IAFF, the PBA and general employees' pay be effective July 1. A yes vote on this means we will put the cart before the horse for all those reasons that are justifiable and should work out by the time you adopt the FY-24 budget in September. He wanted to stress that because he had been frightened of the whole cart before the horse. **Commissioner Pederson** said he met with the city manager and, just like all the commissioners, he complimented the city manager because this was a solid recommendation. **Mayor Burry** jokingly said this was his job on the line. **CM Minner** responded that he recognizes his job is on the line every day and reviewed twice a month. **Commissioner Reisman** stated this was a good thing because without employees we do not have a city. We have to take care of our employees.

The roll call vote was:

Commissioner Connell	Yes
Commissioner Reisman	Yes
Commissioner Pederson	Yes
Commissioner Berry	Yes
Mayor Burry	Yes

Five yeas, no nays, the Commission adopted the resolution.

7. Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida authorizing Approval of a Commissary Kitchen for Leesburg Resource Center; and providing an effective date.

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 11,348

Commissioner Reisman introduced the resolution to be read by title only. CC Purvis read the resolution by title only.

Commissioner Reisman made a motion to adopt the resolution and Commissioner Pederson seconded the motion.

Mayor Burry requested comments from the Commission and the audience.

Commissioner Reisman mentioned there were two numbers going back and forth: an annual deposit of one thousand dollars and then a fifty dollar per hour rate and a membership fee structure of five hundred dollars per year with fifteen dollars per hour. He would like to go with the one thousand dollar deposit and the fifty dollar per hour rental rate. **CM Minner** stated Commissioner Reisman spoke to him about this. He was the one that brought this concept to his attention. He then worked with the Housing Director to come up with a concept for using the kitchen as a commissary kitchen at the Resource Center. They modeled it after Eustis and it is a good program. He mixed some numbers from the application forms that the Housing Director put together versus his agenda transmittal. They liked the proposal for the use of the kitchen where you need to provide insurance. Housing staff will manage the program and make sure that everybody has their stuff in place and that the facility is used correctly. Secondly, the deposit of one thousand dollars would be an annual payment. That gets their foot in the door for anyone who wants to use the kitchen. One thousand dollars is for the prep, damage, repairs, and increase of costs for those types of things. Then there would be an hourly rate of fifty dollars. If the commission can make that revision to the motion, but that was how the resolution was written and revised. The amount would be one thousand dollars for an entry fee and fifty dollars per hour. **Commissioner Pederson** inquired if this was just for residents of the City of Leesburg or for anybody? **CM Minner** answered it would be for anybody who provides the insurance and wants to use the kitchen. They anticipate that it would be for gatherings and culinary schools. There was a program with Lake Tech but that fell apart after Covid. They have received a bunch of different requests from different culinary teachers or small businesses throughout the community that need a place like this facility. **Commissioner Reisman** wanted to make sure that we have yearly reviews of all insurance documents and catering licenses, and he would like to include the Venetian Center, so all documents are reviewed on a yearly basis. They have to renew their contracts for certain things on a yearly basis. They need to make sure we are keeping up with that. **Mayor Burry** asked if they needed to amend the motion. **CM Minner** replied no, the resolution was good. It will be one thousand dollars per entry and fifty dollars per hour. That was how the transmittal read and they have modified the draft application to reflect the commission's suggestion.

The roll call vote was:

Commissioner Reisman	Yes
Commissioner Pederson	Yes
Commissioner Berry	Yes
Commissioner Connell	Yes
Mayor Burry	Yes

Five yeas, no nays, the Commission adopted the resolution.

8. Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida amending the Home Improvement Grant Program; and providing an effective date.

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 11,349

Commissioner Reisman introduced the resolution to be read by title only. CC Purvis read the resolution by title only.

Commissioner Reisman made a motion to adopt the resolution and Commissioner Pederson seconded the motion.

Mayor Burry requested comments from the Commission and the audience.

Commissioner Connell asked the city manager to explain what the amendments are to this policy.

CM Minner explained this was an incentive from Commissioner Berry. She would like to make sure the housing stock throughout the community improves. She is specifically focused on her district and Carver Heights. They have created ways to tactically use that money. A couple of years ago, they created a couple of different programs: the facade sign landscape program, the home rehabilitation program, and later they added the downtown historic building renovation project. Each project overlapped the entire community, so the programs could work anywhere in the city, even though they could be funded four different ways based on how the commission wanted to fund them during any specific year. The flexibilities are written and they will stay in the programs. They are funded by grant awards and the commission funds the projects every fiscal year. The funding source could be the Carver Heights CR, where, if the grant is paid from the Carver Heights CRA, it would have to be located within the Carver Heights CRA area. The 441/27 CRA would be the same. If a project comes, it has to be funded through the 441/27 CRA fund. The downtown would be funded by the Downtown CRA and the general fund. It would be up to the commission to determine where it fits. There are some areas in the city that do not fall into the TIFF districts. That may be something the commission wants to address. We have seen it happen on occasion with the facade sign landscape grants. The FSL grants have had some mild success and the home rehabilitation program has not had any success. The home rehabilitation program has not had success because we set the grant level too low. We required a match and five thousand dollars and, unfortunately, nothing was fixed. When we implemented the grant categories, we identified things that we wanted to make sure would be improved because, in turn, it would improve the housing values and ultimately, it would bring up assessments. We wanted to make sure roofs and windows were repaired, doors were fixed, security issues were addressed, along with sidewalks. Now we are looking to change that program. First we want to look at money. We are proposing to increase the funding amount from five thousand dollars to twenty-five thousand dollars. The current proposal also has no matching requirement. They would receive a check for twenty-five thousand dollars. We also added some landscaping improvements. There is a modification of a lien if they take the money for three years. A clawback issue was brought up regarding restrictions on selling, so they added a lien requirement that would go against the homes and the commission would have the right to remove the lien. The thought behind that was if somebody died, they owned the house, and the estate would sell the house. At that point, we would want to release the lien for that purpose. They will all be handled on a case-by-case basis where you can add and release the liens. That was a big modification. If approved, there would be about twenty-five thousand dollars in the Carver Heights CRA fund for the home rehab program and for the other TIFF's, he would say the same. The funding levels need to be looked at during the budget process to increase that funding. Step one is changing it. Step two is figuring out how much we want to fund and that will be handled during the budget process. The biggest changes are the money, the lien restriction, and the landscaping requirement. We added safety, fire, and carbon monoxide detectors as an additional requirement along with the no-match requirement. **Commissioner Reisman** inquired if this would be open to any Leesburg resident. **CM Minner** responded that it would be open to any Leesburg resident in the areas where we fund the program. If we increase the funding in Carver Heights, we could not use that money in the downtown or 441/27 CRA. Nor could the money be used outside. **Commissioner Reisman** confirmed that a resident who is of the county but lives in Leesburg cannot apply for it. **CM Minner** answered yes, the major changes are that you have to be a Leesburg resident and it has to be owner-occupied. Those are the primary criteria that we did not change. There were long discussions about that when we initially adopted the program. **Commissioner Pederson** commented about the cap and if they would approve the amount to be allocated during the budget process. He supports the program, but he was not comfortable with just giving the money away. He would like to propose a requirement of a ten percent contribution from the property owner. If they are unable to do that, then the city can put a lien on the property. Maybe they could make it a five-year lien and decrease it by twenty percent annually. He would like to see that built in. With those conditions, he could fully support it. **Commissioner Berry** said her thoughts behind this was that it would be a hand up for the community. The majority of the residents she spoke with do own their homes. These homes were built in the 1950's and early 1960's and they need to be repaired. Getting rid of blight is the first and major concern, along with enhancing home ownership. People will feel proud of what they own and they will feel more encouraged. Instead of adding code enforcement and assessing fees, we should help rehab the homes so people can keep their homes and continue to live on their fixed incomes. Throughout the community and especially in district one, there are more homes not up to code and they need assistance. This plan and grant program is excellent. The sad part is that most people do not even know about it. They have no idea how to go about getting this. This needs to be put out in the open for everyone to see. We need to provide the funds so they can make changes to their homes. This is a win-win all the way around, not only for district one, but for the City of Leesburg. **Commissioner Pederson** commented that he respects all the comments made, but for him to agree, the homeowner needs to have some skin in the game.

Commissioner Pederson made a motion to amend and require a ninety/ten grant program where the city would give up to twenty-two thousand dollars towards the home. If the homeowner cannot afford to do that, they would add a lien to the home for five years, which will decrease by twenty percent each year and Commissioner Reisman seconded the motion.

CM Minner wanted to clarify that he said twenty-two five and his suggestion would be that the maximum grant award be twenty-five thousand dollars with a contribution of ten percent of $2,500. That would make $27,500 for improvements. If they cannot bring cash to the table, then there would be a five-year lien applied to the home. If they sell the home, they will have to pay back a portion of that $25,000 and the lien would be reduced by twenty percent per year. **Commissioner Pederson** said he would agree to decrease it annually by twenty percent over five years.
CM Minner clarified that if the homeowner sells their house during the first year they would have to pay back one hundred percent, the second year would be eighty percent, and at the end of five years it would be removed. That is an easy motion that can be modified and adopted by this body. **Commissioner Berry** pointed out that putting liens on homes is another added pressure for people who cannot afford them. This would improve blight in the community and bring neighborhoods up to par. Then mainstream investors will want to come in and invest more. District one in itself has serious cases in that area that need to be rehabbed. When we assess the homeowners with coding, because they are not up to par, that puts added pressure on them. They cannot fix their homes now and then we are adding a fee. There are many lots in inventory and she would not want to do that. The process for not assessing the fees would be to help them rehab the home. If they could fix their homes financially, it would be done. She met with the residents on April 27th and out of forty-eight homes, twenty-eight homes were homeowners. They were very eager and excited that someone was even considering giving them some type of assistance. She did a survey and she received twenty-eight responses. That was over half of the surveys back that supported eagerness to improve the area. They realize that this was not how they wanted to live and they are not comfortable living like that, for many reasons. Each home and resident has a different story and this would be ideal for helping. She was not looking at this as a giveaway because it would increase the district as well as the city. **Mayor Burry** wanted to confirm that the current motion says instead of a twenty-five thousand dollar grant, we would give twenty-two thousand dollars and the homeowner would need to provide two thousand five hundred dollars or a lien would be applied. **Commissioner Pederson** added that the lien would be reduced by twenty percent each year over the five-year period. In other

words, if they cannot afford twenty-five hundred dollars and we give them the whole amount of twenty-five thousand dollars, they will be required to pay the city back some of that money if they sell the home over those five years. That way, the city gets back some of that money. We are improving the house and the neighborhood. It is not an unreasonable request. The prior grant program had a one hundred percent match and it was capped at five thousand dollars and the homeowner had to pitch in to match that amount. That is why it did not work. He is only asking for ten percent and if they cannot do it, then we will add a lien on the house and it will be extinguished in five years. If they sell the house in year three, they will pay forty percent back. **Commissioner Connell** wanted to know the criteria for qualifying. **CM Minner** replied that the information is already in the grant program. They have to be a homeowner-occupied, a resident of Leesburg and there are criteria that prioritize the grant. They have to be current on their taxes and there is an LMI element that is based on the HUD issuance of income, plus how many people are in the home. There can be no current liens or no code enforcement. From the audience, **HRM Clinton** said they will implement the program and they have other partners/agencies that have money for assistance. For instance, Habitat for Humanity has a grant that is designated strictly for Leesburg and Leesburg only and that will go towards some of the rehabs. After reading through the application, they identified along with Lake County Community Action that there may not be one resident getting twenty-five thousand dollars from the city, because they are getting assistance from other agencies. **CM Minner** stated there are other agencies that can help maximize the monies so they can get more dollars for rehabilitation of owner-occupied housing. **Commissioner Pederson** wanted to know if these grants go in different buckets? Will one guy get twenty-five as a gift and the other guy next door get something different? **CM Minner** said they will be on a sliding scale of zero to twenty five thousand dollars depending on who participates in each grant. **Commissioner Pederson** asked if the other programs have those types of requirements? **CM Minner** replied no, the other programs are in the city and the FSL grant does not have this requirement. **Commissioner Pederson** said he was referring to the other programs in the county. **CM Minner** replied no, because those are specific for housing. **Commissioner Pederson** asked if that was a one hundred percent grant. **CM Minner** responded that the housing program is different because there are different pots available. Depending on who we partner with and how we partner. He did not bring that up because it complicates the issue. There is a way to get more than twenty-five thousand for a house because we might mix habitat money with Leesburg money or they may just need a little bit of Leesburg money and get habitat money. There are different avenues that the housing department will be able to help individuals with. The big change is that we are going to try to advertise this program outside of the housing department, which we think will have better outreach. The modification for all practical purposes is a reasonable one because we still achieve Commissioner Berry's goal because we are working with people who are cash struck, who do not have any money, so if they cannot bring money to the table they will signup for the lien option. This is a reasonable compromise and it gets the program going. **Commissioner Berry** added that it says up to twenty-five thousand dollars and, based on the survey, she thinks it will depend on what the homeowners need to do. It may not be this amount. **Commissioner Pederson** said it is a ninety/ten percent split or the decreasing lien. **CA Watson** said he believes the motion made is okay because Commissioner Pederson clarified the ninety/ten percent issue and the motion on the floor is good. **Commissioner Reisman** wanted to make sure these would still come back to the CRA for approval. **CM Minner** stated each and every grant would come back. Now, if the homeowner puts in ten percent, that would make a total of twenty-seven thousand five hundred. If they want a ninety/ten program and if they cannot do that, there will be a lien applied. With the ninety/ten program, the maximum grant would be twenty-five thousand from the city and two thousand seven hundred and fifty from the applicant or any derivative of the ninety/ten program to get out of the requirement of a five-year lien. This might not be a twenty-five thousand dollar grant, it could be a twenty thousand dollar grant. **Commissioner Pederson** said he is flexible, but his intention was for a twenty-five thousand dollar grant and the homeowner would provide two thousand five hundred. If they need twenty thousand, the city will put in eighteen thousand and the homeowner will put in two thousand. **CM Minner** wanted to clarify that this was a ninety/ten grant or a five year lien.

Commissioner Pederson said yes, with a sliding twenty percent decrease each year. **CM Minner** stated if this was to be adopted they could write it up as that.

The roll call vote was:

Commissioner Pederson	Yes
Commissioner Berry	No
Commissioner Connell	No
Commissioner Reisman	Yes
Mayor Burry	Yes

Three yeas, two nays, the Commission amended the motion.

CM Minner informed them that the motion is amended to a ninety/ten program or a five-year lien with the other modifications that were made to increase the funding of the home program. They would now need to vote on the original motion as amended.

The roll call vote was:

Commissioner Berry	Yes
Commissioner Connell	No
Commissioner Reisman	Yes
Commissioner Pederson	Yes
Mayor Burry	Yes

Four yeas, one nay, the Commission adopted the resolution as amended.

7. INFORMATIONAL REPORTS:
The following reports are provided to the Commission in accordance with the Charter/Ordinances. No action required.

A. None

8. CITY ATTORNEY ITEMS:

CA Watson had no items to address this evening.

9. CITY MANAGER ITEMS:

CM Minner recognized a couple of items that the commission did this evening. First, the adoption of the new pay scale and the CBA's was really significant for the employees. He thanked the commission for its bold action. We knocked out a couple of items that were on the vision mission goal agenda list that was approved tonight. We modified the home grant, which was a great modification, and the commissary kitchen. Tonight was a big night.

10. ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Pederson complimented the department heads on the vision statement comments and input. When he went through it, he looked closely at all the input and comments. They were very much appreciated, respected, and helpful.

Commissioner Berry had no comment.

Commissioner Connell had no further comment.

Commissioner Reisman handed out maps of the downtown to the commission. He said he has been talking with the city manager about downtown parking enforcement. With the downtown growing and he knows there has been discussion in the past about enforcing legal parking, this is something we need to look into and we may have to have a study done. **CM Minner** remarked that Commissioner Reisman brought to this body the concept of enforcing "no parking" in the downtown. The city staff and former commissioners have been hesitant to do this due to the other side of the equation, which is the lack of parking in the downtown. The problem with enforcing parking in the downtown, whether it be metered parking or the number of non-conforming parking spaces that we have throughout downtown, specifically on Second Street and Third Street, where there is parking on both sides of the street on a two-way street. It leaves no room for two cars to pass each other because it created an aisle for only one car to get down. It also creates safety issues. So city staff went out and identified the areas. Commissioner Reisman has been talking to him off-line about this and it is something he would like this body to tackle. Staff wise, went out and examined the issue, and the map that was provided by Commissioner Reisman shows very rudimentary red dots in places downtown where parking spaces do not meet the standard and/or it creates safety hazards. There are twenty parking spots marked on the map. Now, we do have a lot of parking spots in the downtown area. There are about one hundred parking spots. However, if we want to have the correct adequate parking spots, parking safety and ease the congestion in the downtown, we would eliminate those twenty parking spots. If we were to remove the twenty parking spots in the downtown, he could guarantee that we have not heard anything yet with reference to there being inadequate parking. This concept deserves merit because there are ways to modify parking in the downtown that do not require removing the parking spots. The first thing would be making the streets uniformly one way. Where Second Street would go one way and Third Street would go the other way. If we create a situation where you have one-way streets, then potentially we will not lose so many parking spots and it will become safer to operate. The only way to tackle this is to have some significant studies done beyond what the public works director, city manager, and chief of police can do. They all do a pretty good job, but there are a lot of sticky wickets to this and it merits putting it in the FY-24 budget. It will make the process longer to address, but there is not a quick fix. Studies are expensive, but he would recommend a study be done on this. The costs could be anywhere between twenty-five and fifty thousand dollars. If we want to fix this issue right, we need that study done because there are other things that would go into a study; like the parking garage and if we need more parking. There could be other centralized parking areas that we can look at and, if there is a more uniform fix, then we can budget for that. He suggested if they are going to do this, that they take a step back and have a traffic engineer come in and analyze it. They will be the ones to provide some real solutions and then we can move forward with them. **Commissioner Pederson** remembered meeting with the community before covid hit about the downtown masterplan redevelopment and after covid it seemed to have gotten lost. It was moving forward very well and then it fell apart. Parking in the downtown was one of the priorities. It may have been number two or three. During the budget session this year he will bring that back up. **CM Minner** stated parking is a difficult issue and we need to talk to professionals. We have already invested millions of dollars in a parking garage and, unless it is Bikefest, that parking garage is ostensibly empty. He does not believe we have a parking issue. The issue is that people do not want to walk in the downtown. If you go to any other downtown area, like Washington DC, Orlando, Tampa, Tavares, or Mount Dora, you have to park a few blocks away unless you get lucky and it is no different here. The traffic engineers may have suggestions about how we can help with parking and that might include moving buildings to create a centralized parking lot. If we go down this parking path, which Commissioner Reisman brought to the

table, we need to take a step back and have the funds for a study done in the budget for FY-24. Once that study is done, we can really look at it. We need a traffic engineer, not the city manager, to find out if we have a problem or not. Studies have value and this is a complicated fix. If we go out and eliminate twenty parking spots to make two people happy, you will have two other people unhappy and we will be back in the same boat. Before we start anything, we need to get a grip on what the real problem is and how we need to fix it. We need a professional traffic engineer to do that.
Commissioner Pederson said that he used to work in the downtown and he is pro downtown. He agreed with all the comments, but we do not have a parking problem, we have plenty of parking. He has some ideas that are not that expensive and he will bring them to the budget session. He is laying the groundwork and he will push for some improvements in parking that will not cost a ton of money. **CM Minner** replied therein lies the problem. He may have a ton of ideas but they may be the polar-opposite of Commissioner Reisman's ideas. That is why we need a professional. Whenever we talk about traffic on any level, it becomes emotional. We have perceived problems, whether it be a traffic or road issue, but we are not traffic engineers. There are professionals that study this and they make the recommendations. If we want to tackle the downtown parking, we need to get professional help. **Commissioner Pederson** stated he was not talking about multi-million dollar projects, he just had a few ideas. In closing, he said whenever he comes downtown for lunch he walks about three blocks. He smiles because that means there are a lot of people downtown. **CM Minner** agreed. **Commissioner Connell** asked for clarity even though it was not being voted on if they were really considering in the upcoming budget to spend twenty five to fifty thousand dollars to address twenty parking spaces and which way the road needs to be? Whether it is one way or two ways? Why would we consider fifty grand for twenty parking spots? **CM Minner** answered that he would drill down into what a parking study would cost. He will propose that to the commission and they can say thumbs up or thumbs down to it during the budget process.

Mayor Burry had nothing further for tonight.

11. ADJOURN:

PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES NEEDING ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN ANY OF THESE PROCEEDINGS SHOULD CONTACT THE HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENT, ADA COORDINATOR, AT 728-9740, 48 HOURS IN ADVANCE OF THE MEETING.

F.S.S. 286.0105 "If a person decides to appeal any decision made by the Commission with respect to any matter considered at this meeting, they will need a record of the proceedings, and that for such purpose they may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based." The City of Leesburg does not provide this verbatim record.

Commissioner Reisman made a motion to adjourn and it was seconded by Commissioner Pederson. The meeting adjourned at 7:32 p.m.