AGENDA MINUTES
CITY COMMISSION MEETING
CITY HALL, 501 W MEADOW STREET
MONDAY, OCTOBER 28, 2024 5:30 PM

1. CALL TO ORDER

The City of Leesburg Commission held a regular meeting on Monday, October 28, 2024, 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, Deputy City Clerk (DCC) Anna Rottermond, the news media, and others.

INVOCATION

The invocation and pledge of allegiance were performed at the Carver Heights/Montclair Area Community Redevelopment meeting held immediately prior to this meeting.

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.

Caroline Van Dyken of 120 Palmora, Leesburg gave a shout-out to all the city employees who worked around the clock during and after the hurricane. Their dedication and hard work did not go unnoticed. With Halloween, her subdivision is hit hard by trick-or-treaters. She hoped that the trees and debris would be cleared out before then to make it safer for the trick-or-treaters. She appreciates the police presence on Halloween because it is a great opportunity for the police to build relationships with the youth.

Now, for the real reason why she was there, the speed cameras. She was confused about how it was approved. After the last meeting, she went back and reviewed all the documentation. On April 8th under the consent agenda, it was approved without being pulled or discussed and the contract with Altumint was signed that day. However, three months later it was brought back to the commission under ordinances to discuss the first reading and second reading. The first reading was July 8th and the second reading was July 22nd. She did not understand how the process worked, because she thought it had to be under ordinances for the first and second readings before approving a contract. She was unsure how the city got into this to begin with, because it is a burden to taxpayers. The expenses range over $200,000 a year and that is being conservative. We will also spend an additional $18 per citation. Then they are adding to the case load of the hearing officer, which means the city will have to pay her more to handle these cases. With the zone times on the signs, yes, they do clearly state the zone times are thirty minutes before and thirty minutes after school starts. However, there are no zone times as far as when the speed limit is to be reduced as far as a flashing light. Who monitors the flashing lights and are they synced with the cameras? They have internal digital clocks and digital clocks do get off. There could be a possibility where thirty seconds makes a difference between the flashing light and the camera system, and that could accuse a citizen of doing wrong. It would then fall to the citizen to prove otherwise.

Ray Hayden of 35121 Dennis Road Leesburg said the Lake Montessori School on Lee Street is normally 25 mph, and it goes to 15 mph at the curve. That curve happens in the blink of an eye. His wife told him about it, so he had to go see for himself, and there were no flashing lights. Thankfully, they did not get hit by the speed thing, but there will be a situation there because there is no warning. Someone needs to look at that and get it cleaned up.

Tralonie Montoute of 816 Georgia Avenue presented a packet of information along with a USB drive that included videos and pictures of her personal property that was damaged by the hurricane because the Leesburg Public Works department did not take care of the flooding situation prior to the storm. **CM Minner** accepted the information she provided. He verified that she was filing a formal claim against the city. **Ms. Montoute** agreed. **CM Minner** explained that he would disseminate that information to Lisa Earl, who is the city's risk manager. She will file the claim tomorrow with our insurance company and the insurance company will determine whether the city has any liability in the situation. It may take a couple of weeks for the insurance company to review the information and make a determination. However, she will hear from them.

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

Commissioner Reisman moved to adopt the Consent Agenda as presented, and Commissioner Pederson 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 October 14, 2024

B. PURCHASING ITEMS:

1. Purchase request for the purchase of nine (9) new 2025 Ford Interceptor Utility AWD vehicles for the Police Department in the amount of $392,826.60 from Garber Fleet Sales, contract holder for the central Florida region under the Florida Sheriffs Association.

2. Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute an Agreement with Ballfer Service Corp for services related to the Mispah Simmons Fence Replacement for an amount of $61,260.00; and providing an effective date.

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 11,910

3. Purchase request for twelve (12) M500- in car system with body worn camera for the Police Department's new police officers for the amount of $150,360.00 from Motorola Solutions, Inc.

4. Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute an Agreement with TFR Enterprises, Inc. for Hurricane Milton Vegetative Debris Grinding; and providing an effective date.

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 11,911

5. Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute an Agreement with Missing Link Mitigation Preserve, LLC. for 0.12 Dual Freshwater Forested and .4 Dual Herbaceous wetland mitigation credits for the Susan Street Sports Complex Project; and providing an effective date.

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 11,912

C. RESOLUTIONS:

1. Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute an Amendment to Agreement for Professional Services with Kimberly A. Schulte to include services as the City's Local Hearing Officer for the City's School Zone Speed Enforcement Program; and providing an effective date.

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 11,913

2. Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida, approving a Proportionate Share Mitigation Agreement entered into by and between the School Board of Lake County, Florida, Kolter Group Acquisitions, LLC, and the City of Leesburg, Florida, to allow for payment of Lake County School Impact Fees; and providing an effective date. (Bar Key Reserve Phase 1)

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 11,914

3. Resolutions authorizing the execution of Gas Service Agreements between the City of Leesburg and Aguia Marina, LLC, to the developments known as Terra Vista Phase 1, Terra Vista Phase 2, and Terra Vista Phase 3.

a. Resolutions 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 Aguia Marina, LLC, regarding offsite development for the provision of natural gas service to the developments known as Terra Vista Phase 1; and providing an effective date.

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 11,915

b. Resolutions 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 Aguia Marina, LLC, regarding offsite development for the provision of natural gas service to the developments known as Terra Vista Phase 2; and providing an effective date.

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 11,916

c. Resolutions 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 Aguia Marina, LLC, regarding offsite development for the provision of natural gas service to the developments known as Terra Vista Phase 3; and providing an effective date.

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 11,917

4. **Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute a Civic Organization Funding Agreement for Fiscal Year 2024-25 with Leesburg Cemeteries, Inc.; and providing an effective date.**

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 11,918

5. **Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida, accepting a Utility Easement affecting the property described therein from DNA Realty Trust, LLC, joined by Chestnut Equity Partners, LLC; and providing an effective date.**

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 11,919

6. PUBLIC HEARINGS AND NON-ROUTINE ITEMS:

A. SECOND READING OF ORDINANCES

1. **None**

B. FIRST READING OF ORDINANCES

1. **An Ordinance of the City of Leesburg, Florida, establishing the Orange Bend Community Development District pursuant to Chapter 190, Florida Statutes; providing for authority and power of the district; providing for the Board of Supervisors of the District; providing for the District budget; providing for functions of the district; providing for miscellaneous provisions; and providing an effective date. (Orange Bend CDD)**

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.

PZD Miller stated this was a request to establish the Orange Bend Community Development District. It is generally located on Couty Road 44 south of County Road 473, and the project consists of approximately six hundred and forty acres. As a reminder, CDDs are provided under Florida Statute, Chapter 190. The reason for creating and funding special purpose districts such as CDDs is to manage, deliver, and finance basic community development services. The services include construction and operation of water, wastewater, roads, bridges, environmental and conservation areas, along with parks, schools and security infrastructure and services. All CDDs are individual, and they can choose what they wish to fund or not. Once they are created, they are limited to specific geographical areas. They cannot encumber debt to local government nor do they have zoning or police powers. The city currently has several CDDs in place, including Arlington Ridge, The Villages of West Lake, Terra Oaks, and County Road 33. Jere Earlywine of Kutak Rock of Tallahassee is present to answer any questions. **Mayor Burry** asked if there were any public comments.

Ray Hayden of 35121 Dennis Road, Leesburg stated he and his neighbors have concerns about Orange Bend Ranch. They have astronomy enthusiasts in their community who are concerned about Orange Bend Ranch not being required to comply with the City of Leesburg dark sky lighting standard. They understand that Orange Bend Ranch was annexed prior to Leesburg adopting the dark sky standards; however, they believe it would be in everyone's best interest for Orange Bend Ranch to comply with the updated standard, so they, along with new homeowners of Orange Bend Ranch, can continue to enjoy stargazing. A forester group advised him that they were exploring their options regarding dark sky lighting. This is a sensitive area, and it would be nice if they complied with that standard. The neighbors are concerned about the broad language surrounding rentals in the draft HOA documents. They do not want Orange Bend Ranch to become a haven for corporate rentals and neither Section 12.22 nor any other restriction in this declaration shall be construed to impose a limit on the total of homes that Orange Bend Ranch can lease to a third party. They would like a requirement added that the recorded title owner of a home resides in the home as the primary or secondary resident. Along with a requirement that the record titleholder owner of a home occupy the home for a specified period of time before they are permitted to rent the home to a third party. With the non-exclusive use prior to the community completion date and the declaration, thereafter, says the association has the right at any and all times, and from time to time, to additionally provide to make the common areas available to other individuals, persons, firms or corporations as it deems appropriate. They do not understand the implications of making the common areas available to other individuals, persons, firms or corporations as deemed appropriate. The association shall so be solely responsible for the drainage system facility and facilities, which may be comprised of swales, pipes, pumps retention/detention slopes or easements. It has been his observation that annexed property for Leesburg has typically been taken over and the surface water management. Given Orange Bend Ranch will impact the wetlands of the emerald or marsh rural protection area, the neighbors would prefer to have Leesburg assume surface water management and wetlands maintenance as they have in other communities.

Lisa Hayden of 35121 Dennis Road, Leesburg remarked that with Orange Bend Ranch CDD, their neighbors all agree that this is a done deal. They wanted to be good neighbors, so she reached out to Four-Star and spoke with a lovely lady by the name of Shelly. She would like to continue their good relationship. She wanted to know if the planning and zoning director could expand on why Orange Bend Ranch needs to be a CDD because she was unfamiliar with them. In the ordinance under Section 5, it says there can be expansions. She wanted to know under what circumstances they could do an expansion? Would they purchase more land and is that why the area east of County Road 44 and north of Poe Street was not included in the CDD?

Jere Earlywine of Kutak Rock said some of the questions relate to the project development itself. However, with respect to the HOA documents and how it dictates what happens with specific homes and things like that has nothing to do with the CDD petition. A CDD is an alternative structure to a homeowners' association. It is set up like an HOA, but it does more things because they can go out and

finance public infrastructure, including the drainage system. The utilities will be turned over to the city for ownership and operation, but CDDs typically retain the drainage structure as opposed to the city putting them in a special taxing district. There may be a conflict in the HOA declaration, and he will go back and talk to Four-Star about it, because the CDD would actually have ownership and operation. That is a good thing because they can apply for FEMA funding along with statewide mutual aid if a big storm comes through. A CDD can also be collected on the tax roll. It has sovereign immunity protection, so it is a more robust operation/maintenance entity that takes care of storm events. With respect to the expansion parcel, there is a piece that is largely conservation. He was unsure if Four Star owned that yet and that may be why it was not included in the petition. The idea may be that they identified it as a future expansion parcel not for homes, but to keep it in conservation owned by a government entity.
Bear in mind that the CDD costs are only paid by that neighborhood, so it will be funded by the residents of Orange Bend and not the folks that reside around it. **Mayor Burry** pointed out on the CDD map that was included in the packet, it did not include the property on the east side of County Road 44. **Mr. Earlywine** agreed. He wished he knew the answer to that. He was not sure if Four Star owned it because it was not part of the petition. From the audience, **Ms. Hayden** said it was all listed as one alt key, and that was why she was confused. **Mr. Earlywine** explained that it may be multifamily or commercial and that may be why that piece of property was excluded. He would get in touch with Four Star to find out that information. **CM Minner** explained that this was the first reading. They will look into that question and get it squared away before the second reading. The short answer is, either it was a scriveners error or they plan to bring it back at a different time during their phasing. They may expand the CDD as they develop the property, but they will get clarification about that by second reading. **Commissioner Connell** asked if dark sky lighting could be added to the PUD at this point. **PZD Miller** answered the way to add the dark sky standard to this PUD would be to reopen the PUD. However, they have been in the process of updating the land development standards. However, that is done after they adopt the comprehensive plan in December. After that, they will begin working on the land development regulations. That is where they intend to put the landscaping and dark sky requirements. The city has never adopted a dark sky standard, but we put that in all PUDs. **Commissioner Connell** wanted to know if the client was open to adding that to the PUD. **Mr. Earlywine** replied that he would ask, but again the development approvals are separate from the CDD petition. **Mayor Burry** stated this item would lie over.

C. NON-ROUTINE ITEMS

1. GE / ITRON AMI (ADVANCE METERING INFRASTRUCTURE) AGREEMENTS

a. Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute the GRIDIQ Separation Agreement with GE Vernova; and providing an effective date.

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 11,920

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

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

Mayor Burry asked the city manager to provide a brief explanation. **CM Minner** explained that this was one of the most significant things that we have done all year. Essentially, the concept is to move out of the GE contract, which is really the bookend now on the smart grid system that the city endeavored to enter back in November 2011. This would put an end to the GE contract and usher in a new way for the city to monitor and issue all our metering associated with the electric department. In 2011, the city endeavored to get into the 21st century with respect to metering.

At that time, the electric industry was making changes and leaving the old analog ways. When we endeavored into this project with GE, better known as the smart grid, we ultimately tried to do several different things. We issued a $10 million dollar debt, and we received a $10 million dollar grant from the federal government to make system improvements. We also made several attempts at automating our electric system from the meter reading concept. We made system improvements to the demand side management on a wholesale level with major customers and with individual residential customers. There are many parts of the GE contract that worked, and we need to continue doing them, and this concept contemplates that. Essentially, that is to keep our current AMI (automated metering infrastructure) grid in place. We would keep the same type of meters, components, and software to allow for a seamless change from GE to ITron. It would be a seamless integration because ITron is a subcontractor of GE. When we endeavored into this back in 2011, there were some other concepts that did not work. When he was hired, we identified what was working and what was not working. By April 2014, we got together with GE and talked about what programs were not working and most of that was associated with the demand side, wholesale stuff with the big customers like Publix and Walmart. We had problems with our all-requirements partners in FMPA on the demand side of the program and at that time we were not going to be able to spread out to the residential component with our customer base, which made some of the integration more difficult for the regular type of AMI service. At that time, we modified the contract with GE and the term of the contract expires December 31, 2026. Without getting more in depth at this time, we are almost to the end of that fifteen-year contract. However, earlier this year, GE provided notice that they wanted to end the contract and if we could end the contract early, GE would go along with it. If we had to go through the term of the contract, GE advised us that they would no longer provide service. We do not know why GE made this determination, but in short, it comes down to one thing, GE no longer wants to be in the AMI business with municipal electric utilities. After receiving that notice, we put together a team led by the IT Director, Tino Anthony. He worked with the Electric Director, Brad Chase, as well as the Finance Director, James Williams. The metering component of all our utilities has a tertiary departmental effect because it weaves in with our IT software components and finance for the billing component. When GE gave notice, we saw it as an opportunity to hopefully save money, and we wanted to make the integration as seamless as possible. We knew if we rode out the terms of the contract with GE, we would have three big unknowns. First, costs, because we did not know what impact that would have on our software network. If we were not compatible, then we would have to change the software, which would make a longer, harder and non-seamless integration for our customers as well as the employees. We really wanted to avoid a system where we would have to be affected by both costs and software. With that, the initial thought was to work with ITron, who does a lot of the major AMI components of the metering, which was beneficial for the city, because they are a subcontractor of GE. We had to get GE permission, which took some time. Tonight, we have two resolutions on the agenda. This resolution will effectively end the GE contract once we become hooked on ITron. The process should take about nine to twelve months because there is a lot of software work that needs to be done with ITron to convert GE stuff to ITron that makes our systems compatible. Included in the packet was a scope of services (in IT talk) that outlines what needs to occur and how much ITron is charging. That cost is roughly $840,000 and the only possible negative (if there is one) is in FY 25, because the utility has a $840,000 initial cost that needs to be worked through to help with the transition. There are benchmarks in the scope of service work, and as we reach each benchmark ITron wants a certain payment, all the while, we still have to continue paying GE their monthly contract costs. By the time we hit the target date of September 2025, the GE contract will be null and void. A good thing is that GE is not charging us to end the contract early. That took some negotiation and a lot of credit for that goes to the IT Director, because we did get a reasonable deal from GE that essentially holds our contract in place while we fix our network system to mesh with ITron. When the conversion is complete, which is anticipated for September 2026, the GE contract will officially end and the new ITron contract will begin. That is the next resolution on the agenda. It is a seven-year contract with ITron to provide us with AMI services. Extensively, it will be seamless for the customers and that is the goal. The customers should not notice any difference from our side. The IT Director and his folks will do a lot of computer work with ITron during the scope of service work, shifting stuff over, and they will make sure everything works. Come September, we should be able to flip the switch and be with ITron. The big win in this situation is cost. There is a dramatic cost difference from GE because currently we pay about $1.5 million a year to GE. If we divide that cost by the customer base to get a unit cost, we are paying about $4.80 per read, per meter, per month. With ITron, that cost will be $1.60 for eighteen to twenty-six months and once the integration of $840,000 is out, that number will drop to about $1.40 per read, per meter, per month. We went back and compared where we were in 2011, and with the analog system it was about $.86 per meter read. We then moved to $1.40 per meter read over the last fifteen years. That equals an increase of 6%. So really, when we look at changing from analog to the AMI mode with ITron, that 6% increase is an industry standard. The financial part was summed up in the Excel spreadsheet that was provided in the packet. Now, why would we want to stay with ITron and consider this the sole source. That is because we want a seamless integration, we do not want to have additional costs for IT with different software, and we do not know what the complications would be if we went another route. We are very hopeful that ITron is seamless, so in that specific manner, they are the sole source of justification. With all things being equal, if we stayed with GE through the term of the contract there would be incremental costs for FY 24, FY 25, and FY 26, which are $1.43 million dollars, $1.478 million dollars, and $1.52 million dollars. If they break that down monthly from this fiscal year to fiscal year 2027, we would have spent $3.488 million dollars with GE. This fiscal year, we may spend about $672,000 with ITron and all of that is integration costs. That is an additional cost for this fiscal year. Next fiscal year we will still have to pay one more integration portion, but we hope that by November we can shift over and pay that last integration number. The Excel chart also shows a decrease from about $123,000 per month to $41,000 per month in terms of costs to read the meters. Long story short, if we compare GE from October 2024 to December 2026 at $3.48 million dollars and ITron costs all in, including the up front cost of $1.25 million dollars, we will save about $2.2 million dollars. So, while the costs jump up in the short term, in the first quarter of FY 27 we will recoup it all back. Then, moving forward, we will see a savings from about $1.5 million dollars to a flat rate of $464,000 per year. Financially, it makes sense and the network makes sense. He recommends passage of this resolution, which ends the GE contract once we are up and running with ITron. The next item on the agenda is the contract with ITron for seven years. Finalizing, he said there was a detailed conversation about this with the electric advisory board at their last meeting. There were four members present, and they recommended adoption of this process. It was a vote of four to zero with one member absent. **Mayor Burry** asked if there were any other questions or comments. There were none.

The roll call vote was:

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

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

b. Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute the AMI (Advanced Metering Infrastructure) Agreement with ITRON; and providing an effective date.

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 11,921

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

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

Mayor Burry requested comments from the Commission and the audience.

CM Minner remarked that everything he said in the last resolution was the same for this resolution. However, with the lingering $847,000 in the electric department, that is right on number as far as cash reserves hanging out around $7 million dollars. However, remember the hurricane numbers are there too. The hurricane will be out about $2 million dollars and then hopefully back in about $2 million dollars. Now, excluding the hurricane conversation, the electric department is sort of a nip and tuck. We finished up the last two months of the fiscal year (August and September) pretty strong with reasonable over recoveries, and that is a good position to be in. Perhaps that will help come April, because remember we talked about an extra fifty-cent increase in the power cost adjustment. That time will come and there are no determinations being made here. It really is about the cash flow level and, for now, we will move forward with the recommendation that the electric department pay for the one-stop target goals from the electric fund. If the electric numbers begin to look goofy, we will come back to the commission with different ways to potentially pay for this. He guessed that would come out of the general fund or other places, but it would just be a matter of shifting cash around to make the books look good. Honestly, we will have to take that on a month-by-month approach, but he wanted to put them on notice. The IT Director and Electric Director along with their folks really deserve a lot of credit for putting this together. In the short/long term, this will be very beneficial to the electric department because it keeps an extra million dollars in that fund, and that extra million dollars equates to a 3% rate increase. If we needed a 5% rate increase, we may only need a 2% increase. Having this ahead of the December 2026 GE deadline is good. As we move forward this fiscal year and beyond the first quarter, we will have to manage that cash, and he will report accordingly. **Commissioner Pederson** said the good news is that we are paying for it over time in monthly payments and not one big lump sum. **CM Minner** agreed, the payments would be either $84,000 or $168,000. Basically, we took that $840,000 number and divided it into ten payments. When we hit each goal, we will make a payment. It was spread out evenly over the term. He would not have wanted to weave those costs into the contract or throw interest on it. This is the best way to get that paid, so the city can get to saving as quickly as possible. **Commissioner Pederson** mentioned that he was happy to see that they started early on this versus waiting until 2026 because that would have been interesting. **CM Minner** replied that we would be in the same boat, but it would have caused a lot of work for the procurement department with electric and IT putting together a very convoluted, difficult RFP process. It would have taken three to six months just to write it. We would have had to put out an RFP with a series of RAIs. It would have been a very complex and a difficult bid process that would have taken us right up to December 2026. **Commissioner Pederson** added that we would have had almost the same shortfalls because we would have had to pay GE and pay ITron. **CM Minner** responded that if we went to the end of the contract we would have had a $3.4 million dollar payment through the end of the term, and they would have needed consultants to help weave stuff and to figure out the integration stuff. Honestly, we are saving a lot of money, and it will be seamless for our customers. **Commissioner**

Pederson thanked the city manager for summarizing it well because he had to call him for a five-minute synopsis after he read through it. **Mayor Burry** asked if there were any comments from the audience.

Caroline Van Dyken of 120 Palmora said she was a resident in 2010 when the discussions began with GE. She appreciated the city manager for giving a recap because, when he first started, he had to come in and handle this matter. He was not there when it was all brought forward with the GE contract, but basically, GE was a carpet sales representative that came in and sold us bad carpet. The contract was awful, and we spent a lot of money. She would be glad to see them out the door. However, her concern is ITron because ITron and GE have a pretty tight partnership. They are subcontractors, and she was not sure if they were one and the same. She wondered if GE was just renaming themselves as another company, and would we be back in the same boat. As far as contracts, the city attorney can look that over, but we had a previous attorney that looked over the contract. It is up to the commission about whether to approve the contract. She knows he talked about integration, and we do have smart meters, but there are other companies out there that integrate with smart meters. It is above her head, so she was relying on the IT and electric departments. She added caution because this was how we got into the mess with GE to begin with. They should look back at some of those meetings in 2011 where they had those discussions.

CM Minner pointed out that it was a difficult time for the city. He did not want to belabor or get drilled down into a lot of detail. However, there was a lot of blame that needed to go around in terms of how we got into what we called the smart grid and a lot of it was internal. That is the biggest reason to bring this up because it is the relationship between GE and ITron, but ITron is not GE. They are separate entities and that relationship between ITron and GE is on a high level. Technically, so everyone understands, ITron bought a company called Silver Springs. Silver Springs was an added component to the electric department. At that time, the electric department wanted to bring them in to add to the GE components. When we started doing the smart grid, we did a bunch of different stuff. We were doing load management on both the high and the low side, we were trying to do a bunch of different things, and we really started adding to GE's bucket. The electric department wanted Silver Springs to come in and put a chip in the GE meter that did a bunch of stuff, and in all honesty, if you pin GE down, they will say that made their job crazy hard. That relationship is probably part of the reason why GE said they were good. By bringing in Silver Springs, which is now ITron, was really the heartbeat of the part that worked, and we have a good AMI electric metering system. We do not do roll-outs anymore and that is an industry standard, which means to turn on or turn off your electric. Back in 2011, we had to roll a truck, which meant a service technician had to go out to turn on or turn off your meter. When the power went out in the old days, we did not know the power was out until you called in. So, the modern-day smart meter with automatic turn-ons/turn-offs, automatic reports of tampering, automatic reports of consumption and usage were the core of why we went to Silver Springs. That worked, but it made GE's job harder. At the end of the day, Silver Springs is not in business, because they were bought out by ITron. We basically went to the sub-consultant of GE for the part of the system that works, which is AMI metering. Without complicating that statement, it is important to note that the smart grid was a difficult decision for the city, and he would admit that it did not provide everything that they wanted, but we have a system that works and come FY 27 we will see significant savings.

Ms. Van Dyken said she thought that was what the smart grid did, but after the hurricane, her business did not have power and as she walked around she saw that everyone else had power. She kept calling the smart grid number, but got no response. She put in her information along with her electric bill information and nobody showed up. She tried to be patient because everyone was without power, but six days after her business had been down, she was reaching the end of what she had prepared for. It was not until she ran into a parks and recreation truck clearing out some trees that she asked about her power being down. They called the electric department and it was fixed that day. She thought that was the whole point of having smart meters, but apparently not, because they had to call the electric department. She greatly appreciated whoever that was, but she wanted to know what happened there. **CM Minner** clarified that the city knew she did not have power, and they were working on restoring the power. **Mayor Burry** asked if there were any other questions or comments. There were none.

The roll call vote was:

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

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

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

A. Financials as of August 2024

Mayor Burry asked if there were any questions or comments. There were none.

8. CITY ATTORNEY ITEMS:

CA Watson stated at the last meeting there was discussion about murals and whether the public art committee was an advisory only committee. After that meeting, he researched that information, and wanted to clarify that they were an advisory recommendation board only. They do not have any final decision-making authority.

9. CITY MANAGER ITEMS:

CM Minner had no matters to address.

10. ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Connell had nothing tonight.

Commissioner Reisman thanked the Leesburg Special Events department for putting on a great event downtown. It felt like thousands of people were down there trick or treating on Main Street. It went really well. Then the Leesburg Recreation Department put on a very scary haunted house at Mote Morris House on Friday, Saturday, and Sunday, which was really exciting. Also, to make people aware, Lakefront TV did a new series called Inside Leesburg and our very own city manager and planning and zoning director gave a pretty good in-depth explanation of our growth. A lot of people submitted questions, and they answered the questions, which was great. Coming up on November 2nd is the Chili Cook-off which is put on by the Leesburg Chamber of Commerce. November 8th is the Discover Leesburg Downtown and on November 9th is the Veterans Parade. He hoped to see everyone out at these events.

Commissioner Pederson had nothing to discuss.

Commissioner Berry gave kudos to district one because this past Saturday they had community events throughout the city and the Resource Center gave out food along with the fraternity organization Kappa and sorority Delta, as well as other organizations that joined and volunteered their time. They also had food at CWC, where they fed a lot of people. The Lake County Chapter of Charmattes, Inc. is another organization who were out on Pine Street giving out donations to cancer survivor patients who needed clothing. She was very proud to see things happen in her district and people being involved. She would love to see more of that. She also gave kudos for the employee luncheon that was given by the city to the departments. It was a great event. She sat, ate, and listened to the employees discuss and share their stories about Hurricane Milton. She thanked the administrators and leaders for grilling and providing food. It was a nice push for morale for the city employees.

Mayor Burry had nothing to comment on.

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.

With a motion by Commissioner Reisman and a second by Commissioner Pederson, the meeting adjourned at 6:21 p.m.