**AGENDA**
**CITY COMMISSION MEETING**
**CITY HALL, 501 W MEADOW STREET**
**MONDAY, JULY 10, 2023 5:30 PM**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

**INVOCATION**

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

**2. PROCLAMATIONS:**

**A. None**

**3. PRESENTATIONS:**

**A. None**

**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.**

**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**

**A. CITY COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES:**

**1. Workshop held May 8, 2023 between the City Commission and the Center for the Arts**

**2. Vision Goal Setting Workshop held May 20, 2023**

**3. Regular meeting held June 26, 2023**

**B. PURCHASING ITEMS:**

1. **None**

**C. RESOLUTIONS:**

1. **Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida authorizing the Leesburg Fire Department to apply for and accept, and purchase, if awarded, a grant from the Florida State Fire Marshal's Office for the purchase of two (2) 30 lb Washer-Extractor designed to clean personal protective equipment to meet NFPA 1851 requirements; and providing an effective date.**

2. **Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida, executing and submitting the Certification of Taxable Value for Fiscal Year 2023-24 to the Lake County Property Appraiser; and providing an effective date.**

3. **Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida, granting to Leesburg Landing II Community, LLC, an extension of two years, for a total of six years from the date the agreement was entered into by the developer for installation of infrastructure, to report connections to new electric meters in its development known as Leesburg Landing Phase II, for purposes of determining if the developer is entitled to a credit per meter against the developer share of the difference in cost between overhead and underground service, or to apply to reduction of the amount of any bond placed with the City by the developer to secure its share of such costs; and providing an effective date.**

4. **Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida, Adopting a Policy for Issuing Proclamations; and providing an effective date.**

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

**A. SECOND READING OF ORDINANCES**

1. **An Ordinance of the City of Leesburg, Florida amending the City Code of Ordinances by amending Chapter 22, Section 22-7, Natural Gas Line Installation procedures; providing for severability; providing for inclusion in the Code of Ordinances; providing for conflicts; and providing an effective date.**

**B. FIRST READING OF ORDINANCES**

**1. An Ordinance of the City of Leesburg, Florida relating to the City of Leesburg Municipal Firemen' Retirement System; amending the Title of the Retirement System for the Members of the City of Leesburg Fire Department to be inclusive; amending the City of Leesburg Firefighters' defined benefit plan to implement the Heart and Lung Act and Firefighter Cancer presumption established by Sections 112.1816, 112.18, 112.181 and 175.231, Florida Statutes; Creating Section 2.4(B)(1) and (2) of the Retirement System relating to Line of Duty Disability benefits; providing for inclusion in the Code; providing for severability; and providing an effective date.**

**C. NON-ROUTINE ITEMS**

**1. None**

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

**A. Financial Reports as of April 2023**

**8. CITY ATTORNEY ITEMS:**

**9. CITY MANAGER ITEMS:**

**10. ROLL CALL:**

**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.**

**AGENDA MINUTES**
**CITY COMMISSION MEETING**
**CITY HALL, 501 W MEADOW STREET**
**MONDAY, MAY 8, 2023 5:00 PM**

## 1. CALL TO ORDER

The City of Leesburg Commission held a workshop meeting on Monday, May 8, 2023, at Leesburg City Hall. Mayor Burry called the meeting to order at 5:00 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. PRESENTATION:

### A. Center for the Arts Update

Mayor Burry asked the Center for the Arts board members to provide their presentation.

Amanda McLea, president of the Leesburg Center for the Arts, thanked the commission and staff for their time. They appreciate the city's continued support for the center. She asked the board of director members and the executive director to introduce themselves. **Ken Naigus**, said he was brand new to the board and is from Clermont. **Toni Stokes**, said she has been on the board for three years. **Richard Colvin** said he was the new executive director. **Joshua Floyd**, vice president, said he has been on the board a little over a year. **Dina Simpson**, said she has been a board member since 2019.

Mr. Richard Colvin thanked the commissioners for having them tonight. They are very mindful of the city's support. It is only because of the city's generosity that the building they occupy for the center is able to survive. He came to Leesburg for two reasons. First, he has an affection for the center and he was involved with some of the previous administrations. He has an affection for the art community in

Leesburg. He is determined that culture does matter. He believes art can transform lives and that is true of all art. Their specialty is visual art, but they will collaborate with all different arts and incorporate them into their educational mission and practice. He has been very fortunate as an artist and as a museum professional for over forty years to have a series of mentors. It is his hope to continue here in Leesburg and to give back some small part of what has been given to him.

Ms. McLea wanted to provide an update and share lessons that they learned over the last few months. They have taken steps to ensure that the center is operating with integrity, honesty, and transparency. They intend to move forward with that as their forefront for guidance to achieve success with their mission. One of the first things they did was update their financial policy. They have new procedures in place on spending limits for the executive director that do not require board approval. They have detailed what those purchases could be. It is very detailed in the specifics of the center. Therefore, any desired purchase outside of those parameters would need board approval. The board contracted with an accounting firm, Hammond, English, and Frazer Accounting, a local firm in Leesburg. There is a defined scope of work which includes a detailed process of how that accounting firm must report back with the financials to the board every month. This contract will be reviewed annually and the board will decide if they want to continue. That will be reviewed and they will look at its metrics for success. The entire board will now have access to the financial reports. There will be view-only access to bank accounts and QuickBooks online. They will be able to see all purchases being made moving forward. Their accountant will come and report to the board in person instead of reporting to one person directly. They are currently in search for a new treasurer. They had a treasurer who stepped forward. However, she has become a general board member and her line of work is in Maitland and that prevented her from taking the treasurer role. That will now be overseen by her along with the executive director. As the board chair, she worked very closely with Sasha Velez. She is the senior financial investigator with the Department of Agriculture law enforcement. Ms. Velez reviewed their policies and suggested changes be made. They took those suggestions and incorporated them into their new practice. She gained some knowledge of previous late filings and a history of improper documentation for the center. That was before they started over viewing the role that caused great problems in the past. They have now repaired that relationship. Ms. Velez offered ongoing assistance moving forward. She was happy to report that they are now in good standing with the Department of Agriculture. They will work together with the Department of Agriculture and it is very imperative to their status as a non-profit organization in Florida. Their Sunbiz account is being updated. Danielle Parker, who was the previous president of the board, recently resigned. So, they are in the process of updating all the officers' names so they are listed accurately. With the exception of adding Mr. Colvin, since he is the new executive director. She asked that Joshua Floyd address the changes to their bylaws.

Joshua Floyd, vice president, stated they took a comprehensive look at the bylaws near the end of last year. The bylaws have only been updated once since 1988, the inception of the bylaws. They went line by line through a comprehensive approach and made changes. Two significant changes that are notable would be; the limited power of the executive director, and the spending limits which are reflected in the financial policy. Those two changes were enacted and reflected in the bylaws. There is more control from the board and less control for the executive director. It provides more transparency about what is being conducted by the executive director. Those two changes have made some big improvements to the bylaws. It was a big step forward for them.

Ms. McLea mentioned as they move forward with the financial updates, they will be open financial reporting to both the community and the board. That will be done on a monthly basis. They will also be open to their stakeholders, who they value and that includes the city. Her mission as the president of the board going forward will be to keep the city updated financially and operationally with what is happening at the center. Some know her personally but she has been in Leesburg for over twenty years. She works at

Lake Medical Imaging. That is her career. She wanted to provide an opportunity for Dina Simpson, secretary of the board, to speak about their future because, as a business owner in this community, she has a vested interest along with great vision.

Dina Simpson, secretary of the board, stated there is no doubt that trust has been shaken. They recognize that rebuilding this trust is tremendously important to everyone. They plan to move forward with great integrity, to be reminded constantly of the meaning of integrity, the quality of being honest and having a strong moral uprightness. That is huge because she is right on Main Street every single day with the community and she has owned a business for six years. That is big. As Ms. McLea said they will provide complete open financial reporting to their board and stakeholders. They will continue to strengthen their board with professional development, including succession training. This was very important to her because, as a previous board member, no one ever taught her about being on a board. She was always in fear of taking an actual board position because no one ever taught her how. This is really important to all of them. There will be a succession, so that way, when someone drops off the board it is not anybody and everybody looking to pick up the pieces, that person will be trained in that position. A big thing they will do is choose the hard right instead of taking the easy wrong. That is something they have to do as members of the community. They need to build this community together with the city. They will stay focused on their missions. Their mission statement is to provide art education, awareness and opportunities for artists, creatives and dabblers in the North Lake County area. To enrich and inspire the community with art and culture and be the place for local artists, creatives and dabblers to gather, create and collaborate. They will focus on programming while working within their financial ability. They will stay involved in the community through community events. Support city leaders and their missions while collaborating with others to promote all art, not just visual art. She speaks for all of them when she says they are passionate about their future. She knows they have partnerships that bring enrichment to the City of Leesburg and art does transform lives.

Ms. McLea stated that concluded their presentation.

**3. ARTS BOARD / COMMISSION Q & A**

**Mayor Burry** asked about their partnership with the Department of Agriculture. In the letter he noticed the expiration date being June 9, 2023. That is only a month away. **Ms. McLea** answered there would be when they do their annual review. Every June they are required to renew their license and it was delinquent in October. When it was filed in November, it was filed incorrectly, so they had to make changes and refile it. In June they will need to renew it for the upcoming year. **Mayor Burry** wanted to know if they had already sent the necessary information for the review. **Ms. McLea** responded yes. **Mayor Burry** questioned if they had their EIN, federal tax determination, and if that was all squared away. **Mc. McLea** responded yes. **Mayor Burry** wanted to ensure their Florida tax exemption was current. **Ms. McLea** answered it was current. **Mayor Burry** commented that he heard they were updating their information on Sunbiz. **Ms. McLea** responded that Sunbiz is being updated from what they had last year. It still shows Danielle Parker as the president of the board and she is no longer the one. They also need to add Ken Naigus to Sunbiz. The paperwork has been completed, they are just waiting for it to clear the system. She checked today and it has not been updated yet. They updated that information late last week.
**Mayor Burry** stated he supports the arts, he is for the arts. He was not there to make any decisions or promises. He would need to see the completed investigation report because right now the only thing he has to go off of is the affidavit from the probable cause, which does not look good. He does not want to pass judgment based solely on that, so he would need to see the outcome from the Department of Agriculture. **Ms. McLea** said she spoke with Ms. Velez about that. She asked her to provide that information to both the city and them. That should come from that office soon.

**Commissioner Reisman** inquired if the investigation was completed. **Mayor Burry** replied that he had not seen anything. That was why he asked. **Commissioner Reisman** asked the city manager if he had received any updates. **CM Minner** answered no, he assumed it was completed. However, the Department of Agriculture handed it over to the Sheriffs Office because that was when charges were filed. **Ms. McLea** stated she knew Detective Neiman of the Lake County Sheriff's Office and Mrs. Velez was in contact. He disseminated the case to her and verbally they were fine with what had happened. She asked her to put that in writing to the commission.
**Commissioner Reisman** commented that he hates what happened to the art center because they became a poster child. He sits on another board and they learned a lot from this investigation. They changed a lot on the chamber board and so did the partnership board. They updated a lot of things after learning what happened to the Center for the Arts. If anything, this was a big learning lesson for everyone. With all the procedures and policies and leadership changes, he would be okay with moving forward with the civic funding. With the next civic funding, he will present something about how they handle civic funding in the budget. **Commissioner Pederson** remarked that he is a supporter. He was on the Leesburg Partnership board when the Center for the Arts was created. They voted to give them seed money and that started with Kathy Cook. He is a supporter and he is sorry about what happened. His position is that we do not penalize a 20-plus-year organization over one individual. They have his support moving forward.
**Commissioner Berry** mentioned that she supports this. She wanted to know if they have any other steps in place to share their plans so the commission knows what they are doing going forward. **Ms. McLea** answered it was like stopping the dumpster fire when this happened. They were focused on getting the financials under control. Obviously, the professional development side is very important because they need to train the board to ensure a strong board. They withdrew from several events over the past year due to cost outlays. **Ms. Simpson** mentioned that they have to stay within the budget and that is where they landed. Their desire is to reinvent the Art Festival and bring it back to Leesburg. They felt that was a crucial thing for the community. Over the weekend, on Friday night, they had an art exhibit opening and she had the pleasure of meeting Simone Richardson from Artists with a Purpose. She has huge visions and they have lunch scheduled. They want to collaborate with the arts, Ms. McLea sits on the Rotary Club as well as Sunrise. Dustin Levine also serves on the Rotary Club. He has performing arts at his purview. They want to collaborate with those arts and bring great things to Leesburg. They want to continue their mission and they are thankful for the involvement from city leadership.
**Commissioner Pederson** wanted to know if they were currently operating. He knows they are not doing many events, but are they operating in some capacity? **Ms. McLea** replied yes. She had to give all the glory to Mr. Colvin because he has done a fantastic job with their programming.

Richard Colvin stated the art with youth program has increased dramatically. They have twelve or thirteen participants on a weekly basis. They are continuing with programming for both children and adults, along with exhibitions for the public to view. They are trying to rebuild relationships. He knows Kathy Cook and when he worked in Eustis a few years back she came in and explained how everything goes. He also worked with Amy Painter. His goal is to repair the bridges and get back to a fully functioning organization. They would like to serve the community. **Ms. McLea** remarked that their paid membership is up, so financially they are stabilizing. **Commissioner Pederson** said he was curious about that because he had not seen specific numbers. He wanted to know if they had enough money to operate. Right now, the city plan is to go through the budget and that could take months before any money is sent in their direction. **Commissioner Reisman** pointed out that the commission held out ten thousand dollars from the last civic funding. It was ten or fifteen thousand until the commission decided it was okay to fund it. **Commissioner Pederson** commented that he supports releasing that money now. He clarified that they will go through the budget in July. It would take some time to approve new money, but he supports releasing it. **Ms. McLea** stated they intend to provide a budget to show where the civic funding monies will be spent. They will also report back to the city once that money has been spent. They will have a standard report going forward at whatever level the city requires. **Commissioner Reisman** pointed out that the money held was ten thousand six hundred and seventy dollars. **Commissioner Pederson** added that he had been a personal friend of the prior executive director. He wanted to know if she was involved in any capacity now? **Ms. McLea** replied absolutely not. **Mayor Burry** said to dovetail on Commissioner Pederson's question, we are a big supporter of the Center for the Arts and they were the victim. He wanted to know if their plan was to pursue criminal charges. **Ms. McLea** answered that the Center for the Arts is pursuing charges. **Mayor Burry** wanted to verify that this would not just go away. **Ms. McLea** said no. Her personal opinion on this is that it does not matter what the dollar amount was, even if it was a penny, if it is not yours, it is not yours. That is her take. As long as she is involved, it will be an absolute no. They will push for criminal charges. **Commissioner Pederson** remarked that things happen. He was on a board when something like this happened. It was embarrassing, but they made it right. He has been in their position and it is tough.

Commissioner Reisman made a motion to release the funds to the Center for the Arts and Commissioner Pederson seconded the motion.

Commissioner Reisman questioned if that motion was correct and if they could do that during a workshop meeting or if they needed to wait and do it during the regular meeting. **CM Minner** answered it needed to be done during the commission meeting. **Commissioner Reisman** stated he would bring it up during that meeting. **Ms. McLea** thanked everyone for the time. They encouraged everyone to go check them out. They meet on the third Wednesday of the month. She would be happy to send that information to the city manager so everyone can add it to their calendars. **CM Minner** stated if they want to do it by consent they can because the number is within his spending authorities. **Commissioner Pederson** mentioned even if they poll the commission now, they can walk out of the meeting knowing they will have the money. **Commissioner Reisman** wanted to confirm that under the consent of the commission he can release the FY-23 reallocation that was held. **CM Minner** said yes. **Commissioner Pederson** said he would support that. **CM Minner** remarked that it would not need a second because, if it is the general consensus of the commission that it needs to occur, that amount is under his spending authority, so he can release it. **Mayor Burry** said he would be a no until they see the final report. **CM Minner** pointed out that after reading the tea leaves he would get the money released. **Commissioner Reisman** said he was looking forward to the continued partnership with the Leesburg Center for the Arts.

**4. 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.**

The workshop adjourned at 5:23 p.m.

**MINUTES OF THE CITY OF LEESBURG COMMISSION**
**VISION/GOAL SETTING WORKSHOP**
**LEESBURG VENETIAN CENTER, 1 DOZIER COURT**
**SATURDAY, MAY 20, 2023**

The City of Leesburg Commission held a Vision/Goal Setting Workshop Saturday, June 20, 2023 at the Leesburg Venetian Center. Mayor Burry called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. with the following members present:

Commissioner Allison Berry
Commissioner Reisman
Mayor James Burry

Commissioner Jay Connell and Commissioner Mike Pederson were absent. Also present were City Manager (CM) Al Minner, Budget Director (BD) Brandy McDaniel, City Clerk (CC) J. Andi Purvis, and others.

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

**Vision/Goals:**

CM Minner stated this meeting would be informal to discuss the city. The city has been extremely fortunate over the last several years. There were a lot of things checked off the to-do list and now we need to load that up again. It is important to do this especially with the newer commission members. It is time to reset the clock and get back at it. A colleague recommended him to speak with a gentleman named Dr. Richard Levey. They met for lunch one day and he decided to hire him. He introduced Dr. Levey and his partner Dr. Joe Saviak.

Dr. Richard Levey appreciated the opportunity to be there. He and his colleague Dr. Saviak have academic careers and he is a twenty-year former city administrator in Florida. He has great appreciation for what everyone does at the city. He understands the challenges and struggles that that are faced daily at the city. He wanted to go through a few slides about the objectives of the day to day and how the city informed him about what success means. Dr. Svaiak will go through a presentation regarding some purposes and benefits of goal setting that will make things clearer about where the objectives are. He will explain the research process and their findings. They will revisit the city's mission, visions, and goals. They have flipcharts and they are asking to reaffirm what they heard during the interview process to nail down the priorities. It will be broken into short term (one to two years) and long term (three to five years). They are more focused on the budget and execution of the shorter timeframe. Today is about identifying what the one-to-two-year priorities are and the three-to-five-year priorities. They are here to facilitate; they do not provide any expertise they just help extract the important issues and priorities.

**Defining Success of Workshop**:

They broke the findings into two groups the department heads/staff and city commission. With their findings they believe the city is inline with their expectations. They want to define success and develop a consensus and collaboration. We would like to establish clear priorities. Referring to slides, he said when they reviewed the findings, one commissioner mentioned improving communication and that was listed in the context of establishing priorities and collaboration. That number could easily be moved and become a four, but because they used different language, they recorded it as such.

**Purpose and Benefits of Goal Setting:**

Dr. Joe Saviak stated he had a quick overview. They all know long term success is not an accident and long-term success in not an unplanned event. It is sound, data driven with well selected objectives. It includes planning and rule setting. Particularly it helps forge the future. There are a lot of issues that cannot be anticipated and we cannot plan for them. We can identify opportunities to optimize and identify threats and risks to litigate or prevent. Once they have selected goals to focus on, it will be a matter of organizing around those goals so the systems, policies and procedures, budget, personnel and technology facilities that. It will enable them to achieve what they are aiming for. They will be able to design the future; however, there are things that are uncontrollable.

Now, what are the specific and well documented benefits for reviewing this today, why is it a best practice, and why is it highly recommended for government to engage in this process? It is for clarity. Organizations have well defined tools. They make measurable, tangible and positive progressions from that. This provides an opportunity for clarification about where to go as an organization and policy makers. It will provide more clarity on what the current mission/vision objectives are. Planning is a tool that will optimize the effective and efficiency of the organization because there are goals and they can reorganize the goals. The objectives and outcomes of this will make them more efficient. In Florida, the local level of the organization is in a high service demand, high growth, capped revenues with limited ad valorem and the number of funding sources. This session will help to be as sufficient as possible. Individuals who have mission tend to be more energetic and enthusiastic. It is a booster to focus the organization around specific mission goals. Everyone needs to know what they are trying to get done, what they want to achieve and where they want to go. They need a point of journey and a destination.
It will help to attract more resources. Once the community understands what the city is trying to do and how much it will benefit them it will become easier to attract different types of funding streams. Public confidence right now is a challenge for government particularly at a development level. They need to have the public’s trust and confidence. If there is a clear plan with specific goals you will achieve the results and that will in turn boost public trust and confidence in the city. When designing the future there are still things that cannot be anticipated or plan for. When introducing and leading change the key thing for local government is to identify opportunities to design and implement successful change.

**Initial Data Collection:**

Dr. Levey stated there were two assessment interviews, one with the department heads and the other with the city commission. The management was done by zoom and the city commission interviews were done face to face.

There were some additional data and they scoured through the city website and social media. They looked at the current city budget and watched a number of city commission meetings to get a feel and flavor of the interaction between the city commission, staff, and the community. They researched the financial performances and took some social economic data from the US Census and the University of Florida. They took reports from other data sources to help understand the community. The interviews/research process consisted of four questions. They asked questions about expectations and this exercise will bring those into alignment. They abbreviated some of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) analysis where they asked about priorities; infrastructure, public policy, and internal capacity. They were asked to prioritize those categories. Today those findings will be answered. He wanted to comment on each of the questions to provide a sense for why the numbers do not add up to sixteen or five. It is because these were open-ended questions and people may have multiple answers for a particular question. He thought it was important to mention that for the record. There was no limit to the responses for each component of the SWOT analysis. With the top priorities, capital projects and internal capacity some people did not include or have three answers for those. There were a couple individuals who did not have answers for one or more of the categories so that affected the end findings and scores. With the top overall three priorities, someone picked their top three which was not mentioned in the earlier questions for their three top priorities for capital programs and internal capacity. They said human nature and that should be recorded because it was an important finding. He wanted to let them know so they did not wonder why the numbers did not match or make sense. That was because some of the characteristics in how the questions were answered that influenced the findings.

The first question of the SWOT analysis, was to answer strengths, weakness, opportunities and threats. There were a lot of one scorers and they felt it was not important to report back on the those. However, they included them in the final report. In terms of understanding the top scores they thought the ones with a score of one from the department heads were not that important for recording purposes, but they did record the commissioners. In the priorities, they did show every department head’s answer. There were a lot of them and they felt it was important to show those.

The top scores went from geographic location to the lakefront. They heard it a lot because of where this city sits geographically in this state between the two coasts. It is centrally located between Jacksonville and Tampa. There are roadway networks and an access to the turnpike. All the aspects of the physical/geographic location everyone felt was an asset and an important strength of the city. When thinking about economic development strategies and growth strategies, we find that to be an important component. The department heads saw quality of service. In the number two position was fiscally sound and they found that on both sides from both groups. The whole responsiveness of citizens quality of services was conveniently grouped together but answers were expressed differently so they separated them. Leadership is an important response to this and they got a sense of what people view as strengths of the city, but the geographical location came out loud and clear.

For weaknesses, throughout the process from the department head side was the pay classifications for recruiting, retaining, and compensating employees. That was the top issue. Through this experience twelve out of sixteen department heads scores remarked high. That is not uncommon to see in this state from elected officials and leadership. Internal staff tends to focus more on the internal operations issues. They are not saying that paying classifications are an issue to city commission but they heard that linger through the priorities. In terms of weakness the commission seemed more externally focused than the staff. That is completely understandable and it makes perfect sense. They heard from staff about software and that will be something to address because it affects the perception of internal efficient operations. The homeless/crime issue was a top issue for the city commission. Four out of five thought it was the top weakness of the city. The scores for quality of the economic base were common along with traffic. They saw that in common for both sides. It was interesting to see external marketing/communications being a weakness. They heard the city does not do enough to tell its story externally to the community or marketing the city. Opportunities and the ability to grow seem to be the number one opportunity of the commission and department staff. Leesburg is very unique in this state on growth because there are a lot of the issues to be dealt with. From department head’s they heard about opportunities dealing with the physical location of the city and the amazing lakefront aspect to the community. They have an opportunity to take advantage of that. That is an economic development message they hear when transitioning the context with the natural environment. On the department head side growth and external marketing issues came up. The commission side expressed concerns about interest and opportunity for growth, the quality of jobs and high value of jobs were mentioned. With sports tourism they saw opportunities. There is a possibility to cleanup some of the transportation issues. When it came to threats, he spoke with the city manager about the process of making sure that there was a collective understanding of threats to the city long-term. New state legislation needs to be watched because over the last several years the states presumption of local government has been that a city does not rank as a threat. The state has been revamping their tools for local government to manage resources. With the poverty/crime rate and socioeconomic/household income those could be combined. The department heads concern was about the quality of the economic base, competitive wages, and job growth. They also want to ensure a robust private sector employment base. There are paying classification issues that showed itself with the ability to recruit and retain employees. US-27 was a concern and it will come up under priorities. The department heads mentioned the quality of K-12 schools. Even though the city does not have control, the quality of the school systems does affect the future growth of the community. They looked around the state and the involvement between the schools and municipalities vary. The city needs to do what it can to influence the quality of K-12 education because that is the future. There were concerns about the city and county relationship from department heads that did not come up under the city commission. The big thing from the commission were the state regulations.

**Research Findings:**

In terms of top priorities, they broke that out into three groups; capital projects and programs, internal capacity, and overall priorities. The first finding is capital projects and as the city manager mentioned they are trying to gain some consensus of potential budget issues as they move into the budget process. With the department heads they saw a lot of stormwater and wastewater utility expansion, that was a top priority, along with the roads. Roads are an issue because the two of the biggest corridors are not city responsibility. They are FDOT's responsibility. Just like the schools that is not a city responsibility either but we see the consequences of those issues. Across the state a lot of cities are stepping in and partnering with FDOT to try and solve some of the roadway capacity issues. On the commission side, the Susan Street and recreational facilities came through loud and clear. They are advancing those and he believes they just received some county TDC funding for that. That project is advancing but they found not much more consensus on the other capital projects. There were a lot of ideas. However, Susan Street was the top priority. There were a lot of scores in the area of capital projects, they recorded the department heads scores that received a one. Sidewalks/pedestrian safety, EV charging stations, a public safety training complex, and the airport had some ideas and priorities. They showed those to reflect that they were mentioned but they did not highly score enough to make the top priorities.

With programming, on the city commission side they saw code enforcement and eliminating blight. That came through very clear. Along with improving the quality of neighborhoods and commercial corridors. Traffic operations again have issues because the city does not have control over the roads so you suffer the consequences of traffic moving through the city. It is not all generated here but a lot of it moves through the city. That is a top priority to focus on. It may be solved by a collaboration with the state. He did not believe it will be solved without it. Beautification is an outgrowth of code enforcement and eliminating blight. If they put those two together the commission is completely inline with that problematic issue. Some of the individual answers that had no secondary were marketing/external communications, special events, youth programs, housing, and sports tourism. The department heads findings were lakefront entertainment and restaurants. They heard a lot of people visit the Ski Beach Restaurant. However, there are other problematic things that are important. They can take advantage of the city's location whether it be commercial activity, a fishing tournament or other aspects of programming that appear as opportunities for the city due to its geographical location. Affordable housing, they heard was an important issue. Downtown businesses, recruiting, recreational programs and sports tourism were among some of the findings.

When it comes to internal capacity, the commission had a solid awareness of the importance of employees, especially recruitment and retaining. No organization, public or private, works without their employees. This says everyone cares about the ability to hire and retain employees. That was a great finding. They saw the same thing from the department heads. Beyond that there were individual answers from the commission with individual scores. With department heads they heard software was an issue in terms of the age of the existing financial, HR type software programs. Multiple departments felt that technology might improve operations, external communications and marketing also had high scores from department heads. What the commission saw as an important priority was making sure they are reaching out to the community effectively. They also saw economic development plan and strategic planning as important issues. Single scores from department heads were Wi-Fi hotspots, cell phone service for inspectors, computer aided dispatch through public safety and increase of planning and zoning fees.

Under question number three they received a lot of ideas as priorities.

On the commission side they have a lot of answers but none came with a high priority score. The pay and classification received a two out of the commission. After that building/facility security came up but that was not listed as a priority, it was just raised. With department heads it was the pay and classifications that need to be addressed. The utilities and technology were a consistent theme. They were not surprised that technology did not come up from the commission side because it always comes up on the staff side. That is because the employees work in the systems every day. Third place was lakefront, then external communications/marketing, roads, and employee training. They also saw building and security even though it had a score of one from the commission and a two from department heads.

**Mayor Burry** mentioned under the top priorities and capital projects, Leesburg is a utility company that happens to run a city. Looking at the responses from what he calls the utility company versus the city everything on the utility company side is utility company. Whether that be wastewater utility expansion, roads or street lights. The commissions side are big projects, the fun glittery stuff. We have to recognize the utility side drives the bus from a money perspective and their interest on the utility side is different as a commission. It is too bad that some of the things are not on both sides, but they need to be cognized of that. **Dr. Levey** said when they spoke, he provided that observation and he recorded it the day they spoke. He found it to be an interesting comment. Yes, with a city of this size they are very unique to have the utility operations. They are very fortunate to have that and obviously it is a unique source of revenue. Sometimes they may not think about that when asked about what your capital priorities are and you may take it for granted that the revenues are sitting there to fund capital projects. The department side the aggregation of the priorities were fairly consistent. However, the commission side had a lot of different ideas about what the priorities are. The second part of this session, will be flip charts to reaffirm and build some consensus around which of these are top priorities. That will give staff direction to build their budget representing the priorities.

**Mission, Vision and Goals:**

With the mission, vision, and goals which is documented and taken from the budget, everyone was asked if they had any comments or concerns about it or if they would like to make any changes. They only heard one comment about sustainability. That the mission, vision, and goals did not really reflect sustainability. When that was drafted sustainability may not have been a hot issue. Other than that, they heard fairly clear that everyone was comfortable with the mission, vision, and goals statement.

**Overall Priority Ranking by Goal:**

They assigned a priority to the five goals. They need to make sure there was alignment in the priorities with mission, vision and goals. It will be an interesting exercise to do later once they have established the priorities. Then they will refer back to the mission, vision and goals statement once the projects align with the goals and programs. It really is about organizational continuity and a specific high-level direction. The annual budget will be executed based on capital programs, internal capacity and projects. It will be in alignment from the findings.

The commission recessed at 9:45 a.m. and reconvened at 10:00 a.m.

Dr. Levey wanted to review the top four priorities and they could combine the capital programs by capacity or go through the list individually. This was the commissions opportunity to say yes and what their thoughts were or if they have other ideas. They can share their more important items. They will review the one-to-two-year goals first because they are short term and those can be dealt with in the next fiscal year budget. There could be items they want to deal with immediately. Then they can review the long-term goals which are the three to five years.

It is an open forum for the commission to share and hear from staff. If there are questions on the projects and what those mean. There maybe more information that is meaningful to understand exactly what each item means, with the scale, scope of costs, time and ability to execute. **Mayor Burry** opened this up for discussion. **Commissioner Reisman** asked which chart they should put their suggestions? **Dr. Levey** answered with the commission there are so many ideas that only one commissioner mentioned and they are hoping to come away from this with a smaller list. They can talk about what they think is important because it is important to record them. Each person can talk about what is important to them. They can discuss a timeframe and at the end we can circle back for affirmation. **Commissioner Reisman** stated his first priority would be the pay and employee recognition, because without employees we do not have a city. **Dr. Levey** asked if he considered that a short-term goal. **Commissioner Reisman** replied yes. We are growing rapidly so infrastructure needs to be a major priority. **Dr. Levey** pointed out that was an ongoing issue. He wondered if there was a certain aspect of infrastructure, utility, roads or parks that needs addressed? **Commissioner Reisman** answered he would leave that to the experts.
**CM Minner** added that he would put it on both charts. Under the one-to-two-year time frame they can talk about CUP's, the wastewater treatment plant expansion and wastewater collection. On the long-term chart, it would be the electric expansion because that is more substation stuff. Since he has been here, they have done well on the special commission fun projects. From the list they can see that they have gotten behind on the meat and potatoes; the pay, infrastructure, security issues, and those types of things. There are security issues at all the facilities especially city hall. The employees talked about it a few years ago and it has picked up again. Security issues will be a big number, but it does need to be addressed. **Commissioner Reisman** pointed out under that is the livability of the facilities. With people on top of each other, upgrades to the facilities where the employees work and just for morale. Our recreation facilities are both one to two and three to five years with the sports tourism side of it. **Dr. Levey** mentioned there are good facilities and they are improving them. Did he want to see a continuation of expanding parks and recreation facilities? **Commissioner Reisman** indicated that it would be improving and growing. **Dr. Levey** inquired when he says facility, did he mean city hall or multiple city offices? **Commissioner Reisman** said all facilities. They should meet with all the department heads because there are certain facilities lacking.
**Commissioner Berry** added crime prevention and homeless as top priorities. **Dr. Levey** said he also heard sports tourism from someone. **Commissioner Reisman** replied that falls under recreational facilities. **Dr. Levey** replied that it could also be an economic development and

marketing program, so that should be separated out. **Mayor Burry** said for him it is the economic drive and that is why people want to come here. Why else are people from out of town coming to Leesburg. There are other ways that can happen and we need more. Whether it be bass fishing or the Big 10 softball tournaments. They did not intently draw the path and make it come but that is where we ended up. Now, we need to capitalize on that. **Dr. Levey** commented that sometimes the greatest economic successes are accidental. Its not dumb luck, but it happens. **Mayor Burry** stated they need to recognize that and make sure they capitalize on it. **Commissioner Reisman** mentioned that he does not think our city has a true identity. **CM Minner** pointed out that we are the Lakefront City. **Dr. Levey** stated for the people that live here or work here they get it, but around the state or country people may not have heard that. The idea of advancing that idea does capture external marketing. **CM Minner** said that was an important, and to be honest, that is one of his biggest weaknesses, the lack of marketing because he is not a marketing guy.
He wants to get a move on that and get it done. Over the past ten years we have seen a lot of stuff getting done. It was not until recently that people have been saying Leesburg has been doing stuff. However, we do have a marketing approach but if that is important to the commission at this stage, they can spend one hundred and seventy-five thousand dollars a year on marketing. LakeFront TV does have a good product, but their media is bad. He received an email from Commissioner Reisman, it was a Facebook ad from Mount Dora, and he said it would be nice if the city did this. He believes the funds are there it is just a matter of redistributing funds or adding to them. While driving in, he was thinking about that and wondered if they need to go back to a PIO position or bring on a marketer. Either way, marketing does need to be reviewed.

**Mayor Burry** said in the sports world we have one. Allison Strange does that for us. **CM Minner** added that he sees us in competition with our sister cities, but with Mount Dora we talk about that city a lot because they seem to have their special notch. Tavares has done a fantastic job, along with Clermont. That is our competition. There are other cities in the county but when people talk about marketing in Lake County, we think about those three cities. **Chief Hicks** said he has been coming to Leesburg for fifty years. He did not live here until thirty-five years ago. Leesburg’s identity when he was a kid was citrus first, then fishing, and those were the massive things. There is no identity for Leesburg because they interact with people from all over the state and country and to the smallest degree people know Leesburg for Bikefest. That is a bit of our identity and that is what people recognize Leesburg for. Fishing tournaments are coming back and he was curious to know what everyone’s thoughts would be if they were going to brand this and get an identity. They are a lakefront city because there is not a lot to do unless you go out on the lake. If we change that what would the identity be moving forward? **Mayor Burry** said not to bugaboo the name but when we talk about the lakefront city here it is. It’s the Venetian Gardens and a majority of our coastline for the city is on Lake Griffin. Right now, we do not do anything with it. You cannot go eat on that lake anywhere. Maybe when we get that RV glamping park there will be a place. That is another reason we should embrace that because that is a reason for someone to pull their camper into Leesburg and eat at the restaurants, they will spend some money and then get in their camper and go home. **Dr. Levey** asked if that was Lake Griffin. **Mayor Burry** replied that is a hidden gem. **Dr. Levey** answered maybe that is not something they want to address immediately, but something they can start thinking about to strategize and take advantage of Lake Griffin. **Mayor Burry** stated if he had a whole host of time and money, he would be thinking like the resort guys because Lake Griffin is untouched.

There is great fishing, great outdoors and bird watching at Emerelda Island. There is a lot of stuff to do out there. However, there is no place to eat on Lake Griffin. **Dr. Levey** asked if this was something worth putting on the list. **Mayor Burry** said it was an idea and he did not know what the city could do other than to promote the resort that will go in there, but there is still a big chunk of land on US 411.

**CM Minner** remarked that he would add in perspective of the image of being a lakefront city is that you do not have to live on the lake. He thinks they have the platform and the mayor went out in the details for Lake Griffin, but in Sabastian the slogan was Life on the Lagoon and nobody lived there. A very few lived on the intercoastal, but lagoon was the lifestyle. Everyone would go out to the intercoastal and that was a big part of how Sabastian was. The lakefront city has the same concept. Everyone knows that lakes are about the lifestyle. Everyone goes out to the lakes whether it is a restaurant, even if you do not live in Palmora Park, you can still put your boat in the water there. He believes that the lakefront city is Leesburg because of the lifestyle. Then we get into the sports tourism thing. Even though it is the lakefront city you will still go to sleepy hollow to play baseball or go to Susan Street to do rectangle sports. That is all lakefront lifestyle. That was the concept for building the Venetian Center. People could walk into it and feel like you are in a big barn on the lake with the waves of the water in fountain. **Commissioner Berry** asked from a marketing perspective could they bring Berry Park into the marketing? It would be inviting for all to come and maybe recreate that. Some people do not have boats and there needs to be something inviting for them. She looks at the park as a hidden treasure. For Lake Griffin there is a nature trail you can walk and take pictures. Families can come have picnics and camp. Things of that nature. Lakefront is great and everyone knows about fishing and Bikefest. However, how can we market other things that Leesburg has to offer.
**Dr. Levey** said that is a good comment. They listed several marketing ideas and developing a brand of the city as a priority. Staff can then follow up if they agree it is a priority and how are they going to fund it to appeal to a broader community. That could fall in if they list it as a priority in the budget process. They could identify that and staff can bring you a budget that has some resources allocated to that. **One man** mentioned they are referring to all different types of tourism. For instance, he is from St. Augustine and history is their brand. They are very rich in history and heritage along with the African American community. They specifically focus on that to bring in visitors to that community. People like to see and experience their heritage.
**Dr. Levey** heard a lot about code enforcement, beautification and clean-up. However, he was sure the city was already doing a lot of that. **CM Minner** said the big word for that is redevelopment, workforce housing, infrastructure expansion, fixing the corridors and helping with the home grant program for redevelopment. With the mission statement, he thinks it just needs to be freshened up. They are still a community energetically working in collaboration to ensure that the City of Leesburg upholds its history, ambiance, and natural resources to become and stay a vibrant community. The mission is to provide efficient and effective municipal services that promote public safety, economic growth, and quality of life. That is how we get there. There are five items recommended and everything on there was said before. When it comes to pay classifications, they could have that fixed by June. They have the plan already going. They talked about gas because that is humungous and we need more infrastructure. The only other thing to look at are the planning issues that are associated with new growth. We have the comp plan coming up, we have the growth in the south and redevelopment.

**Commissioner Berry** asked where they put the marketing brand and what number was put to that. **Commissioner Reisman** said it was number four. **CM Minner** stated they do not have to categorize the priorities where it is one project first and then another. They can do a million things at one time; we just need to have the master plan to know what needs to be done. There was a feel for what is getting done and what we want to do and some will take some time. They can take the charts back, link it together in a resolution for the commission to approve. **Dr. Levey** said it reflects the information they collected through their processes. He thinks the city manager shortcut it and ran with it. **Dr. Saviak** said with the paying classification that should be tackled first because they will have secondary fiduciary effects on the other problems. By reducing blight and increasing the beautification in the city they have that tackled and hire more people. That was why it scored high from both commissioners and department heads. If we had more people, we could tackle the homeless issue which will drive all the other issues. **Chief Hicks** added that crime and homeless should not be paired, they are two different things. It would go in the blight column and it should be addressed. **CM Minner** said number three should not include crime and homelessness. They should call it providing public safety and under that would be a subsection for more police officers, a substation, good training and everything that gets chopped out of the budget. Crime and homeless are a sub element of that.

**Commissioner Reisman** asked if structure expansion was a high priority for the department heads, the ERP software or technology in general. **CM Minner** said they would need another technology bullet point if they want to do that. He would make technology improvements a separate category because when talking about structure expansions we do not think about technology. **LD Gangone** said it was a matter of training. If they had the training to use the software it may be perfectly fine, but the people that knew how to use it are gone and the new people do not have the training. Maybe if they can train everyone who uses it all the time that would help. **ITD Anthony** replied over the years, with budget issues, it seems that training goes up because he cannot send three of his people to a conference. With the resource issues it is difficult to pull people out of their day-to-day work volume to throw them into training. We have twenty city buildings and three employees; it is just too hard. When they rolled out the new user interface to the current system, they left what they call the character base user interface. It took a longtime for IT to wean folks off that character base interface. They were comfortable with it because they had been using it forever. **CM Minner** stated that is why they are going to put technology back under infrastructure.

**Mayor Burry** commented when looking at the overall priorities and moving forward he thought about House Bill 1331 and Senate Bill 1380. Everyone should be very familiar with both of those so when conversations come up you can articulate why they are terrible ideas. If those pass all our goals will change because we will not be doing business the same way anymore. If you like how we do business now, you need to verse yourself with those bills. We need to make sure that Keith Truenow, our house of representative, knows they are a terrible idea. We need to hit up the county commissioners as well. If these things happen our utilities would be shuttered, closed or sold off, and we will go to a completely different model for running the city.

**CM Minner** thinks the time has been spent well and the commission needs to ensure some of the subsets to memorialize where they are heading. From that overall SWOT analysis more people were in alignment than what he thought he would see. They need to put everything together in a resolution to bring back. A summary and a resolution that states these are the things this body will be working on over the next one to five years pursuant to our mission statement. They relate to our existing mission statement so we will be reaffirming our mission statement. Then there will be the subcategories to be worked on. If Allyson Strange comes back to the commission, it will not be a surprise. For him this was a good exercise. **Dr. Levey** thanked everyone for their time.

**ADJOURN:**

The meeting adjourned at 10:38 a.m.

________________________________
James A. Burry Jr., Mayor

**ATTEST:**

________________________________
J. Andi Purvis, City Clerk

**AGENDA MINUTES**
**CITY COMMISSION MEETING**
**CITY HALL, 501 W MEADOW STREET**
**MONDAY, JUNE 26, 2023 5:30 PM**

## 1. CALL TO ORDER

The City of Leesburg Commission held a regular meeting on Monday, June 26, 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. None**

## 3. PRESENTATIONS:

**A. None**

## 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.**

Gary Custer, 8909 East Treasure Island Avenue, stated he was there to discuss CR 44. Referring to photos he provided to the commission, he said the first photo was from August 2022. It showed CR 44 flooded from the development on top of the hill which is known as Silver Lake Pointe. Now, eleven months later, they are having the same issue. This is an engineering problem. He spoke to the city about it, he has also talked to the county about it and nobody seems to be able to resolve the issue. He brought the pictures in so everyone could see what they were dealing with. A vehicle could come over the hill on CR 44 when it is flooded and hydroplane and it may cause an accident. He provided pictures that showed the rain washing across both lanes on the road. It has clay in the water running down both sides of the road. The road is red and dirty. That is how much clay has been washed down the hill. It washes all the way down the hill and it goes into the swamp. That sediment will plug that swamp. In turn, that causes no drainage, which will lead to stagnant water. It is a mess out there and nobody wants to do anything. He spoke with the city manager and was told that someone was going to come out. That someone was going to talk to the people and solve the problem. The way they resolved the problem was to build a dam across the driveway, so the water would be redirected. However, that did not do any good. The first time they did that, it washed out. It washed all the way down the hill and the same thing is happening now. It is a problem. He does not know who will solve this issue, but someone needs to do something before there is an accident. Who will be responsible then? It may be the developer, but the city approved it so someone needs to fix it. Please address this issue. **Mayor Burry** asked if he was concerned about the runoff coming out of the driveway? **Mr. Custer** answered the runoff would not come out of the driveway if it was designed right. It was designed wrong. He went and looked at the back side of the development. You can go through Silver Lake and come up to the backside of this development to look at it. They created a retention area and they dug down through the clay layer to make retention that would perk away. That is the way to do it. There is a paved cul-de-sac constructed on top of the hill in this development. He understands how things work. Water channels down and it comes to the cul-de-sac where it is supposed to drain away. If you look at the cul-de-sac there is dirt on both sides, it is tiered. It fills up before it can drain away. Who will want to live there with a pond out front that they have to drive through? He did not know how long it took to perk away, but when he went back there the other day he could see where it was flushing away. It needs to be redesigned so water goes the other way. No water should come out on to the road. The Planning and Zoning Director stated at a previous meeting that all retention needs to be retained on the property. That is according to the PUD, but that does not happen here, so someone needs to figure it out and fix it. **Commissioner Pederson** said he was confident that they would get it right. He remembered talking about this before and projects do have to be self-contained. There have been some minor complaints about other projects with similar issues, but the water was not running out on to a road this busy. He believes the developers will get that fixed. He appreciated that he brought it to their attention. **Mr. Custer** pointed out that this issue has been going on for eleven months. **Commissioner Pederson** answered that this developer will get it right.

Ray Hayden, 35121 Dennis Road, stated in relation to this, there are gas lines being buried on CR 44. On his way to the meeting he looked over and saw that there was an issue with a community which was built years ago. The runoff from the new development will come down to that area and go into that development. The development he was referring to was there before he moved in 2018. He saw how some stuff was being done with the burying of the gas pipe. He can see how the water will run down to the older development. With the front of the new development and the driveway, he noticed last time how bad it was. He went and looked at it again and saw what they did to try and fix it. There are two big channels on each side of the driveway. What happens when those fail? He saw both washouts. It does not just run down the driveway. It is coming down in front of the first fix and washes it out. This can be seen in the images provided by Mr. Custer. It came down so fast that he recorded it and put it on YouTube. The images provided were from that video. It came down and spread across the entire road. They can see red clay canals on both sides of the road. He had another video where they saw a truck driving through it and he had huge rooster tails of red clay flying from the back of the truck. That truck was on the east side of the road. The water will drain on to CR 44 and go down to the older development. They can see the lake from that property at the back of the development on top of the hill. That is the high point, so any water that comes down will not go into the filtration system. He has the impression that they will make another one a little lower, but anything that goes past it comes right out on the road. There is no way to stop the water. He does not see a real way to successfully stop it from running. They will keep their eyes out on this and report back on what they know.

Joannie Smalley, Leesburg Partnership, 1002 South 9th Street, reminded everyone about the Fourth of July events. The City of Leesburg Fourth of July celebration will be Tuesday, July 4th. It will include a kids' zone and food. The entertainment will start at three o'clock at Ski Beach and fireworks follow at nine o'clock. There is a Lightning baseball game set for 5:30 p.m. She hopes that everyone comes out. They will publish the parking and traffic changes for this event within the next couple of days.

Cressida Foster, 2106 Woodland Boulevard, stated she resides in the Woodland Park community. They are having issues with homeless people standing in the woods around their homes. They come into their neighborhood and take things that do not belong to them. In her little corner, everyone is mostly eighty plus years old. She will protect her neighbors anyway she can. She would like the city to address this issue because something needs to be done. They need to keep them out.

**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.C.1 - Voting Delegate Designation for the Florida League of Cities (FLC) Annual Conference
5.C.3 - Review the Basis of Design Report to add a Fluoride Injection System to the Water Distribution System and discuss further action

Commissioner Pederson moved to adopt the Consent Agenda except for 5.C.1 and 5.C.3, 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 June 12, 2023**

**B. PURCHASING ITEMS:**

**1. None**

**C. RESOLUTIONS:**

**1. Voting Delegate Designation for the Florida League of Cities (FLC) Annual Conference**

**ITEM TABLED**

Commissioner Reisman introduced the item. CC Purvis read the title.

CM Minner explained that each year the Florida League of Cities conducts their annual conference and this year it will be held in Orlando. Typically, one or two members of the commission attend that meeting. As part of the process, during the business meeting at the conference, there is a delegate appointed from each city there. However, as of today, no one from the commission has signed up for the conference. The purpose of this is to designate one commission member. They just need to formally recognize whoever goes and the authority could be given to him. They would write a proclamation for that person authorized. If there are two members, it may have to come back before this body. This was meant as a reminder showing it was coming up. **Commissioner Pederson** pointed out that he was the designee, but the conference would be held during the budget sessions, so he was not planning to attend. He asked if anyone was planning to attend. **CM Minner** responded that he does not attend conferences. However, it would not be a big deal if no one attended. If someone does attend, they just need to make sure that person is the designated delegate. **Mayor Burry** wanted to confirm it would be held on August 12th. **Commissioner Pederson** agreed it would be Wednesday, August 12th, and there was a budget session the day before and the day after. **CM Minner** stated if anyone wanted to go they could get with his office. They would get them registered. If an issue arises, they will bring it to their attention. **CC Purvis** pointed out that the budget sessions are held in July and the conference is in August. **Commissioner Pederson** thought it would be held on July 12th. He will go back and look at his calendar. **Mayor Burry** suggested they could table this issue.

Commissioner Reisman made a motion to table this until the next meeting and Commissioner Berry seconded the motion.

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 tabled this item.

**2. Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute a Second Amendment to the Development Agreement for the Provision of Public Facilities between**

**The Villages Land Company, LLC, and the City of Leesburg; and providing an effective date.**

**ADOPTED RESOLUTION 11,350**

**3. Review the Basis of Design Report to add a Fluoride Injection System to the Water Distribution System and discuss further action.**

**ADOPTED RESOLUTION 11,355**

Commissioner Reisman 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 Berry seconded the motion.

Mayor Burry requested comments from the Commission and the audience.

Commissioner Connell questioned the equipment being proposed and if it would be at one particular water plant? **CM Minner** answered that the equipment in the proposal would take care of the Leesburg water system except for Plantation. **Commissioner Connell** wanted to know if the city would have any valves if this was injected into one plant and if it would migrate throughout the whole city? **CM Minner** replied that he was unsure how many injection points were planned. **PWD Kelsey** answered there was just one. **CM Minner** continued to say if it was just one, it would be just like it was set up before. It would be at the main plant which then chloronizes all the water in the main Leesburg system. It would not include the Plantation system. **Commissioner Connell** wanted to confirm that by injecting this at one plant it would make it throughout the whole city? **CM Minner** answered that is what Dewberry said. **Commissioner Connell** asked if it would be equally distributed throughout the city. **PWD Kelsey** answered it would not be equal.

Brent White, Dewberry Engineers, stated they have not done enough study to say exactly where it will migrate. At this point in the preliminary design, it shows the flow that the main water treatment plant will put out on the shared distribution system. About sixty-five percent of the total flow will go into the distribution system. If they want to clearly define where it will migrate to, they need to do some more hydraulic modeling or a tracer study to see how far out into the system it will reach. **Mayor Burry** remarked they could wait until the system was in and then test it. **Mr. White** agreed. The plan is to install fluoride analyzers at all the plants. That way they could see it at the entry to the plant and various points of the system. They would be able to see if it was reaching that area. **PWD Kelsey** mentioned the biggest bang for the buck would be the main plant. That would get it to the majority of residents. They just do not know to what level it will migrate throughout the system, but it would be the best at the main plant. **CM Minner** believed that to be a bit of a trip hazard. Either they want fluoride or they do not want fluoride. They also need to remember the levels are per million and that is pretty small. It is not a shocker if they put an "x" amount of fluoride in it because it will get reasonable coverage and meet the standard. They are not talking about a lot of fluoride. **Mayor Burry** questioned the chlorine and if we inject that at one point? **PWD Kelsey** answered that it is injected at every plant. That is a disinfectant chemical that is required. Fluoride is not required by the state. **Commissioner Reisman** wanted to know if certain homes could get higher levels versus other homes. **Mr. White** answered it all depends on where they are on the distribution system. If they live closer to one of the smaller plants, they will most likely get their water from that plant. **Commissioner Connell** remarked that we were not really accomplishing what the commission wanted to accomplish because we do not know the levels. Spending three hundred and fifty thousand dollars to find out if it is even going to work is a lot. He did not think the city should be enforcing their will on citizens by putting stuff in the water they do not want. He had several people reach out to him stating they did not want fluoride in their water. This was overreaching on their part to mandate they have fluoride. **Mayor Burry** said over seventy-five percent of the communities in the State of Florida provide fluoride. Is that over reaching? **Commissioner Connell** answered there were two issues. First, we do not even know if this will work and we should not mandate our citizens to drink what we put in the drinking water. **Commissioner Berry** questioned if fluoride was in the water prior to taking it out before? **CM Minner** said yes. He asked if the design mimicked what they had before? **Mr. White** responded that he was not familiar with the previous design, but it is a typical fluoride system, so it should be similar.

Chief Plant Operator, Al Purvis, stated when it was originally installed, it was installed at the main water treatment plant. It was always at just one injection point. With the old system, they were isolated between the east system, which is the mall and airport, and the south system, which includes everything down south. The folks down south are retired for the majority, so if we just install it at the main plant, it will migrate through because everything is an open system now. That is why they need to monitor it. However, the bulk of it will be at the main plant. **CM Minner** wanted to verify if the south would be smaller amounts. If that is the case, it would not meet the minimum. **CPO Purvis** responded that the water system migrates east and south. The best bang for the buck would be to inject it from the main plant. **CM Minner** remarked that it would be the minority areas, low income areas, Carver Heights and downtown. The core of Leesburg would be covered like it was before. **CPO Purvis** agreed. **CM Minner** said for the folks they are trying to affect the most, minority, disadvantaged and low-income folks, those who are unable to get fluoride covered by somewhere else would get it from this modification. The folks that do not need it as much would be the seniors in Legacy, Plantation, and Arlington Ridge and they would get very little. **CPO Purvis** answered yes. They still have to monitor it because once this chemical goes in, there are regulatory compliance issues that must be addressed by many different agencies. **CM Minner** stated with that answer, there was not a dog in the fight on this from the staff's side. They will do whatever the commission says, but the crux of the matter is to return the system to the way it was previously. It is the commission's legislative decision whether they want to return to that. **Commissioner Berry** asked for an explanation of what the eighty thousand contingency was on the estimated proposed dollar amount. **CM Minner** replied that it is typical whenever they do projects to add a contingency for unforeseen things that may happen.

Bill Polk, of 600 Cascade Avenue, stated they have been through this before. He said they need to look at history, because they shut that system down for a reason. Ray Sharp was the water treatment plant guy when they shut it down. They had dentists, doctors and people who argued about whether they needed fluoride in the water. Every tube of toothpaste has enough fluoride to keep all your teeth happy. Now, the city has an ineffective system, so fluoride will not even cover older people. Do older people want their teeth to fall out? He does not think so. The fluoride deal has been a historical issue. If they look back in the records they will see where and why they shut it down. It was for a reason. It is very expensive to maintain to start with and it is not that effective. The city will only get so much fluoride in the water in certain areas of Leesburg. No one talked about the maintenance costs or testing costs. He was not sure how much would be spent on this project, but they could hand out toothpaste on any corner downtown and that would make everybody happy. They do not have to put in all the fancy stuff, it is not necessary. He does not know where they got the information from that said the city needs fluoride. If they talk to any dentist, they will say that we do not need fluoride in the water. It is actually a poison. Fluoride is a poison. **Mayor Burry** disagreed on that point. **Mr. Polk** asked if it was just him or if the whole commission disagreed. **Mayor Burry** replied that he was answering for himself, not for the whole commission. **Mr. Polk** stated the commission needed to know what they were looking at. It will cost a lot for maintenance. This is an ineffective system to start with, so they are not going to be equal on anything. They went through this about ten years ago when he was on the commission. That was when they shut it down. It was shut down because it was not effective. They all voted against keeping fluoride in the water. **Mayor Burry** mentioned that he has letters from every dentist in Lake County who signed on to promote putting fluoride in the water. **Mr. Polk** asked if he said every dentist in Lake County? **Mayor Burry** answered yes. **Mr. Polk** stated the ones he goes to say no. He goes to three different dentists in Lake County. He could name them if the commission would like. They may have signed on not knowing what they were signing just to get the paper out of their office. **Mayor Burry** stated the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American Academy of Medicine, and the American Dental Association say it is a good idea. **Mr. Polk** said there was another group that said it was poison. **Mayor Burry** inquired what group that might be. **Mr. Polk** said everybody. Pull it up on your cellphone, go to Google and ask what fluoride is. It is a poison.

Darel Craine, of Helms Avenue, said the commission needs to know there are children that live in all the areas of every plant the city serves. It was brought up that the southern plants have a lot of retired people. All the plants have a lot of retired people, but every system that pumps water out to the customers in the City of Leesburg has children living in them.

Mayor Burry asked if there were any other comments. There were none.

The roll call vote was:

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

Three yeas, two nays, the Commission adopted the resolution.

**4. Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida accepting a Right-of-Way Deed to the City of Leesburg from Village Community Development District No. 14, for the purpose of dedicating all roadways located within Villages of West Lake Unit No. 72, Unit No. 73, and Unit No. 74 as described therein; and providing an effective date.**

**ADOPTED RESOLUTION 11,351**

**5. Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida accepting a Right-of-Way Deed to the City of Leesburg from Village Community Development District No. 14, for the purpose of dedicating all roadways located within Villages of West Lake Unit No. 75, Unit No. 76, and Unit No. 77 as described therein; and providing an effective date.**

**ADOPTED RESOLUTION 11,352**

**6. 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 Cardiac Dragon 360 AC LLC, for the purpose of setting forth the terms under which the city will provide natural gas service to the development known as Banning Ranch Phase I and Banning Ranch Phase II; and providing an effective date.**

**ADOPTED RESOLUTION 11,353**

7. **Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida, Authorizing and Directing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute an agreement for School Resource Officer (SRO) services to be provided to Lake County School Board – Leesburg Schools - for the 2023-24 school year starting in August 2023; and providing an effective date.**

**ADOPTED RESOLUTION 11,354**

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

**A. SECOND READING OF ORDINANCES**

1. **An Ordinance of the City of Leesburg, Florida, annexing certain real property consisting of approximately 0.97 +/- acres; and being generally located south of Griffin Road and east of Snowberger Avenue, lying in Section 21, 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 1; and providing an effective date. (Polk Gorman Properties AX)**

**ORDINANCE 23-34**

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

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

Mayor Burry asked the city attorney to swear in everyone who wished to speak about all three items. **CA Watson** asked anyone wishing to provide testimony to stand and he then swore them in.

Senior Planner, Kandi Harper stated this was an expansion of an existing business. It is a little bit of economic development. It is the same ownership, but the property is not currently located in the city. Gorman Plumbing is the adjacent property owner and they are expanding. They would need the annexation, a small-scale comprehensive plan amendment, and a rezoning. **Mayor Burry** asked if the petitioner would like to speak on this matter. From the audience, the petitioner, **William Polk,** said he would be willing to answer any questions.

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 ordinance.

**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 0.97 +/- acres from Lake County Urban High Density to City of Leesburg Industrial, for a property generally located south of Griffin Road and east of Snowberger Avenue, lying in Section 21, Township 19 South, Range 24 East, Lake County, Florida; and providing an effective date. (Polk Gorman Properties SSCP)**

**ORDINANCE 23-35**

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 ordinance.

**3. An Ordinance of the City of Leesburg, Florida, changing the zoning on approximately 0.97 +/- acres from Lake County RP (Residential Professional) to City of Leesburg M-1 (Industrial) to allow for business expansion in Industrial for a property generally located south of Griffin Road and east of Snowberger Avenue, lying in Section 21, Township 19 South, Range 24 East, Lake County, Florida; and providing an effective date. (Polk Gorman Properties RZ)**

**ORDINANCE 23-36**

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 ordinance.

**B. FIRST READING OF ORDINANCES**

**1. An Ordinance of the City of Leesburg, Florida amending the City Code of Ordinances by amending Chapter 22, Section 22-7, Natural Gas Line Installation procedures; providing for severability; providing for inclusion in the Code of Ordinances; providing for conflicts; and providing an effective date.**

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

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

**C. NON-ROUTINE ITEMS**

**1. None**

**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** informed the commission about the closing of the south five hundred acre parcel. It is scheduled for this week and that will wrap it up. He brought the documents for the closing with him so he could get the mayor's signature. He will be attending the Municipal Attorney Seminar in south Florida at the end of next week. He will get some good information about legislation and other things that have come out. He would share that information with the commission when he returns.

**9. CITY MANAGER ITEMS:**

**CM Minner** stated there were a few issues that came up this evening and he wanted to address them. First, whenever we deal with emotional issues, they do tend to get a bit emotional. An item may receive a three to two vote one way or the other, but they are contentious.

Someone spoke at the Call to the Public about homelessness. That is a difficult issue that is tackled by the city. Just about every community in this nation struggles with homelessness. It is not just a Leesburg issue. If anyone has issues or has witnessed a theft or crime committed by homeless folks, the best thing to do is to contact the police department. Homeless folks are not above the law. When they break the law and get caught they will be arrested. That would be the best thing to do. Please report the incidents and please call the police department.

With the drainage and development issues specifically on the CR 44 corridor, it is important to point out that there is a delineation between what the commission does on adopting development and the development of an approved subdivision. We talk about a lot of different things when we adopt or approve developments. They talk about runoff, densities, fencing and different styles of housing. Sometimes developments do not even see a hammer and sometimes they do. Right now, we are in a situation where many of the developments that were approved are actually being developed.

Last year, we changed the composition of the public works department to tackle developing subdivisions better. There was an ordinance that included the creation of an Assistant Deputy Director position in the public works department. Ryan Gerdon filled that position. He goes out and talks with folks. Mr. Gurdon regularly wrestles with developers. Whether it be stormwater issues or not getting sod down, those are the things he deals with. In this particular case, they did have a breach. It was not the first time and the best thing that we can do is continue to be vigilant. They were disappointed that it happened again. However, it was not because this body approved the subdivision. The city is doing its best to manage those types of things. However, when issues like this come up, please contact the city. They are working with the developers and Mr. Gurdon has been successful in communicating that. They need to keep in touch with the other regulatory agencies, especially the St. John's. It is a little overreaching to say bad engineering because these are reviewed and approved by St. John's. They are designed by professional engineers, but there is always that bridge between the finished product and final development which can be painful for existing residents. That is why the city changed the codes and added additional personnel to tackle those things. As far as fines and those types of things, when sediment and pollution gets out, unfortunately, that is not under the city's authority. We can try to enforce it the best we can, but contacting St. John's is best because they are the real enforcement arm and that is where developers can be hit. He encouraged folks to keep in touch with the Assistant Deputy Director and his office. They are doing the best they can to manage the developers.

With the fluoride, this will be brought before this body for final design so they can enter into the bid phase. It will be about forty-five to sixty days for them to finish the design. Then they will go out for bid. They can expect this topic back again when the final contract comes before this body for approval. According to the engineers, they estimated that it would be in the neighborhood of six hundred and fifty grand and that would be ten grand under budget. The annual operating costs are estimated at sixty-five grand, which was about ten grand under what was estimated. That will still come back before the body. The next time will be in contract form to execute the construction contract.

### A. Bulk Cost of Power Adjustment Update

**CM Minner** (referring to a chart) said pursuant to the rules and operations of the city, the city manager is ultimately charged with the responsibility of adjusting the bulk power cost rate. Unfortunately, back in September 2021, the city had to jack it way up for all the issues that were discussed. It is important to point out that when we did the increase it was estimated that power costs would be on the blue line. If they average out the blue line, the average megawatt cost that was anticipated for FY 23 was about one hundred and twenty-eight dollars. Mind you, before we had the issue of gas prices, the cost of a megawatt was somewhere around eighty to eighty-five dollars. The increase was for what the city needed to recover the losses and to pay for what we thought were going to be exorbitant fuel costs moving forward. Since then, a few things have happened and they talk about it in the rate watchers section on the city's website. There have been quarterly reports from him to the customers explaining where we were. The commission wanted to wait to recapture the total loss, which was estimated at the 12.5 million dollar level, before bringing back the rate. So, a few things have happened. We had a cooler winter than expected in the

northeast, which helped minimize some of the impact; the supply and demand of gas, two pieces of legislation, and the FMPA's hedging. The hedging kicked in on April 1st and the gas prices are hedged for the next eighteen months. With that hedging in place, even if we lose on the hedging, which we might a little bit, it all depends on where the market goes. The difference now compared to back in September is hedging. We know pretty close to where the price of natural gas will be. He believes he made that report during May or June. At that time, we thought we should wait to see what happened because we still had the three tricky months of March, April, and May where we had low sales but high demand. Typically, we under recover for those months. Over the past few months and during that quarter we ended up over recovering, far above what was anticipated. That is a good thing.
The city received more money back and we over recovered quicker than anticipated. If we take that over recovery and mix it with the anticipated fuel costs, we will come back to the eighty or eighty-five dollars per megawatt range. Our average for the fiscal year will be one hundred and two bucks. That is a significant decrease. What happened was, when we started out with the anticipated bulk fuel costs deficit, we were trying to get the power cost collections back. The excess power cost we had was at the bottom with about a 9.7 million dollar loss in the BCPA. Remember we like to keep a balance of three million dollars. So, when everyone hears him talk about 12.5 million, that is how we get the total loss. We need to return that and stay stable, around three million dollars. Up until about April, the city's numbers were not that bad. We were pretty close to recovering compared to what was thought. Starting in April, we started seeing the divergence and, because that power cost number is going down, we can lighten up on the power cost reimbursement. Now, after three good months, we are sitting around 1.3 million dollars unrecovered. We also see the price will be at a spot where we can lower the fuel cost now, not just to recoup, but by the end of the fiscal year we should be in the black. That number will go from seven cents a kilowatt to three cents a kilowatt. They hope by the end of the fiscal year that we will have a total recovery of 12.5 million dollars. That the losses are recouped and because we have high sales in the summertime when the bills are most expensive, it would give the customers a break. We see different utilities around the state which have announced lowered fuel costs for these reasons; Mount Dora and the FPL are two of the utilities. They have adjusted their fuel costs for the summer and the city can follow suit. It will be a significant reduction. He did say they would have a lower bill because in the summertime everyone typically has higher bills. They will see a bill lower than where the fuel cost was at seventy cents. If they stayed at seventy cents, the city would significantly over recover by June or July. We would then be sitting on a surplus of about five to seven million dollars. It is a two million dollar range, but that is why they believe they can lower the fuel costs. It will put them back into a range of a tick under one hundred and thirty-eight dollars a megawatt. The unfortunate situation is we are becoming competitive with the state, but it is nowhere close to where we were before. It is about ten or fifteen dollars more than what we were before all this started. We were hanging out from around one seventeen to one twenty. At one thirty-eight, it is still relatively-high from where we were before everything happened; with global supply and demand, a war and efforts to become more green energy around the nation. That created the increases in fuel costs. It is good news and Leesburg will look like other utilities. However, recovery is moving ahead of schedule and the rate is returning. That would be all the things that were talked about back in September and moving forward. If the projections are correct and costs stay at eighty-five to ninety a megawatt, they could see another penny or half a penny. We can knock off the power cost adjustment come the beginning of the next fiscal year. They will keep in touch and continue to do updates on the website to keep that power cost adjustment number as low as we can.

## 10. ROLL CALL:

**Commissioner Reisman** commented that the city had just released a City of Leesburg development map on the website. He gave huge thanks to the GIS, IT, and Planning and Zoning Departments. He wondered if the city manager could provide a brief overview of that new feature. **CM Minner** stated when Commissioner Reisman first came into office he asked for more advertising and more dissemination of information with reference to development issues. They copied the wheel and posted all the subdivisions that had been approved. It is up on the website now. It includes both commercial and residential developments. It is a big map with all of the things that have been approved going back to Tara Oaks. It is pretty comprehensive and it took time to put together. It has a pretty good graphic representation of where developments are geographically, how many subdivisions and those types of things. It looks pretty cool. **Commissioner Reisman** added that if they are looking for it, it is under the GIS section on the website.

**Commissioner Connell** stated last week he was made aware that the city does not have any type of policy in place for proclamations. He believes there should be some form of policy in place which states proclamations will be reviewed by the commission or city staff and comply with whatever policy we may adopt. Some of the stuff he was told through that conversation about what could happen was alarming. He spoke with the city attorney concerning the legal side of this and he put together a list of a couple of cities in the state that have policies and it explains what they would or would not give a proclamation for. He asked the city attorney to speak about that. He would like some consideration to move forward to put a policy together on proclamations that says we do not just hand them out like lollipops to anyone that wants one. Proclamations are a reflection of the city commission and the City of Leesburg. We should have guidelines in place for what and who we give them to. **CA Watson** said it was a mayoral discretion issue in terms of proclamations. There are a number of cities and counties in the state that have procedures. The governor issued a policy on their website to explain the discretion of proclamations. Some proclamations could be amended by staff or rejected if they are not acceptable by the mayor. However, it boils down to a discretionary issue and it may be a good idea to broadcast what the typical policy is in terms of proclamations, so nobody is surprised about having some discretion. It would also be forthright to everybody.
**Commissioner Berry** asked how they would determine the milestones and who would determine the discretionary issues. Is that something the commission will decide? **CA Watson** answered it is more of a mayoral discretion issue. A commissioner could theoretically express some dissent from a proclamation after it has been read, but the mayor has the final say on proclamations. **Commissioner Berry** wanted to know if the criteria would be established and written going forward? Could there be amendments allowed as they come forward because when she thinks about milestones, that could be anything from families, historical schools, or any organization or business. **CA Watson** explained if the commission as a body wanted to discuss general policies for what they were comfortable with, that would not be an unhealthy thing. That way, there would be some unified voice in terms of what that policy would be. It is not something that is memorialized in the code, so it is flexible in the sense of being able to adjust what may fall under it. It could provide examples of what proclamations would be and issue versus some other type of action, a letter of congratulations or another type of recognition or acknowledgment. There are different types of acknowledgments and recognitions that could be given and proclamations are one of them. **Mayor Burry** stated that current proclamations are primarily driven by staff who contact him to make sure he is okay with reading them. The staff wants to make sure he is okay with reading the proclamation. He wondered what they needed to tighten down on. **Commissioner Connell** stated it was his understanding that there was no policy in place. It has been the practice of the city over the years that anybody who comes in asking for a proclamation will be given one. It is their choice if they want it read publicly or just have the mayor sign it. We should have some policy in place that says there are certain things that the city will not give. We are not going to just give out a proclamation. That is why he reached out to the city attorney because it has become sort of a civil rights issue and a pick and choose situation. He wants to make sure the city is on legal grounds. That is why the city attorney put the criteria together, showing what other jurisdictions are doing. We should have a written policy for these things. We as the City Commission for Leesburg issue proclamations and it should say what we would or would not issue proclamations for. **CM Minner** commented that without being adversarial, he works at the pleasure of the commission and the unwritten rule for proclamations has been, if somebody requests one, we have

typically written one. It is not based on gender, sexual orientation, national origin, religious preference or anything else. At the last meeting, there was a socially divisive proclamation read. He did not think having a policy was a bad concept. For example, Governor, Ron DeSantis, has one which the city attorney handed out before the meeting. That one would be perfect. They could simply strike through where it says governor and put in mayor. The same thing with the Fort Lauderdale and Sarasota proclamation procedures. They all work the same. At the end of the day, it will not stop controversial issues from coming before them and it may differ between mayors. City staff reaches out to the mayor and asks if he is comfortable with the proclamation. If the mayor says no, that organization may come directly to the city commission meeting and ask why the mayor said no. The slippery slope is not to put staff in the position where staff and the mayor are choosing. That would be a difficult conversation piece. They could take any of the three policy examples and put Leesburg's information in it and that would be fine. They will have a written policy that functions. That does not necessarily mean you will not get a proclamation that you do not like. **Commissioner Connell** understands if staff does not want to make that decision. He suggested putting it on the consent agenda for a roll call vote prior to putting it on the agenda. If they want to discuss it, they can pull it for discussion. It could be done at the meeting before it goes on the agenda for reading. That way they can get all the commissioners' opinions on it. There should be something in place because some of the examples he was given that the city would give out were hypothetically alarming to him. That is why he brought it up and why he spoke to the city manager and the city attorney about it. There should be a policy in place and if staff does not want to make that decision, he understands. It should be put under the consent agenda. That way it could be pulled for discussion. If it passes, it will be read at the following meeting. **CM Minner** mentioned in direct candor if we have a policy in place that has staff and/or the mayor approve or not approve a proclamation, they will get other organizations like the LBGTQ proclamation in the city manager's office. The city manager will approve that proclamation because the city has a policy that says we do not discriminate. If a devil worshiper came to the city and asked for one, the staff would be inclined not to do that because it is not a recognized group. **Commissioner Connell** said when he spoke with the city manager last week it was said that the city would give them one. **CM Minner** answered right now they could because there is no policy in place. A policy would give them a bit more liberty to cleanse out the crazy ones. However, proclamations that are persistent and pursuant to our existing code will still occur. As commissioners, you may not like those proclamations. He would not advise having the commission vote on a proclamation before it is issued. We live in tricky times and we live in litigious times and we do things that may not necessarily represent us, but it is the right thing to do because it is persistent with our policies and it is in the best interest of the city to minimize litigation and we need to put our best foot forward. **CA Watson** remarked that he agrees. The policy would provide notice for anyone wanting to ask for a proclamation. Putting it to a vote before it is read is a little bit more in the weeds than the general idea of the policy. Mayoral discretion is the general rule. The policies that were printed off are pretty vanilla. They just provide general information. If anything, the benefit of that is really notifying the public that if they apply, there is no guarantee that it will be read. It may be changed or revised depending on what the city is comfortable with. **Commissioner Connell** stated that was what he was saying. We need some type of guidelines. **CM Minner** said they could approve a policy similar to the examples provided by striking out the word governor and putting in mayor. They can make a resolution that adopts the policy on proclamations and it will go on the city website. Then, if the LBGTQ group comes in and asks the city to make a proclamation and if the mayor says yes, then it is done. It is good policy because if a devil group came in and wanted a proclamation, that answer could change. The city attorney put examples on their desks tonight that said, for all the crazy stuff, this policy may help filter those out. This is a good concept, but it will not fix everything. There will still be proclamations that come before the body that the majority may not agree with. As long as everybody understands that, moving forward, we do not have any issues. **Commissioner Connell** said he understood but he was unsure why he keeps bringing up the LBGTQ community. **CM Minner** answered that was because we did not have a problem with proclamations until that one was read. **Commissioner Connell** responded that it was brought to his attention and he did not realize the city had no policy at all on proclamations, that we could just give them out to anybody who wants one. We should have some guidelines in place that provide discretion about what we may not want to recognize with a proclamation. **Commissioner Berry** wanted to know if they will have time to review and have a discussion when a proclamation comes in for a request because right now they do not. **CM Minner** responded no, and that is why the commission would not want this body to approve every proclamation. There are some proclamations that come through the office which recognize the Lions Club because they hold annual conventions and they may need something for the next day. They have not had anything crazy in the ten years he has been here, but that is not saying we will not get one. We have not had anything crazy or totally contrary to our operational policies to this day come to his office that the mayor has signed. He understands, and a simple written policy would be a good way to go. They can keep it at the discretion of the mayor. That is fine, but if we have a mayor that does not want to adopt a proclamation on a controversial issue, the repercussions of that is they could expect that group to stand behind the podium to ask the mayor why he did not do it. **Mayor Burry** mentioned at that point the mayor would have to talk about it. **CM Minner** added, just like Newton's law, for every action there is an equal and opposite reaction. His job is to advise the commission about pitfalls that they may get into. He understands the desire for a policy, he has no issue with that. If it is the body's desire to put together a resolution that adopts a policy, it will be done and they will see it on the next agenda. However, a policy would not be the end all. They will still have controversial issues that need to be grappled with. **Commissioner Berry** commented that they should respect the mayor's decision if they want to read a proclamation. They should not put discretionary on a policy that could vary from one group to another. The city does not need to be locked in for what should be approved and what is not. We are all respectable people, we acknowledge people accordingly and treat them fairly. If it is something that is out of order, the mayor will make a good decision and everyone should support that. Having criteria is one thing, but to have the commission vote before it is read at meetings opens the door for larger issues. **Commissioner Connel** said he was fine with that. It was a suggestion, but if staff and the mayor want to take that responsibility and if they adopt a policy to see if they think in their opinion it meets that criteria, he is fine with that. If the mayor or staff do not want to take that responsibility, that was why he suggested putting it on the agenda for an overall vote. That way, they would not be singling out one person as either yay or nay. He is good either way, but we should put a policy in place. **Mayor Burry** said it was his opinion that we have a working model now and we do not have a policy. If someone from the public brings to the staff what they would like in a proclamation, then the staff contacts the mayor to see if he is okay reading it and that is when the decision is made. If they go forward with a formal document and use the information from the governor, he would add that we have a right to modify or deny any proclamation request. That may free the city legally and it does not get you in the court of public appeal. We need to spell out that we will do it or we will not do it and that is mayoral discretion. **CA Watson** said that was what he was getting at with the notice issue. If nothing else, it puts everyone on notice that there is discretion to amend, modify, or even outright reject a proclamation request. **Mayor Burry** said he was in agreement with that and it is not a bad thing. However, he did not think our model was broken. **Commissioner Connell** replied that we do not have a model at this time. **Mayor Burry** said the city's model is pretty much like the governor's office. It would come through staff, go to the mayor, and the mayor would decide whether to read it or not. We could have a statement that says we can deny it for any cause. He asked for a matter of consent on how all the commissioners feel. **Commissioner Pederson** responded that what has been in place has worked. He is fine staying where they are now. Drawing more attention to this will create an issue for us. We will probably be challenged by this. He hopes that the mayor has discretion if they are concerned about one. He was sure he would speak to the attorney. However, he is fine with where we are now and we are overly complicating this. **Commissioner Reisman** added that he would be okay with copying this model and changing it to say mayor. That way, they are implementing some kind of policy. **CA Watson** wanted to clarify that he was referring to the governor's example. **Commissioner Reisman** responded it could be either or.

**Commissioner Berry** had nothing further to discuss.

**Commissioner Pederson** had no comment.

**Mayor Burry** commented that last week there was a quarterly meeting for the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO). The MPO is the local conduit for citizens to have a say on projects in the transportation world and where they rank with FDOT funds. There are twenty projects on the list that the professionals have put together and Leesburg only has one project on that list. Last year it ranked at number five and this year it moved to number four. It moved up one notch and that project is for the widening of 441 from Perkins to Newell Hill. That would make the whole corridor three lanes each way. So, unfortunately, when our citizens do not like the amount of cars on the road, it is hard for the city to up and ride the horse because the MPO wont even talk about it. He encouraged anyone who is concerned about the roads in the area to contact the MPO because that is who they need to talk to. It is a citizens' active group and everyone should be talking to them.

**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 Commissioner Pederson seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 6:38 p.m.

# City of Leesburg
# Lake Front City

## Agenda Memorandum

**Item No:** 5.C.1.

**Meeting Date:** July 10, 2023

**From:** Joseph Mera, (Fire Chief)

**Subject:** Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida authorizing the Leesburg Fire Department to apply for and accept, and purchase, if awarded, a grant from the Florida State Fire Marshal's Office for the purchase of two (2) 30 lb Washer-Extractor designed to clean personal protective equipment to meet NFPA 1851 requirements; and providing an effective date.

---

**Staff Recommendation:**
Staff recommends applying and, if awarded, acceptance of the Florida State Fire Marshal's Office grant and authorizing purchase of two (2) 30lb Washer-Extractor designed to clean personal protective equipment to meet NFPA 1851 requirements for a total cost not to exceed $18,000. This is a 75% / 25% matching grant from the Florida State Fire Marshal's Office with a cost breakdown as follows: state portion of the grant is $13,500 and the COL portion is $4,500.

**Analysis:**
The purpose of this grant project is to purchase two (2) 30 lb Washer-Extractor designed to clean personal protective equipment to meet NFPA 1851 requirements. These washers are used to wash/decontaminate firefighting personal protective clothing.

**Procurement Analysis:**
None

**Options:**
1. Approve the application and acceptance of the Florida State Fire Marshal's Office grant and authorize purchase of two (2) 30 lb Washer-Extractor designed to clean personal protective equipment to meet NFPA 1851 requirements; or
2. Such alternative action as the Commission may deem appropriate.

**Fiscal Impact:**
The total cost of the two (2) 30 lb Washer-Extractor designed to clean personal protective equipment to meet NFPA 1851 requirements is no greater than $18,000. This is a 75% / 25% matching grant from the Florida State Fire Marshal's Office with a cost breakdown as follows: the state portion of the grant is $13,500 (75%) and the COL portion is $4,500 (25%) which is available in the current budget.

If awarded, a budget adjustment will be necessary to add these funds to the current budget.

| | |
|---|---|
| Account No. | 001-0000-334-2200 |
| Project No. | FDMAR4 |

**RESOLUTION NO. ___________**

**RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LEESBURG, FLORIDA AUTHORIZING THE LEESBURG FIRE DEPARTMENT TO APPLY FOR AND ACCEPT, AND PURCHASE, IF AWARDED, A GRANT FROM THE FLORIDA STATE FIRE MARSHAL'S OFFICE FOR THE PURCHASE OF TWO (2) 30 LB WASHER-EXTRACTOR DESIGNED TO CLEAN PERSONAL PROTECTIVE EQUIPMENT TO MEET NFPA 1851 REQUIREMENTS; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.**

**BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LEESBURG, FLORIDA:**

**THAT** the Mayor and City Clerk are hereby authorized to execute an agreement with Florida State Fire Marshall, whose address is 11655 NW Gainesville Road, Ocala, Florida 34482, for the purchase of 2 Washer/Extractors.

**THAT** this resolution shall become effective immediately.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED** by the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida, at a regular meeting held on the 10th day of July 2023.

________________________________
Mayor

ATTEST:

________________________
City Clerk

# City of Leesburg
# Lake Front City

## Agenda Memorandum

**Item No:** 5.C.2.

**Meeting Date:** July 10, 2023

**From:** Brandy McDaniel, (Budget Director)

**Subject:** Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida, executing and submitting the Certification of Taxable Value for Fiscal Year 2023-24 to the Lake County Property Appraiser; and providing an effective date.

---

**Staff Recommendation:**
Staff recommends authorizing the City Manager to execute and submit the Certification of Taxable Value for Fiscal Year 2023-24 to the Lake County Property Appraiser, establishing a tentative millage rate based upon one of the options listed below.

**Analysis:**
Truth in Millage (TRIM) guidelines require the City Commission to determine the "tentative millage rate" in July of each year. This is a rate representing the maximum millage rate that may be adopted by the Commission at the end of the budget process. The Commission has the ability to adopt a "final millage rate" lower than the tentative rate, but not higher. The final millage rate will be adopted in September, at the conclusion of the budget process. The current rate adopted millage rate in FY 23 is 4.0192 mills. The proposed FY 24 millage rate is the "roll back rate" of 3.4752 which is a 13.5% decrease over the current millage rate of 4.0192.

**Procurement Analysis:**
N/A

**Options:**
The City Commission may adopt a tentative rate up to 10.6563 mills by a simple majority vote. It may adopt a rate between 10.6564 and 11.7219 (the maximum), by a 2/3 vote (4 out of 5 commissioners approving). Options 1, 2 and 4 below are all straight from the TRIM guidelines. Option 3 is shown, so you will know what happens if you simply add 1 mil to the current rate.

| Millage Rate Options: | Adjusted Taxable Value | | Millage Per $1,000 | | Gross Ad Valorem Proceeds | Budget % | Tentative Budgeted Ad Valorem Proceeds | Prior Year Budgeted Ad Valorem Proceeds | Change |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Current Millage Rate FY 23: | 2,522,857,860 | X | 4.0192 | = | 10,139,870 | 95% | 9,632,878 | 7,935,987 | 1,696,891 |
| 2. Roll-back Rate: | 2,522,857,860 | X | 3.4752 | = | 8,767,436 | 95% | 8,329,065 | 7,935,987 | 393,078 |
| 3. Current +1 Mill: | 2,522,857,860 | X | 5.0192 | = | 12,662,728 | 95% | 12,029,592 | 7,935,987 | 4,093,605 |
| 4. Maximum Millage Rate: | 2,522,857,860 | X | 11.7219 | = | 29,572,688 | 95% | 28,094,053 | 7,935,987 | 20,158,066 |

1. Adopt a tentative millage rate of 3.4752 mills ("roll-back rate"); or,
2. Such alternative action as the City Commission deems appropriate.

**Fiscal Impact:**

Adoption of the proposed "roll-back rate" of 3.4752 will result in Ad Valorem proceeds of $8,329,065 at 95% of which the General Fund keeps $6,840,521 due to $1,488,543 going to the CRA's. Any other rate must be multiplied by the Adjusted Taxable Value and then by .95 to determine the Ad Valorem proceeds that may be budgeted.

**RESOLUTION NO. ____________**

**RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LEESBURG, FLORIDA, EXECUTING AND SUBMITTING THE CERTIFICATION OF TAXABLE VALUE FOR FISCAL YEAR 2023-24 TO THE LAKE COUNTY PROPERTY APPRAISER; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.**

**BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LEESBURG, FLORIDA:**

**THAT** the City Manager is hereby authorized to execute the "Certificate of Taxable Value for Fiscal Year 2023-24" with a tentative millage rate of 3.4752 mills "roll-back rate" and submit the same to the Lake County Property Appraiser, whose address is P.O. Box 1027, Tavares, Florida 32778.

**THAT** this resolution shall become effective immediately.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED** by the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida, at a regular meeting held on the 10th day of July 2023.

___________________________________
Mayor

ATTEST:

__________________________
City Clerk

# City of Leesburg
# Lake Front City

## Agenda Memorandum

| | |
|---|---|
| **Item No:** | 5.C.3. |
| **Meeting Date:** | July 10, 2023 |
| **From:** | Brad Chase, (Electric Director) |
| **Subject:** | Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida, granting to Leesburg Landing II Community, LLC, an extension of two years, for a total of six years from the date the agreement was entered into by the developer for installation of infrastructure, to report connections to new electric meters in its development known as Leesburg Landing Phase II, for purposes of determining if the developer is entitled to a credit per meter against the developer share of the difference in cost between overhead and underground service, or to apply to reduction of the amount of any bond placed with the City by the developer to secure its share of such costs; and providing an effective date. |

---

**Staff Recommendation:**
Staff recommends accepting and approving the resolution granting an extension of two years to Leesburg Landing II Community, LLC., Developer Agreement described therein.

**Analysis:**
On June 20, 2023, the owner/developer of the Leesburg Landing Phase II project requested a two-year extension on the developer's agreement for reimbursement due to the unanticipated economic downturn precipitated by COVID-19 pandemic and the 2022 hurricanes, Ian in September and Nicole in November.

**Procurement Analysis:**
N/A

**Options:**
1. Adopt the Resolution accepting and approving the extension as presented, or;
2. Such alternative action as the Commission may deem appropriate

**Fiscal Impact:**
None

**RESOLUTION NO. ___________**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LEESBURG, FLORIDA, GRANTING TO LEESBURG LANDING II COMMUNITY, LLC, AN EXTENSION OF TWO YEARS, FOR A TOTAL OF SIX YEARS FROM THE DATE OF THE AGREEMENT WAS ENTERED INTO BY THE DEVELOPER FOR INSTALLATION OF ELECTRIC INFRASTRUCTURE, TO REPORT CONNECTIONS TO NEW ELECTRIC METERS IN ITS DEVELOPMENT KNOWN AS LEESBURG LANDING PHASE II, FOR PURPOSES OF DETERMINING IF THE DEVELOPER IS ENTITLED TO A CREDIT PER METER AGAINST THE DEVELOPER'S SHARE OF THE DIFFERENCE IN COST BETWEEN OVERHEAD AND UNDERGROUND SERVICE, OR TO APPLY TO REDUCTION OF THE AMOUNT OF ANY BOND PLACED WITH THE CITY BY THE DEVELOPER TO SECURE ITS SHARE OF SUCH COSTS; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.**

**WHEREAS,** the City of Leesburg ("City") and Leesburg Landing II Community, LLC ("Developer"), entered into an agreement dated August 13, 2021, allocating the expenses of installing electric infrastructure in the development known as Leesburg Landing Phase II (the "Development"), and providing for the Developer to receive a credit for each electric meter connected within the Development for a period of four years after the date of each such agreement, and

**WHEREAS,** §25-474 of the Code of Ordinances of the City permits a developer to request an extension of up to two years on the time allowed under such agreements to receive a credit for electric meters connected within the development, for good cause shown, and

**WHEREAS,** the Developer has submitted such a request to the City in connection with the Development, stating the reasons the Developer believes it is entitled to an extension, and the City Commission has determined that the reasons stated by the Developer do constitute good cause justifying the granting of an extension,

**NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVE BY THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LEESBURG, FLORIDA:**

**SECTION I.**

The Developer is granted an extension of two years to submit new electric meter connections in the Development. Those connections within the phase or phases covered by the agreement dated August 13, 2021, may be submitted for credit up to and including August 13, 2027. Connections within the appropriate phase which are submitted by the deadline shall be entitled to receive the credits provided in the agreement.

**SECTION II.**

This Resolution shall take effect upon its passage and adoption according to law, and shall be self-executing without the requirement that the Developer enter into any amendments to the agreements recited above.

**SECTION III.**

If any portion of this Resolution is declared invalid or unenforceable, and to the extent that it is possible to do so without destroying the overall intent and effect of this Resolution, the portion deemed invalid or unenforceable shall be severed herefrom and the remainder of the Resolution shall continue in full force and effect as if it were enacted without including the portion found to be invalid or unenforceable.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED** at the regular meeting of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida, held on the ____________ day of _________________________, 2023.

THE CITY OF LEESBURG, FLORIDA

BY: __________________________________
JIMMY BURRY, Mayor

ATTEST: _____________________________
ANDI PURVIS, City Clerk

Leesburg Landing
81 Dockside Dr.
Leesburg FL. 34748
(352) 728-8911
Leesburglanding@outlook.com

Utility Surety Bond Extension Petition

(City of Leesburg Utility Bond)

City of Leesburg Attn:

Steve Davis, Service Planner
Brad Chase, Electric Director
2010 Griffin Rd
Leesburg Fl. 34748

Al Minner, City Manager
510 West Meadows St.
Leesburg Fl 34748

Applicant: Leesburg Landing II LLC

Property Description: Parcel #2 Alt Key 1289858, of Lake County Tax Parcel #161924000100010000500.

George Branton the applicant, being the owner of the property referenced above and having the authority to enter into this agreement, hereby we

Request as follows:

I. Utility Bond Extension of two Years on the Developers agreement signed on August 13, 2021, extending that agreement until August 13, 2027. The reason for this request is as follows.

1. Public health emergency Covid-19 (November 2019- May 2023).

2. Hurricanes Ian in September 2022 and Nicole in November 2022.

The above circumstances have created a supply chain shortage and staffing issues causing the developer of Leesburg Landing II to be unable to get the staff and materials needed to complete the project in a timely manner.

Currently We have filled 24 Of the 108 Lots.

We have enclosed a copy of the original agreement along with a copy of the check for the cash bond posted.

George Branton
Owner and Developer

Developer: Leesburg Landing II Community, LLC
29605 US HWY 19, SUITE 130
Clearwater, Fl 33761

RE: Leesburg Landing- Phase II

Leesburg Landing II Community, LLC, the Developer of Leesburg Landing- Phase II, has requested the City of Leesburg Electric Department to design the electric distribution facilities for the above-mentioned project. The project is located in Leesburg, Lake County, Florida. This development has been reviewed and approved by City of Leesburg.

The developer will be charged according to the City of Leesburg ("City") Municipal Code **Sec. 25-474. Installation of electric distribution facilities**. An estimated cost of installation of both underground and overhead distribution facilities has been created by the City Electric Department. This cost is for the installation of primary and secondary electric distribution facilities only and does not include service conductors or services to individual homes. These are typically charged a flat fee on a per service basis up to 100'. The contractor will be responsible for the installation of non-residential services to the point of service determined by the City. The developer's letter of agreement (attached to this letter) explains the costs to the developer.

The City Electric Department requires utility easements to be dedicated in the final plat of subdivisions, or granted to the City prior to installation of electric utilities. Please refer to **Sec 25-450. Utility easements** in the Code of Ordinances.

The City Electric Department requires that all areas are to be at or near final grade before installation of any electric utilities. All property corners and lot lines shall be staked prior to installation. The developer will maintain proper clearances from all electric facilities. All road crossings will be installed prior to stabilized base. Any crossings not installed prior to this, will be installed by pit and mole or directional bore (City Electric Department will determine the method selected), and the developer shall bear the total cost. These and any other additional costs shall be paid before the electric distribution facilities are energized. The developer will be responsible for any compaction required due to the installation of electric facilities.

The developer can choose to install the conduit supplied by the City Electric Department, following the City installation guidelines. The developer may receive a credit against the cost of the installation of the underground electric distribution facilities, not to exceed the estimated cost, if the developer chooses to install the conduit. The conduit shall be inspected by an employee of the City Electric Department prior to backfilling the trench. All conduits covered before this inspection is accomplished shall be uncovered by the developer at his cost and the developer shall be charged a return fee. All conduits shall have a pull string installed to insure the continuity of the conduit. Any conduits found to be plugged or damaged at the time wire is scheduled to be pulled in shall be cleared and / or repaired at the cost of the developer.

The final service locations are indicated on the subdivision drawing included with this letter. Any deviations from this plan or the designated service locations shall incur additional charges, which shall be borne by the developer. These charges shall include all material, labor and other expenses incurred by the City Electric Department as a result of the deviation. It will be the developer's responsibility to contact an Electric Service Planner at the City Electric Department to "spot" all new service locations. The City Electric Department's "Service Requirements" booklet can be requested online at ***LeesburgFlorida.Gov/Electric.***

A pre-construction meeting will be scheduled by the developer with the City Electric Service Planner who is assigned to the project, the City Deputy Director or his designee, the City Contract Supervisor, and representatives of the developer. Contact will be made by the developer with the City Deputy Director to schedule all work. The developer shall be responsible for coordination between the various trades, contractors, and utilities working on the project to insure a minimum amount of re-work, corrective actions, and delays. The City Deputy Director can be reached at 352-728-9786, extension 2011.

Sincerely,

______________________________,

Brad Chase ____________________, Electric Director

______________________________,

Al Minner ____________________, City Manager

Appendix 1-Design Information

Subdivision Information

108 Residential single family homes, 0 Town Homes, 0 Condos,

0 Duplexes 0 Apartment units in 0 buildings,

0 Commercial Lots, 0 Commercial Units in 0 Buildings

Residential Units are : ☐ Total Electric ☑ Electric and Gas

Electric Appliances will include: ☐ Range/oven ☐ Heat ☐ Hot Water Heater

☐ Clothes Drier ☐ Pool Heater

The average AC size is 4.0 ton. The average electrical service is 200 mps.

The average square foot of Residential house is 1,500 Sq. Ft.

Lift station ☐ Yes ☑ No Voltage 3 Ph 277/4. Size of Motors ______ Horsepower,

Service Size will be none Amps

Additional Services

Gateway/Entrance feature ☐ Yes ☑ No - If Yes, Service size _____ Amps Qty. _____

Irrigation Meters ☐ Yes ☑ No - If Yes, Service size _____ Amps Qty. _____

Clubhouse or Rec. room ☐ Yes ☑ No - If Yes, Service size _____ Amps Voltage ____

Pool ☐ Yes ☑ No - If Yes, Service size _____ Amps

No Additional Services

**City of Leesburg Electric Department**
**Developer's Agreement**

Developer: Leesburg Landing II Community, LLC

Address 29605 US HWY 19, SUITE 130

City/State/zip: Clearwater, Fl 33761

COL Work order # 1343573 Date 05/14/2021

The above-mentioned developer has requested the City of Leesburg ("CITY") Electric Department to design and install underground electric distribution facilities in the development " Leesburg Landing- Phase II ".

The estimated cost of installing overhead electric distribution facilities is $225,612.00. The estimated cost of installing underground electric distribution facilities is $ 214,272.00. The estimated cost of installing underground electric distribution facilities with the developer's contractor installing the conduit is $ 29,592.00.

The estimated costs for Charges in Aid to Construction (CIAC) for the extension of lines and or for the electric feeds for rental lights in the subdivision is $ 0.00. This is a non-refundable cost. The developer will provide a cashier's check for that amount.

In accordance with Sec.25-474 of the Municipal Code, the developer will be responsible for the cost difference between the overhead electric distribution facilities and the underground electric distribution facilities, if there is one. In this case, the cost difference between overhead and underground distribution is null, because the estimated cost of underground is less than the overhead.

The developer will receive a credit per meter based on the per meter cost of the less expensive underground electric distribution facilities, As permanent service is connected and a normal flow of electric energy is registered and accumulates 1,850 kWh per meter. This per meter charge will be refunded or credited back up to 4 years from the date of acceptance of this agreement. There will be 108 new meters within this development.

The acceptance of this agreement must be within 90 days of the date above.

See the next pages for the options for payment to install electric infrastructure in the subdivision.

# Developer Options for payment.

**The developer has selected one of the options below for payment.**

**Option #1** X Cash Option

The developer has chosen to pay the full cost of the project up front with a certified check.

$ 225,612.00, is the estimated cost of the overhead distribution facilities.

$ 214,272.00, is the estimated cost of the underground distribution facilities, which is less than the estimated overhead costs. The cost of the underground distribution will be refunded at the rate of $ 1,984.00 per meter, as each meter is set and accumulates 1,850 kWh energy usage. The contractor has up to four years from the date of this agreement to have all meters set and each meter must accumulate 1,850 kWh energy usage. Any fees for meters not set and/or meters that have not achieved the required kWh usage within that four year time frame, <u>will not be refunded</u>, and becomes property of the City Electric Department.

$ 0.00 is due for Charges in Aid to Construction (CIAC) for line extensions or installation of electric feeds for rental lights. This is non-refundable.

The contractor will provide a cashier's check in the full amount of $ 214,272.00, (the Underground costs, plus any CIAC) made out to the City of Leesburg. This money will need to be paid at the time this agreement is signed.

**Option #2** ☐ Cash Option, Developer installing Conduit

The Developer has elected to install the conduit at his expense, and receive a credit on said installation.

$ 225,612.00, is the estimated cost of the overhead distribution facilities.

$ 184,680.00, is the estimated cost of the underground distribution facilities minus the cost of the conduit installation and trench, which is less than the estimated overhead costs. The cost of the underground distribution will be refunded at the rate of $ 1,710.00 per meter, as each meter is set and accumulates 1,850 kWh energy usage. The contractor has up to four years from the date of this agreement to have all meters set and each meter must accumulate 1,850 kWh energy usage. Any fees for meters not set and/or meters that have not achieved the required kWh usage within that four year time frame, <u>will not be refunded</u>, and becomes property of the City Electric Department.

$ 0.00 is due for Charges in Aid to Construction (CIAC) for line extensions or installation of electric feeds for rental lights. This is non-refundable.

The contractor will provide a cashier's check in the full amount of $ 184,680.00, (Cost of the underground, minus the trench costs plus the CIAC) made out to the City of Leesburg. This money will need to be paid at the time this agreement is signed.

**Option #3** ☐ Bond or Letter of Credit Option

The developer has chosen to provide a letter of credit or surety bond to the City of Leesburg for the estimated cost of underground electric distribution.

$ 225,612.00, is the estimated cost of the overhead distribution facilities. $ 214,272.00, is the estimated cost of the underground distribution facilities, which is less than the estimated overhead costs. The cost of the underground distribution will be credited at the rate of $ 1,984.00 per meter, as each meter is set and accumulates 1,850 kWh energy usage. The contractor has up to four years from the date of this agreement to have all meters set and each meter must accumulate 1,850 kWh energy usage. Any fees for meters not set and/or meters that have not achieved the required kWh usage within that four year time frame, will not be credited, and becomes property of the City Electric Department.

At the end of the four-year period, a claim will be placed on the Letter of Credit or Bond for any meters that have not been installed, or reached the 1,850 kWh usage as required. The developer can choose to pay the amount due, or have it collected from the bond or letter of credit.

$ 0.00 is due for Charges in Aid to Construction (CIAC) for line extensions or installation of electric feeds for rental lights. This is non-refundable.

The contractor will provide a cashier's check in the full amount of $ 0.00, (for any CIAC that is due) made out to the City of Leesburg. This is non-refundable. This money will need to be paid at the time this agreement is signed.

The contractor will provide a letter of credit or surety bond in the amount of $ 214,272.00, (Cost of the underground distribution) made out to the City of Leesburg. This bond or letter of credit shall be in force prior to the start of any work.

The Developer has chosen Option # _1_ from above.

Developer:

The undersigned have full authority to act on behalf of the developer.

____________________, Manager__________

George Branton, Manager Date 8-13-21

____________________, ____________________

____________________, ____________________ Date ______

# City of Leesburg
# Lake Front City

## Agenda Memorandum

| | |
|---|---|
| **Item No:** | 5.C.4. |
| **Meeting Date:** | July 10, 2023 |
| **From:** | Al Minner, (City Manager) |
| **Subject:** | Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida, Adopting a Policy for Issuing Proclamations; and providing an effective date. |

---

**Staff Recommendation:**
Approve Resolution creating a policy which manages requests for proclamations.

**Analysis:**
The Commission, at its June 26, 2023 meeting, had discussion requesting a Proclamation policy.

**Procurement Analysis:**
None

**Options:**
1. Approve as presented; or
2. Such alternative action as the Commission may deem appropriate.

**Fiscal Impact:**
None

## RESOLUTION NO.____________

**A RESOLUTION OF THE MAYOR AND CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LEESBURG, FLORIDA, ADOPTING A POLICY FOR ISSUING PROCLAMATIONS; AND, PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.**

**WHEREAS**, the Mayor and City Commission wish to create a policy which manages requests for proclamations.

**NOW THEREFORE**, be it resolved by the Mayor and City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida, that the Mayor and City Commission do hereby establish, adopt and seek the following operational policy:

1. Proclamation Definition – A proclamation shall be an official document issued by the Mayor of the City of Leesburg for the purpose of raising awareness about an issue, celebrate milestones, or commemorate a certain group or event.

2. Requesting a Proclamation – A proclamation may be requested via email, fax, postal mail, or personally requested. Such requested should be made to the Office of the City Manager or emailed to commissioners@leesburgflorida.gov. Up such request, the Mayor reserves the right to modify or deny any proclamation request. If a proclamation has been issued in the past, a new request will still be required each year. Proclamation preference will be given to issues that affect the City of Leesburg.

3. Proclamation Guidelines – Proclamations are generally considered for the purposes of raising public awareness about issues affecting a large number of Leesburg residents or to commemorate special milestones of significance. Proclamations are not provided for anniversaries (of individuals or businesses), grand openings, fundraisers or act as a letter of support or endorsement of people, products or services.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED** by the Mayor and City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida at their regular Meeting conducted on the 10th day of July 2023.

**CITY OF LEESBURG**

By:______________________________
James A. Burry, Jr., Mayor

ATTEST:

______________________________
J. Andi Purvis, City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND LEGALITY:

______________________________
William Grant Watson, City Attorney

# City of Leesburg
# Lake Front City

## Agenda Memorandum

| | |
|---|---|
| **Item No:** | 6.A.1. |
| **Meeting Date:** | July 10, 2023 |
| **From:** | Robert Thilmony, (Gas Director) |
| **Subject:** | An Ordinance of the City of Leesburg, Florida amending the City Code of Ordinances by amending Chapter 22, Section 22-7, Natural Gas Line Installation procedures; providing for severability; providing for inclusion in the Code of Ordinances; providing for conflicts; and providing an effective date. |

---

**Staff Recommendation:**
Approve the Ordinance to amend the City Code of Ordinances by amended Chapter 22, Section 22-7, Natural Gas Line Installation Procedures.

**Analysis:**
Pursuant to Chapter 22, Section 22-7 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Leesburg, Florida, natural gas line installation is required in all new residential developments of more than five (5) units and developers are required to equip not less than eighty percent (80%) of such units with a natural gas water heater and natural gas furnace. The City of Leesburg wishes to expand gas appliance options under Chapter 22, Section 22-7 to provide the option of either (i) a natural gas water heater, natural gas stove, and natural gas dryer, or (ii) a natural gas water heater and natural gas furnace.

**Procurement Analysis:**
N/A

**Options:**
1. Approve Ordinance as presented; or
2. Such alternative action as the Commission may deem appropriate.

**Fiscal Impact:**
None

**ORDINANCE NO. 2023-______**

**AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF LEESBURG, FLORIDA AMENDING THE CITY CODE OF ORDINANCES BY AMENDING CHAPTER 22, SECTION 22-7, NATURAL GAS LINE INSTALLATION PROCEDURES; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; PROVIDING FOR INCLUSION IN THE CODE OF ORDINANCES; PROVIDING FOR CONFLICTS; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.**

**WHEREAS,** pursuant to Chapter 22, Section 22-7 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Leesburg, Florida, natural gas line installation is required in all new residential developments of more than five (5) units and developers are required to equip not less than eighty percent (80%) of such units with a natural gas water heater and natural gas furnace; and

**WHEREAS**, the City of Leesburg wishes to expand gas appliance options under Chapter 22, Section 22-7 as set forth herein.

**NOW THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LEESBURG, FLORIDA, AS FOLLOWS:**

**Section 1. Recitals.** The above recitals are adopted and incorporated herein by reference.

**Section 2. Text Amendment**. Chapter 22, Section 22-7 of the Code of Ordinances City of the City of Leesburg, Florida shall be amended as follows:

**Sec. 22-7. Natural gas line installation procedures.**

Natural gas line installation shall be required in all new residential developments of more than five (5) units, in accordance with the conditions and criteria hereinafter specified. Developers shall insure that not less than eighty (80) percent of all units in the development be equipped with <u>either (i) </u>a natural gas water heater<u>, natural gas stove,</u> and natural gas ~~furnace~~ <u>dryer, or (ii) a natural gas water heater and natural gas furnace</u>. Before any natural gas lines are installed in any such development the following prerequisites must be met:

(1) *Streets to be surveyed and graded.* All streets within the area shall be properly surveyed, marked and graded the full width of the right-of-way.

(2) *Costs of installation.*

a. *Installation by city.* Where the natural gas line distribution system is to be installed by the city, the cost of all natural gas lines and appurtenances must be borne by the developer, subdivider or re-subdivider. Before the city commences any natural gas line construction, the cost, as estimated by the city's design engineer (or designee), must be paid in cash or a bond sufficient to cover

CODING: Words in ~~struck through~~ type are deletions from the existing Ordinance;
Words in <u>underscored</u> type are additions.

the cost of construction. The cost must be posted by the developer. The developer must connect at the nearest available natural gas supply and must also bear the cost from the nearest point to the subdivision. The city may require the sharing of trench space, which will be dug by the developer's water and/or electric utility contractor at no charge to the city.

b. *Installation by developer.* The developer may at his option install his own natural gas distribution system or contract same to be done by a reliable contracting firm, at the developer's expense. The natural gas system improvements shall become the property of the city after completion. The developer shall guarantee the improvements pursuant to <u>section 25-453</u>.

c. *Plans and specifications to be submitted.* Prior to any construction of natural gas line facilities, proposed plans and specifications must be submitted to the city for preliminary approval.

d. *Inspection and approval.* Before facilities are finally accepted by the city, they must be inspected and approval given by the city as to construction, and any deviation or improper construction must be corrected or replaced before facilities can be used or final approval granted. Inspections must be made before any trench may be completely filled. (3)

(3) *Mains, lines and meters to be property of city.* All natural gas lines and connections, will be, and remain, the property of the city and the city will be responsible for the maintenance and repairs of the system.

(4) *Main line specifications.* All natural gas line installations, valves and connections shall be installed according to the specifications of the city. Natural gas lines that serve any area must be of a size designated by the city to insure adequate pressures and quantities.

(5) *Map of installations.* A complete "as built" map of all valves, taps, bends, tees and crosses must be prepared by the design engineer, or by the natural gas system contractor and certified by the design engineer, as designated by the city.

(6) *Meters are property of city; services charges.* Natural gas meters and regulators will be furnished and installed by the city and will remain the property of the city. In any new construction, or in any case in which an existing structure is altered so as to create more than one (1) single-family dwelling or single unit therein, a meter shall be installed to serve each such single-family dwelling or single unit; no meter serving more than one (1) single, discrete unit in a building shall be allowed. Charges for the installation of meters, regulators, and services are based on actual cost of labor and materials at time of installation for service.

(7) The following criteria shall govern when gas mains must be installed by developers where natural gas service is not available directly adjacent to the real property being developed:

Gas main and service installations will be required when it is determined by the city in its discretion that a connection to the city's existing natural gas system is reasonably available. In determining whether such a connection is reasonably available, the city shall take into account, among other considerations, the following factors, no single one of which shall be considered determinative in and of itself:

(1) Whether the cost to the developer for connection to the nearest adequately sized city natural gas line exceeds the total cost of natural gas infrastructure within the development, including mains, services, meters and appurtenances.

(2) whether the cost to the developer for connection to the nearest adequately sized city natural gas line exceeds the total cost of connecting the development to the city's water and wastewater systems;

(3) The distance from the development to the nearest adequately sized city natural gas line, both standing alone and compared to the distance to the nearest city water and wastewater lines;

(4) Any physical or geographical obstacles to the installation of a line from the development to the nearest adequately sized city natural gas line, including but not limited to lakes, streams or other water bodies, and roads, streets, railroads or other public or private rights of way which must be crossed in order to construct the line;

(5) The number of residential units within the development as compared to the total cost to the developer for creating a connection to the nearest adequately sized city natural gas line;

(6) The terms of any annexation or development agreement between the city and the developer, entered into prior to the date this ordinance was first adopted;

(7) Whether and to what extent the development had received any annexation, rezoning or other land use approvals from the city prior to the date this article was first adopted.

**Section 4. Incorporation.** The provisions of this ordinance are intended to be incorporated into the Code of Ordinances of the City of Leesburg, Florida, and sections of this ordinance may be renumbered, re-lettered, and the word “ordinance” may be changed to “section”, “article”, or any other phrase in order to accomplish such intention.

**Section 5. Conflicts and Severability**. All ordinances in conflict with this ordinance are hereby repealed. If any section, sentence, clause, or phrase of this ordinance is held to be invalid or unconstitutional by any court of competent jurisdiction, then said holding shall in no way affect the validity of the remaining portion of this Ordinance.

**Section 6. Effective Date**. This Ordinance shall take effect immediately upon its final adoption by the City of Leesburg Commission.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED** this ____ day of __________, 2023 by the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida.

______________________________
James A. Burry, Jr., Mayor

ATTEST:

______________________________
J. Andi Purvis, City Clerk

Approved as to form:

______________________________
William Grant Watson, City Attorney

CODING: Words in ~~struck through~~ type are deletions from the existing Ordinance;
Words in <u>underscored</u> type are additions.

# City of Leesburg
# Lake Front City

## Agenda Memorandum

| | |
|---|---|
| **Item No:** | 6.B.1. |
| **Meeting Date:** | July 10, 2023 |
| **From:** | Al Minner, (City Manager) |
| **Subject:** | An Ordinance of the City of Leesburg, Florida relating to the City of Leesburg Municipal Firemen' Retirement System; amending the Title of the Retirement System for the Members of the City of Leesburg Fire Department to be inclusive; amending the City of Leesburg Firefighters' defined benefit plan to implement the Heart and Lung Act and Firefighter Cancer presumption established by Sections 112.1816, 112.18, 112.181 and 175.231, Florida Statutes; Creating Section 2.4(B)(1) and (2) of the Retirement System relating to Line of Duty Disability benefits; providing for inclusion in the Code; providing for severability; and providing an effective date. |

---

**Staff Recommendation:**
Approve Ordinance on first reading and set for public hearing.

**Analysis:**
The attached modifications to the pension plan are housekeeping items that reflect changes in legislation and that have "no impact" on funding.

**Procurement Analysis:**
None

**Options:**
1. Approve Ordinance as presented; or
2. Such alternative action as the Commission may deem appropriate.

**Fiscal Impact:**

FLA

FREIMAN LITTLE ACTUARIES

June 1, 2023

**Via Email**

City of Leesburg Municipal Firemen's Retirement Plan
c/o Sonja Vicchiollo
33937 Tarawood Dr.
Leesburg, FL 34788
sonja vicchiollo <pensionstandard@outlook.com>

Dear Sonja:

**Re: Statement of No Impact of Proposed Ordinance Amendment**

This letter is being written to provide a statement of no impact with regard to the attached proposed ordinance amendment for the City of Leesburg Municipal Firemen's Retirement Plan (the Plan).

**Summary of Changes**

Plan Name. Name of Plan revised to City of Leesburg Municipal Firefighters' Retirement Plan.

Required Minimum Distributions: Creation of *Section 1.1 Definitions. (37) Required Minimum Distributions* to comply with Internal Revenue Code Section 401(a)(9).

Heart and Lung Act and Firefighter Cancer Presumption: Creation of *Section 2.4 Disability and Retirement Income (B)(1) and (B)(2)* to comply with the Heart and Lung Act as well as the Firefighter Cancer Presumptions of Chapter 112 and 175 Florida Statutes.

**Actuarial Impact**

There is no impact to change the name of the Plan.

There is no significant impact related to the addition of Required Minimum Distributions language.

There is no material impact related to addition of language to the Disability and Retirement Income section of the Plan as it is not expected to materially increase the number of line-of-duty disabilities awarded by the Plan.

Please let me know if you have any questions or need additional information.

Sincerely,

Chad M. Little, ASA, EA
Partner, Consulting Actuary

4105 SAVANNAHS TRAIL, MERRITT ISLAND, FL, 32953-8607 • OFFICE (321) 453-6542 • FAX (321) 453-6998 • MOBILE (321) 591-8265 • chad@flactuaries.com • www.flactuaries.com

**ORDINANCE ___________**

**AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF LEESBURG, FLORIDA RELATING TO THE CITY OF LEESBURG MUICIPAL FIREMEN'S RETIREMENT SYSTEM; AMENDNG THE TITLE OF THE RETIREMENT SYSTEM FOR THE MEMBERS OF THE CITY OF LEESBURG FIRE DEPARTMENT TO BE INCLUSIVE; AMENDING THE CITY OF LEESBURG FIREFIGHTERS' DEFINED BENEFIT PLAN TO IMPLEMENT THE HEART AND LUNG ACT AND FIREFIGHTER CANCER PRESUMPTION ESTABLISHED BY SECTIONS 112.1816, 112.18, 112.181 AND 175.231, FLORIDA STATUTES; CREATING SECTION 2.4(B)(1) and (2) OF THE RETIREMENT SYSTEM RELATING TO LINE OF DUTY DISABILITY BENEFITS; PROVIDING FOR INCLUSION IN THE CODE; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.**

**WHEREAS**, the City of Leesburg had established a defined benefit plan for the members of the City of Leesburg Fire Department on or about 1991 entitled the City of Leesburg Municipal Firemen's Retirement Plan; and

**WHEREAS**, in the over thirty years since the plan was established, there have been more women firefighters, and;

**WHEREAS**, the Board of Trustees for the Plan desires the Plan name to be more inclusive and to conform to the documents which reflect the name as City of Leesburg Municipal Firefighters' Retirement Plan; and

**WHEREAS**, the Florida Legislature, in recognition of the elevated health risks to firefighters for certain heart and lung and cancer diseases, has created a duty-related heart and lung disease presumption and cancer presumption; and

**WHEREAS**, Florida Laws Chapter 2019-21 has amended Chapter 112, Florida Statutes, by creating Section 112.1816, governing disability and death benefits for firefighters; and

**WHEREAS**, Chapters 112 and 175, Florida Statutes, establish rebuttable presumptions for firefighters in cases of heart disease, hypertension, tuberculosis, meningococcal meningitis, and hepatitis, and cancer; and

**NOW THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LEESBURG, FLORIDA:**

**SECTION 1.** The Defined Benefit Plan for the members of the City of Leesburg Fire Department will be entitled City of Leesburg Municipal Firefighters' Retirement Plan.

**SECTION 2.** Section 1.1 of the City of Leesburg Municipal Firemen's Retirement System is hereby created to read as follows:

**(37) Required Minimum Distributions**

Notwithstanding anything in the plan to the contrary, all distributions under the plan shall comply with section 401(a)(9) of the Code and the Regulations thereunder, as prescribed by the Commissioner in Revenue Rulings, Notices and other guidance published in the Internal Revenue Bulletin, to the extent that said provisions apply to governmental plans under section 414(d) of the Code.

**SECTION 3.** Section 2.4 of the City of Leesburg Municipal Firemen's Retirement System is hereby created to read as follows:

**2.4 – DISABILITY RETIREMENT AND RETIREMENT INCOME**

(A) **Disability Retirement:**

A Participant may retire from the Service of the City under the Plan if his Service is terminated by reason of his Total and Permanent Disability as defined in Section 2.4 (B) below and on or after October 1, 1991, but prior to his Normal Retirement Date. Such retirement from the Service of the City shall herein be referred to a disability retirement. In the event of disability retirement, uniformly and consistently applied rules shall be used with respect to all Participants in similar circumstances and payment of retirement income will be governed by the following provisions of this Section 2.4.

(B) **Total and Permanent Disability:**

A Participant may be considered disabled by the Retirement Committee if, in the opinion of a duly licensed physician selected by the Retirement Committee, such Participant is so disabled as to be permanently unable to execute the regular duties of his usual course of employment as a Firefighter with the City or the duties of such other position or job within the Fire Department which the City makes available to him and for which such Employee is qualified by reason of his training, education or experience without loss of pay or benefits.

(1) The provisions of Sections 112.18, 112.181, and 175.231, Fla. Stat., are hereby codified within the Plan and are intended to be incorporated by reference. The Board of Trustees may adopt uniform administrative rules for the conduct of hearings relating to these rebuttable presumptions and for the determination of any disqualifying events reflected in Chapters 112 and 175, Fla. Stat.

(2) The provisions of Section 112.1816, Fla. Stat., are hereby codified within the Plan and are intended to be incorporated by reference. The Board of Trustees may adopt

uniform administrative rules for the conduct of hearings relating to absolute causation for an in-service disability pension and for the determination of any disqualifying events as reflected in the statute.

***********

**SECTION 4**. It is the intention of the City Commission, and it is hereby ordained, that the provisions of this Ordinance shall become and be made a part of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Lakeland, that the sections of the Ordinance may be renumbered or re-lettered to accomplish such intentions, and that the word "Ordinance" shall be changed to "Section" or other appropriate word as the context so requires.

**SECTION 5**. All ordinances or parts of ordinances in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

**SECTION 6**. If any word, sentence, clause, phrase, or provision of this Ordinance, for any reason, is held to be unconstitutional, void, or invalid, the validity of the remainder of this Ordinance shall not be affected thereby.

**SECTION 7.** This Ordinance shall take effect immediately upon its passage.

**Passed on First Reading** this ____day of __________________ 2023.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED** at the regular meeting of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida, on this ____ day of _____________ 2023.

**THE CITY OF LEESBURG, FLORIDA**

____________________________________
James A. Burry, Jr., Mayor

Attest:

___________________________
City Clerk

## Miscellaneous Accounts Receivable Customers With Unpaid Balances
**Prepared by Finance**
**April 30, 2023**

**CURRENTLY WORKED BY PROVIDING DEPARTMENT OR FINANCE**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **001 Fund** | | | |
| Jennings, Matthew | Boat not here/ Sent to Attorney | Marina Rent | 711.99 |
| Porter-Shaw, Breanna | Working with Police Dept | Security for Jan 28,2023 | 40.00 |
| | | | **711.99** |
| **013 Fund** | | | |
| Calhoun, Contessa | Working with Housing Dept | Housing Rent | 3,031.00 |
| Piard, Marie | Working with Housing Dept | Housing Rent | 1,952.00 |
| | | | **4,983.00** |
| **041 Fund** | | | |
| Nix, Corey | Working with Electric/ making payments | Apprentice Reimbursement | 2,050.59 |
| | | | **2,050.59** |
| **510 Fund** | | | |
| Lowery, Clara Necole | Working with Fleet | Damage to City Property | 2,238.67 |
| | | | **2,238.67** |
| | | **Total** | **9,984.25** |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **001 FUND TOTAL** | **$** | **711.99** |
| **013 FUND TOTAL** | **$** | **4,983.00** |
| **041 FUND TOTAL** | **$** | **2,050.59** |
| **510 FUND TOTAL** | **$** | **2,238.67** |
| | **$** | **9,984.25** |

**Expected write offs as of Apr 30, 2023**

Every September, the Finance Director informs the Commission the dollar amount of customer accounts to be written off. Listed below are the amounts for the prior fiscal years and how the City is trending for fiscal years 2021 and 2022

| Fiscal Write Off Year | Projected Written Off | | Actual Written Off | Add'l Amount Collected |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2021-2022 | $ 281,753 | | 350,141 | 68,388 |
| 2020-2021 | 307,042 | | 22,615 | (284,427) |
| 2019-2020 | 284,281 | | 666,005 | 381,724 |
| 2018-2019 | 342,912 | | 284,276 | (58,636) |
| 2017-2018 | 394,427 | | 268,001 | (126,426) |
| 2016-2017 | 345,913 | | 314,552 | (31,361) |
| 2015-2016 | 491,091 | | 440,511 | (50,580) |
| 2014-2015 | 431,543 | | 364,023 | (67,519) |
| 2013-2014 | 292,507 | | 258,246 | (34,261) |
| 2012-2013 | 280,544 | * | 216,319 | (64,225) |
| 2011-2012 | 380,227 | * | 341,414 | (38,813) |

**Projected**
**Fiscal year 2022 - Month by Month**
**10/01/21- 09/30/22**

| Month | Amount Written Off | Number of Accounts Commercial | Number of Accounts Residential | Average Account Balance Commercial | Average Account Balance Residential |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| October | $ 18,445 | 3 | 67 | 185.97 | 266.97 |
| November | 19,468 | 6 | 65 | 165.85 | 284.19 |
| December | 25,734 | 3 | 71 | 365.75 | 347.00 |
| January | 18,428 | 1 | 60 | 237.64 | 303.17 |
| February | 21,646 | 2 | 62 | 157.19 | 1,790.76 |
| March | 17,878 | 0 | 43 | 0.00 | 415.78 |
| April | 32,964 | 11 | 61 | 1,030.32 | 354.60 |
| May | 15,027 | 0 | 47 | 0.00 | 319.73 |
| June | 29,250 | 2 | 71 | 381.48 | 401.23 |
| July | 34,286 | 4 | 79 | 6,811.79 | 347.77 |
| August | 18,029 | 3 | 46 | 433.27 | 363.67 |
| September | 30,599 | 3 | 76 | 1,896.88 | 327.73 |
| Accounts to be written off* | $ 281,754 | 38 | 748 | | |
| Prior Yr to Date | $ 307,042 | 36 | 821 | | |
| difference - () negative | $ 25,288 | (2) | 73 | | |

**Projected**
**Fiscal year 2023- Month by Month**
**10/01/22- 09/30/23**

| Month | Amount Written Off | Number of Accounts Commercia | Number of Accounts Residential | Average Account Balance Commercial | Average Account Balance Residential |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| October | $ 23,873 | 5 | 77 | 199.24 | 297.10 |
| November | 34,977 | 1 | 90 | 290.80 | 385.40 |
| December | 52,217 | 6 | 119 | 936.08 | 391.60 |
| January | 48,307 | 4 | 76 | 3,201.68 | 467.10 |
| February | 53,540 | 3 | 88 | 373.72 | 595.67 |
| March | 58,912 | 4 | 99 | 977.69 | 555.57 |
| April | 34,336 | 1 | 56 | 474.74 | 604.66 |
| May | | | | | |
| June | | | | | |
| July | | | | | |
| August | | | | | |
| September | | | | | |
| Accounts to be writte | $ 306,162 | 24 | 605 | | |
| Prior Yr to Date | $ 154,563 | 26 | 429 | | |
| difference - () negative | $ 151,599 | (2) | 176 | | |

City of Leesburg, Florida
Report of **REVENUES** by Fund
For Period Beginning of October 1, 2022- April 30, 2023 or 58%

| | REVENUES | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | CURRENT YEAR | | | LAST YEAR | |
| Fund Name | FY 23 Adjusted Budget | FY 23 Revenue | FY 23 Percentage | FY 22 Revenue | FY 22 Percentage |
| General Fund | 30,693,872 | 19,412,648 | 63% | 19,996,195 | 67% |
| Special Revenue Fund | | | | | |
| Housing Assistance | 106,680 | 79,903 | 75% | 59,185 | 61% |
| Debt Service Fund | 1,745,218 | 1,608,036 | 92% | 1,614,659 | 92% |
| Capital Projects Fund | 6,326,541 | 644,916 | 10% | 2,391,861 | 76% |
| Discretionary Sales Tax | 2,599,868 | 1,559,181 | 60% | 1,291,390 | 137% |
| Police Forfeiture Fund | - | 41,075 | 0% | 22,445 | 54% |
| Police Education Fund | - | 3,062 | 0% | 2,569 | 0% |
| Gas Tax | 800,000 | 445,813 | 56% | 391,386 | 52% |
| Police Impact Fees | - | 395,319 | 0% | 88,266 | 0% |
| Fire Impact Fees | - | 44,543 | 0% | 96,479 | 0% |
| Recreaton Impact Fees | - | 72,150 | 0% | 160,753 | 0% |
| Building Fund | 1,073,600 | 576,858 | 54% | 607,189 | 58% |
| Community Redevelopment Agencies | | | | | |
| Greater Leesburg CRA fund | 752,463 | 754,078 | 100% | 557,971 | 98% |
| Carver Heights CRA fund | 654,068 | 670,191 | 102% | 514,072 | 101% |
| Highway 27/441 CRA fund | 1,829,915 | 1,834,669 | 100% | 1,359,081 | 99% |
| Enterprise Funds | | | | | |
| Stormwater Utility Fund | 1,916,746 | 1,030,863 | 54% | 979,757 | 79% |
| Electric Utility Fund | 95,863,940 | 44,370,454 | 46% | 39,207,300 | 61% |
| Gas Utility Fund | 9,906,850 | 7,014,297 | 71% | 6,356,618 | 79% |
| Water Utility Fund | 11,067,692 | 6,366,513 | 58% | 5,762,140 | 59% |
| Wastewater Utility Fund | 15,386,454 | 9,093,596 | 59% | 14,588,982 | 78% |
| Solid Waste Utility Fund | 4,962,610 | 2,870,838 | 58% | 2,767,672 | 60% |
| Airport Fund | 6,056,251 | 1,015,761 | 17% | 932,451 | 15% |
| Internal Services Fund | | | | | |
| Health Insurance Fund | 7,769,137 | 4,109,297 | 53% | 4,761,796 | 62% |
| Workers Comp Insurance Fund | 1,160,309 | 681,806 | 59% | 567,358 | 84% |
| Fleet Maintenance Fund | 3,798,186 | 1,777,016 | 47% | 1,901,602 | 51% |
| Pension Trust Funds | | | | | |
| Police Retirement Trust Fund | 2,223,377 | 3,122,675 | 140% | (1,432,444) | 0% |
| Fire Retirement Trust Fund | 1,720,614 | 3,159,879 | 184% | (1,269,097) | 0% |
| General Employees Trust Fund | 3,240,408 | 3,995,627 | 123% | (859,899) | 0% |
| Use of Fund Balance (Various funds) | 78,322,409 | | | | |
| Total All Funds | 289,977,208 | 116,751,064 | 55% | 103,417,737 | 61% |

City of Leesburg, Florida
Report of **EXPENSES** by Fund
For Period Beginning of **October 1, 2022- April 30, 2023** or **58%**

| | EXPENSES | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | CURRENT YEAR | | | LAST YEAR | |
| Fund Name | FY 23 Adjusted Budget | FY 23 Expenses | FY 23 Percentage | FY 22 Expenses | FY 22 Percentage |
| General Fund | 32,760,412 | 17,782,009 | 54% | 17,914,493 | 56% |
| Special Revenue Fund | | | | | |
| Housing Assistance | 162,112 | 72,848 | 45% | 73,213 | 48% |
| Debt Service Fund | 1,745,218 | 1,604,800 | 92% | 1,610,787 | 92% |
| Capital Projects Fund | 12,788,301 | 702,452 | 5% | 3,101,790 | 40% |
| Discretionary Sales Tax | 2,680,893 | 181,685 | 7% | 1,325,889 | 52% |
| Police Forfeiture Fund | 61,571 | - | 0% | - | 0% |
| Police Education Fund | 3,500 | 6,915 | 198% | 6,523 | 109% |
| Gas Tax | 1,207,052 | 451,599 | 37% | 572,701 | 76% |
| Police Impact Fees | 204,900 | 197,761 | 97% | 8,000 | 76% |
| Fire Impact Fees | 47,949 | 3,400 | 7% | 7,120 | 2848% |
| Recreaton Impact Fees | - | 3,470 | 0% | 182,560 | 101% |
| Building Fund | 1,570,402 | 745,802 | 47% | 905,497 | 52% |
| Community Redevelopment Agencies | | | | | |
| Greater Leesburg CRA fund | 813,641 | 505,230 | 62% | 627,323 | 87% |
| Carver Heights CRA fund | 754,068 | 125,853 | 17% | 448,444 | 63% |
| Highway 27/441 CRA fund | 1,979,110 | 145,674 | 7% | 176,656 | 12% |
| Enterprise Funds | | | | | |
| Stormwater Utility Fund | 3,283,752 | 710,364 | 22% | 803,207 | 33% |
| Electric Utility Fund | 102,434,356 | 43,695,675 | 43% | 39,872,590 | 52% |
| Gas Utility Fund | 11,701,816 | 5,202,180 | 44% | 4,888,502 | 44% |
| Water Utility Fund | 17,692,463 | 5,326,504 | 30% | 4,900,797 | 35% |
| Wastewater Utility Fund | 64,033,187 | 7,676,228 | 12% | 6,537,529 | 20% |
| Solid Waste Utility Fund | 5,454,110 | 3,454,777 | 63% | 3,400,936 | 66% |
| Airport Fund | 7,050,961 | 1,722,747 | 24% | 1,514,232 | 20% |
| Internal Services Fund | | | | | |
| Health Insurance Fund | 7,769,137 | 4,860,267 | 63% | 5,110,808 | 66% |
| Workers Comp Insurance Fund | 1,160,309 | 790,399 | 68% | 373,289 | 56% |
| Fleet Maintenance Fund | 5,433,589 | 1,838,648 | 34% | 2,050,899 | 47% |
| Pension Trust Funds | | | | | |
| Police Retirement Trust Fund | 2,223,377 | 779,284 | 35% | 1,331,539 | 68% |
| Fire Retirement Trust Fund | 1,720,614 | 977,951 | 57% | 837,011 | 50% |
| General Employees Trust Fund | 3,240,408 | 1,909,350 | 59% | 1,954,605 | 60% |
| Total All Funds | 289,977,208 | 101,473,872 | 35% | 100,536,940 | 46% |

x

CITY OF LEESBURG
CASH AND INVESTMENTS BY FUND
4/30/2023

| POOLED CASH & INVESTMENTS | TOTAL | GENERAL FUND | SPECIAL REVENUE FUNDS GROUP | DEBT SERVICE FUNDS | CAPITAL PROJECTS FUND | ELECTRIC UTILITY FUND | GAS UTILITY FUND | WATER UTILITY FUND | WASTEWATER TREATMENT FUND | COMMUNICATION FUND | SANITATION SERVICES FUND | STORM WATER FUND | AIRPORT FUND | BUILDING PERMITS FUND | INTERNAL SERVICE FUNDS GROUP |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| OPERATING CASH | $75,702,354.72 | $15,478,950.72 | $8,840,135.51 | $ 510,986.90 | $ 12,885.76 | $9,721,238.18 | $ 4,724,174.04 | $ 6,092,208.54 | $ 13,977,826.46 | | $ 1,176,964.23 | $3,455,903.19 | $4,538,050.18 | $ 1,794,163.16 | $ 5,378,867.85 |
| RESTRICTED CASH | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CUSTOMER DEPOSITS | 7,005,344.91 | | | | | 5,118,289.89 | 1,175,054.74 | 700,525.28 | 1,820.00 | | 9,655.00 | | | | |
| RENEWL & REPLCMNT | 18,971,734.24 | 1,935,480.03 | 21,743.28 | | | (133,375.76) | 531,392.46 | 3,634,555.05 | 11,552,507.59 | | 850,000.00 | | | | 579,431.59 |
| BOND/NOTE SINKING FUND | 33,647,176.21 | | 568,372.76 | | | 1,085,841.37 | 40,693.71 | 433,250.80 | 31,519,017.57 | | | | | | |
| INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SIGN GRANT & HUD SHIP | 306,782.00 | | 306,782.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HWY 441/27 CRA - Restricted Surplus | 600,000.00 | | 600,000.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| IMPACT FEES | 7,305,842.82 | | | | | | | 1,961,647.39 | 5,344,195.43 | | | | | | |
| OTHER RESTRICTED CASH | 12,614,655.92 | | 73,233.03 | | 12,360,965.36 | | | | | | | | | | |
| DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS | 508,557.92 | | | | | 503,428.52 | 5,129.40 | | | | | | | | |
| RATE STABILIZATION | (3,231,127.00) | | | | | (3,231,127.00) | | | | | | | | | |
| SUBTOTAL OF RESTRICTED CASH | 77,728,967.02 | 1,935,480.03 | 1,570,131.07 | | 12,360,965.36 | 3,343,057.02 | 1,752,270.31 | 6,729,978.52 | 48,417,540.59 | | 859,655.00 | | | | 579,431.59 |
| TOTAL POOLED CASH | $153,431,321.74 | $ 17,414,430.75 | $ 10,410,266.58 | $ 510,986.90 | $ 12,373,851.12 | $ 13,064,295.20 | $ 6,476,444.35 | $ 12,822,187.06 | $ 62,395,367.05 | $ - | $ 2,036,619.23 | $ 3,455,903.19 | $ 4,538,050.18 | $ 1,794,163.16 | $ 5,958,299.44 |
| NON-POOLED RESTRICTED CASH | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CASH WITH FISCAL AGENT | 1,248,599.91 | | | 678,607.69 | | | 95,601.76 | 198,858.90 | 275,531.56 | | | | | | |
| DEPOSITORY TRUST ACCOUNT | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DEP-WELLS FARGO | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SUBTOTAL NON-POOLED CASH | 1,248,599.91 | | | 678,607.69 | | | 95,601.76 | 198,858.90 | 275,531.56 | | | | | | |
| TOTAL POOLED CASH AND INVEST | $154,679,921.65 | $17,414,430.75 | $ 10,410,266.58 | $1,189,594.59 | $12,373,851.12 | $13,064,295.20 | $6,572,046.11 | $13,021,045.96 | $62,670,898.61 | | $2,036,619.23 | $3,455,903.19 | $4,538,050.18 | $1,794,163.16 | $5,958,299.44 |

INDIVIDUAL SPECIAL REVENUE FUNDS

| POOLED CASH & INVESTMENTS | SPECIAL REVENUE FUNDS TOTAL | HOUSING ASSISTANCE FUND | GREATER LEESBURG CRA FUND | CARVER HEIGHTS CRA FUND | HIGHWAY 441/27 CRA FUND | POLICE FORFEITURE FUND | POLICE EDUCATION FUND | DISCRETIONARY SALES TAX FUND | GAS TAX FUND | POLICE IMPACT FUND | FIRE IMPACT FUND | RECREATION IMPACT FUND |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| OPERATING CASH | $ 8,840,135.51 | $ 221,006.19 | $ 295,441.47 | $ 717,472.80 | $ 3,403,994.09 | $ 144,717.41 | $ (3,018.23) | $ 1,930,669.59 | $ 585,467.48 | $ 947,612.53 | $ 222,192.19 | $ 374,579.99 |
| RESTRICTED CASH | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HUD SHIP PROGRAM & $HOUSE PROCEEDS | 73,233.03 | 73,233.03 | | | | | | | | | | |
| BOND/NOTE SINKING FUND | 568,372.76 | | 54,016.25 | | 514,356.51 | | | | | | | |
| SIGN GRANT | 306,782.00 | | 57,587.00 | 100,000.00 | 149,195.00 | | | | | | | |
| R&R / OTHER RESTRICTED | 21,743.28 | 21,743.28 | | | | | | | | | | |
| CUSTOMER DEPOSITS | 600,000.00 | | | | 600,000.00 | | | | | | | |
| SUBTOTAL OF RESTRICTED CASH | $ 1,570,131.07 | $ 94,976.31 | $ 111,603.25 | $ 100,000.00 | $ 1,263,551.51 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ - |
| TOTAL POOLED CASH | $ 10,410,266.58 | $ 315,982.50 | $ 407,044.72 | $ 817,472.80 | $ 4,667,545.60 | $ 144,717.41 | $ (3,018.23) | $ 1,930,669.59 | $ 585,467.48 | $ 947,612.53 | $ 222,192.19 | $ 374,579.99 |
| NON-POOLED RESTRICTED CASH | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DEP-WELLS FARGO | - | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SUBTOTAL NON-POOLED CASH | $ - | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL POOLED CASH AND INVEST | $ 10,410,266.58 | $ 315,982.50 | $ 407,044.72 | $ 817,472.80 | $ 4,667,545.60 | $ 144,717.41 | $ (3,018.23) | $ 1,930,669.59 | $ 585,467.48 | $ 947,612.53 | $ 222,192.19 | $ 374,579.99 |

INTERNAL SERVICE FUNDS

| POOLED CASH & INVESTMENTS | INTERNAL SERVICE FUNDS TOTAL | HEALTH INSURANCE FUND | WORKERS' COMPENSATION FUND | RISK MANAGEMENT FUND | FLEET MAINTENANCE FUND |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| OPERATING CASH | $ 5,378,867.85 | $ 1,117,073.49 | $ 1,446,048.29 | $ - | $ 2,815,746.07 |
| RESTRICTED CASH | 579,431.59 | | | | 579,431.59 |
| SUBTOTAL OF RESTRICTED CASH | $ 579,431.59 | $ - | $ - | $ - | $ 579,431.59 |
| TOTAL POOLED CASH | $ 5,958,299.44 | $ 1,117,073.49 | $ 1,446,048.29 | $ - | $ 3,395,177.66 |
| TOTAL POOLED CASH AND INVESTMENTS | $ 5,958,299.44 | $ 1,117,073.49 | $ 1,446,048.29 | $ - | $ 3,395,177.66 |

**CITY OF LEESBURG**
**INVESTMENT REPORT**
4/30/2023

| **DESCRIPTION** | | **BALANCE 4/30/2023** |
|---|---|---|
| BANK OPERATING AND SAVINGS ACCOUNTS | | |
| Truist Bank - Disbursement | $53,132,694 | |
| TD Bank - Savings | 77,342 | |
| Southstate Bank - Savings | 11,443 | |
| Southstate Bank - CD | 2,000,000 | |
| JP Morgan - CD | 5,000,000 | |
| Southstate Bank - CD | 5,000,000 | |
| TD Bank - CD | 4,000,000 | |
| Seaside Bank | 4,038,495 | |
| | | $73,259,973 |
| LOCAL GOVERNMENT INVESTMENT POOLS | | |
| FLSAFE | 8,021,861 | |
| FLCLASS | 10,167,545 | |
| FLPRIME | 4,136,942 | |
| | | 22,326,348 |
| U S TREASURY MONEY MARKET FUND (FGU Deposit) | | 0 |
| US BANK (Fiscal Agent) | | 1,248,600 |
| CHANDLER ASSET MANAGEMENT (SECURITIES) | 57,845,000 | |
| PUBLIC TRUST ADVISORS (SECURITIES) | 0 | |
| | | 57,845,000 |
| TOTAL INVESTMENTS | | 154,679,922 |
| MARKET ADJUSTMENT | | (542,171) |
| **TOTAL VALUE OF INVESTMENTS** | | **$154,137,751** |