AGENDA MINUTES
CITY COMMISSION MEETING
CITY HALL, 501 W MEADOW STREET
MONDAY, JULY 28, 2025 5:30 PM

1. CALL TO ORDER

The City of Leesburg Commission held a regular meeting on Monday, July 28, 2025, at Leesburg City Hall. Mayor Reisman called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. with the following members present:

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

Commissioner Mike Pederson was absent. 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

Mayor Reisman 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. Water and Wastewater Utility Impact Fee Study Analysis and Results

CM Minner stated the city has been working on presenting the commission with some recommendations and proposals for increasing the water and sewer impact fees. So, with that, he turned it over to Shawn Ocasio of Raftelis Financial Consultants, Inc.

Shawn Ocasio, Senior Manager of Raftelis Financial Consultants, Inc., Maitland, said in terms of his role for this project, he has been overseeing the project as a whole, and he has been working with the city to coordinate the analysis for updating the water and wastewater impact fees. They are functioning in the role as a sub-consultant to the city’s engineers, Jones Edmonds. He thanked the utility staff and the whole team because they were very good at getting them all the information they needed. It was a very supportive process, so they were able to get everything put together quickly. This analysis kicked off in February, and they were already at this stage. He has worked with other clients where it took a lot longer to get things accomplished. It has been a very nice experience working with Leesburg.

Referring to the slides, he said he wanted to spend a little time talking about the study. More specifically, he wanted to give some background and primer information on impact fee basics along with the legal considerations around impact fees. They will have discussions about the method they are using, and the major assumptions that were embedded in it to give us the results. We will discuss the summary findings and the recommendations themselves, along with some items to consider with respect to implementation. To begin, what are impact fees? Impact fees are specifically designed to recover the cost of major capital investment in municipal facilities, infrastructure, and vehicles that provide capacity to serve new development. In this case, with the water and sewer utility systems, we need to recover infrastructure costs, major treatment-related assets, and transmission-related assets. Essentially, new growth buys into the system that the city had built in advance of their arrival. The fees would be used to pay for growth-related projects and growth-related assets. Impact fees cannot be used to pay for operating costs or anything like that. These fees are meant for growth and that growth pays their share of growth-related facilities and investments on a forward-looking basis. Impact fees can pay for expansion-related components of the debt payments if the utility system has debt. There is a little flexibility about how they can use them. However, it is mainly geared towards expansion-related projects and improvements to the system. The fees are paid for by new development and redevelopment that results in an increased demand for service and capacity. The fees are used to directly pay for growth-related facilities and major equipment, or to pay for expansion-related portions of debt payments.

Moving on to the benefits of impact fees. First, we need to have them in place, and at the right levels. Impact fees help to mitigate the burden on rate payers. The fees need to be set at appropriate levels to cover the costs of constructing structures. By doing that, it reduces the burden on the rates themselves. They would receive a growth-related share of capital costs to cover projects because it would be funded by that growth. If the impact fees are not in place or if they are not set to an appropriate level that is justifiable, then the burden is pushed on to the ratepayers, who are the monthly customers. It is very important to have the impact fee rates at the right levels, especially since there is alot of growth happening in Leesburg. The impact fees need to be set at the right levels, which is coined as saying growth pays for itself or growth pays its own way, which in turn benefits the rate payers who are already there.

Moving to another slide, he said impact fees and related criteria have been developed under Florida Statutes and case law. To provide some history, impact fees are governed by Florida Statute 163.31801. There have been numerous amendments since the law was created in 2006. Some more recent impact changes were made in 2021 and 2024. There are new changes coming up that will take effect in January 2026. This set of statutes goes through constant evolution, so it is important to keep the pace moving forward. Among some of the major considerations, the Florida Statute requires that impact fees be based on the most recent localized data of the community. It further defines that the information has to be within the last four years. Part of the study required us to have the most recent data along with the current capital planning data from this year and the next five to six years and this study definitely fulfilled that requirement. There are provisions built in from the initiation of the study to when the fees are adopted. There is a twelve-month window to complete the study, and we are well within that timeframe. When a community adopts an impact fee there is a ninety-day grace period before they can collect it to allow the development community to adjust its inventory pricing to account for any new or increased fees. Impact fees cannot be charged before the issuance of a building permit. The fees are collected at the time of issuance because there are rules about when fees are collected. There are some administrative items that relate to the accounting of the impact fees. Impact fees must be kept in separate funds, which Leesburg already does because impact fees are already in place.

Back in 2021, the state legislature passed some rules that changed how they implemented impact fees. They put some limits on it along with a couple of phasing requirements. If a community were to project an increase of up to 25%, that increase would have to be phased in evenly over a two-year period. If the increase is greater than 25% and up to 50%, then they would have to phase that in evenly over a four-year period. The statute goes on to say that anything above 50% is capped, and it would be maxed out at that 50% increase under normal circumstances. However, in 2021, they built in a provision for extraordinary circumstances. Essentially, the intent there was that if a community had a special situation or an extraordinary situation, there would be a set of procedural requirements to allow a community to bypass the phasing rules and the maximum threshold of 50%. So a community could exceed that and what he found interesting was, in their infinite wisdom, they did not define what constitutes extraordinary. Now, that is a good thing because they left it up to the community to make the determination of what is extraordinary for them. Another term built into some of the recent changes was that impact fees cannot be increased more than once every four years. Another change in extraordinary circumstances is that communities should not wait more than five years to increase fees, because there are more restrictions embedded there, and the state is trying to box this in with timing. In the current form, if a community were to proceed under extraordinary circumstances, there has to be a demonstrated needs study that documents the circumstances of the community that make it extraordinary. That includes a justification for the increase above that phasing program or above that cap. There is a justified needs study followed by two publicly noticed workshop meetings with the community to discuss the circumstances that are part of that needs study. They have to allow input and feedback from the development community about the circumstances. Once they go through the procedure of having a justified needs study for the circumstances, and after going through the two-workshop meeting process, there is a two-thirds vote requirement of the governing body in order to implement it. Now, what will take effect in January 2026 is that a community can still pursue extraordinary circumstances for an increase of over 50%, but the community will have to phase it out where, before that date, they could do it all at once. They will have to phase it out over a two or four-year period of time. They also made it harder to pass, so instead of a two-thirds vote, it will require a unanimous vote. That is another condition to be aware of that will take effect in January 2026. If a community waits more than five years between impact fee updates, they are not allowed to claim extraordinary circumstances on the next go round.

With the criteria for designing impact fees, there is essentially one main thing they look for, and that is called a dual rational nexus test and that boils down to the costs that are included in the design of the fees themselves. They have to be growth-related, and when we design the fees for growth, the revenues that are collected from growth have to be applied to growth-related projects. It ties the design of the fees with the growth-related costs to the usage of those revenues that are collected for growth-related projects. When designing impact fees, there has to be a reasonable level of service to the community. They cannot use impact fees to fund any deficiencies in the system or operations, nor can they use them to fund any service deficiencies. It can only be used for expansion-related items.

In terms of the method overall, we are trying to design a fee that is a cost per unit of capacity of the system. In order to do that, we have to figure out the cost side of the equation and then the units of capacity. We look at the fixed assets for the utility system and that covers every asset that is on the book for the utility system, treatment plant, transmission lines, distribution facilities, and minor equipment. It is everything. We also have to allocate that by the system between water and wastewater. From there, we classify it by major function. The reason they do that is because there are certain assets they have to leave out and certain assets they have to include. We have to go through the pairing process to fine-tune what that bucket of cost will be for the calculation. From there, they will take it to what the capacity of your system is to get the cost per unit. It will be on that cost-per-unit basis going forward.

He showed a summary of the existing water and wastewater fixed assets. The system right now has about $170 million in total assets associated with the water and wastewater systems. It roughly allocates about $67 million on the waterside and about $103 million on the wastewater side. It included about 75% of the system assets and about 25% were excluded for the reasons that the statute requires, along with the smaller types of items. The capital cost side is forward-looking because the fixed assets look at existing investments to date, and we took those costs and added that to the planned future costs moving forward over the next few years. In the plan we have about $127 million of total projects. It was broken down into $56 million for water projects and about $71 million for wastewater projects. Some of the big-ticket items for the waterside are reuse mains at about $34 million, fire protection improvements at $6.2 million and water mains at $11.5 million. On the wastewater side, they have the Turnpike Plant Expansion Phase Two at $39.2 million, and the Southern Corridor Forcemain Bypass at $13 million.

In terms of capacity, on the waterside there are six water plants, of which three have the capacity to serve new growth in terms of excess capacity above current demand levels. Through analysis, we isolated the costs of the facilities that have the capacity to serve growth and then related them back to their units, and the total system treatment capacity is about 28.8 MGD. We then looked at the facilities that have the ability to serve new growth coming in, and that is three plants which is about one million gallons per day. When we adjusted that down we looked at the current flow flowing at the facilities, and that showed 60% of the facility currently remaining. However, they need to remember that the city is experiencing a large amount of growth, so the city will eat through that as development comes on board. There are projects included in the plan that account for that. On the wastewater side, the current facility has about eight million gallons a day of treatment capacity. With the Turnpike improvement project, it will go to nine and a half million gallons a day. The current available capacity is 42.32% or 3.386 million gallons a day. Again, that will be used as the city continues to grow. The city will need to build new facilities to accommodate that growth, and that is the purpose of the impact fees. Those fees will fund the expansion of that new growth. In terms of existing fees today, on the waterside we have $1,175 per equivalent residential unit and on the wastewater side we have $2,778 per unit for a total of $3,953. In their analysis, they also looked at proposed fees, and on the waterside we see an increase to $2,039 per equivalent residential unit, and on the wastewater side we see an increase to $4,567 per unit for a total of $6,606. Now, for a sense of scale, that is an increase of 74% on the waterside and 64% on the wastewater side. Those are significant increases for a total overall average increase of about 67%. Referring to the chart, he said the column on the right shows where the city would be if the city were to implement the statute approach, because it would be capped at $1,762 on the waterside and $4,167 on the wastewater side for a total fee of $5,929. This would be the total fee if the city were to use the phase-in approach over four years and cap out at 50%.

He showed a chart of surrounding communities with their fees. He showed where Leesburg would fall in both instances, whether that be the existing fees or the proposed fees. Right now, Leesburg sits at the lower end of the pack and with the fully calculated increase level, Leesburg would land a little above the average. Now, why do we see such a disparity across communities? There are a myriad of reasons as to why we see different fees in different places. It could be an issue of what treatment facilities each municipality has. It could be the age of the facilities in terms of how they do things and are they adequately funding their renewal and replacement needs, or they could have pushed projects back because that could artificially lower the costs, and were lucky enough to receive grant funding to help defray some of the costs. There are a lot of different things to consider. The source of water supply could be another reason. It is a comparison of the cost per unit of capacity, but there are a lot of things embedded that the comparison does not really show. They do with other municipalities, so they do know some of them are going through this process right now too. The cities of Casselberry, Apopka, Sanford, and Clermont have all approached them about doing updates. So, even though the city's relative position would be increasing the fully calculated level, odds are that other communities are doing these studies as well. So, the relative position increase might be mitigated because the same capital cost increases that Leesburg is experiencing are also happening in other cities. He worked with the City of Sanford on their multi-year capital plan back in 2019, and the five-year period of capital improvements that they wanted to do was about $190 to $195 million. He worked with them each year as a part of their planning process. That same capital plan is closer to $300 million now because of capital cost inflation. Municipalities everywhere are experiencing this; it is not just unique to the utility systems. They see this happening in fire departments where, five years ago, a pumper might have cost half a million dollars, and now it costs closer to one million dollars. They have seen asset acquisition costs and construction costs all across the board increase very significantly in an extraordinary manner over the past five or six years.

In terms of implementation, the water impact fee on a per ERU basis is based on the fully calculated level increasing by about 74% and the wastewater increasing by about 64%. Those fully calculated amounts are higher than the 50% of the standard statutory implementation approach. The city essentially has two options. The city could choose to implement the standard statutory approach, which would be phased in over a four-year period to that 50% cap, and it would cap out there. The con to that is because the fees would be perpetually under recovering compared to what they should be based on the fee analysis. The differential there on what would have been recovered from growth would instead be recovered through the rates, otherwise those projects would have to be pushed back. It does create a potential burden on the existing rate payers by pushing it in that manner. The alternative is to implement provisions, under extraordinary circumstances, which are the procedural requirements and that would be the recommended option based on their analysis. Some circumstances that went into the justified needs' analysis were that the city has experienced significant population growth, and that has continued to project on the horizon. Leesburg’s population has grown from roughly 27,000 to about 37,000 between 2020 and the present. That is an average of about 6.5% per year on an average annual basis. To give a sense of scale, the average for the state is less than 2% per year, so Leesburg is experiencing very high growth. Leesburg is actually one of the highest he has worked with, and it relates to units that have been approved for development since 2020. There are about 40,000 units that have been approved for development, and about 14,000 of those units are related to The Villages. The level of significant growth that the city has experienced, and will continue to experience, is what created the need for the expansion-related projects in the capital plan. It directly links to the costs that the city will incur because of that growth. Those costs are what drives this. The cost of constructing facilities has increased significantly over the past five to six years. For a sense of scale, the consumer price index has increased by about 27% since 2019. When looking at construction materials, they have increased 40% since 2019, and that does not include costs of labor. We have seen very significant increases that are extraordinary compared to normal circumstances. With the city’s existing investment in the wastewater facilities, he divided that out per gallon of capacity that the facility can treat, and it came to an average cost per gallon investment of $8.64 per gallon. He also looked at the construction costs for new facilities, and the expansion of the Turnpike facility. The increase on a cost-per-unit basis is about $26.13 per gallon of capacity. It now costs three times more to build. They have seen a very significant increase in other communities. He did a study for the City of Mount Dora, and their new facilities plan for wastewater expansion was $43 per gallon of capacity compared to their embedded investment, which was about $13 or $14. It is a phenomenon that we are seeing across the board, and it differs materially from what has been seen historically in terms of costs and the increases.

Moving on to implementation. On the front end, there are some changes upcoming in the Impact Fee Act, and those changes will take effect in January 2026. They relate to SB 1080 and SB 180. One note is, if impact fees have not been updated in more than five years, you will not be able to implement them through the extraordinary circumstance approach. However, that update will not go into effect until

January, so there is still time to implement that methodology, but the timeline for that to be done is short. SB 180 has also passed legislation, and this one has to do with the impacts of hurricanes. It says for one year after a hurricane makes landfall, an impacted local government may not propose or adopt restrictive or burdensome procedures concerning review, approval, or issuance of a site plan, development permit or development order. The question that was raised in this bill was whether this affects the implementation of impact fees, because they are not specifically called out in the listing of items being restricted. We could conceive of a good-faith argument that says the payment of an impact fee is a part of the process for getting a building permit and those types of things and does the raising of an impact fee fall under these restrictions? If yes, then there is the potential that this bill could impact how the city goes about implementing impact fees moving forward. If not, then, it is a non-issue, but it is something he wanted to bring up because it is still so new, and we do not know all the answers yet.

CA Watson said he appreciated him pointing that out, but to hammer more on that we do not know what that language exactly means. It is broad, vague, and expansive, so it is certainly a possibility. It seems that a number of cities are still planning to move forward with the process at this point despite SB 180 passing. They are looking at the idea that SB 1080 is more specific to impact fee procedures and how a community goes about raising them. It is very important to point out that SB 180 is a potential concern, because we do not know what the exact impact of that will be on raising impact fees and whether a court would consider that part of the development permit process or not. **Commissioner Berry** asked what would happen in January 2026, and what should we do? **CA Watson** answered that was the trigger because that is a different bill. It is confusing because they numbered the bills pretty much the same. SB 180 specifically deals with emergency procedures and hurricanes, things like that. It also talks about the burdens on the development process. Where SB 1080 changes the extraordinary circumstances' analysis. As Mr. Ocasio said January 2026 is important because that is when the new impact fee regulations go into effect and when the extraordinary circumstances option will change. **Commissioner Berry** said the extraordinary circumstances were the question, because of what would be considered extraordinary. **CA Watson** replied that it would be more difficult to do once January 2026 hits. More particularly with the five-year limitation and the other restrictions. It would be much easier to do the extraordinary circumstances for the purpose of raising impact fees beyond that 50% threshold if we did it prior to January 2026. **Commissioner Burry** questioned the one-year impact. Are we referring to Hurricane Milton specifically? **CM Minner** responded yes. **Commissioner Burry** then said that the date would be October 9th. **CA Watson** agreed. **Commissioner Burry** pointed out that they would have to do this between October 9th and January 1st. **CA Watson** commented that with the emergency management bill it reads as though it is limited in scope, and it actually covers the entire state. So, every municipality is covered by the emergency management bill, which is SB 180.

Mr. Ocasio said with that in mind, he put together two alternative implementation schedules with the city manager for recommendation. If the consensus was to move forward with the extraordinary circumstances approach in order to get the full fee level implemented as opposed to over time. The extraordinary circumstances workshops could take place on August 11th and August 25th. Subsequently, the city would then have the first and second ordinance readings associated with the passing of the ordinance on September 8th and 22nd. They would then have an October 1st effective date and the city could start collecting new fees starting January 2026, after the ninety-day grace period between when it is adopted and when they can begin collecting. As an alternative, there is a potential workshop for September 22nd and October 13th with ordinance readings on October 27th and November 10th, with fees being effective December 1st. The city could then start collecting fees on March 1st. In either case, the city would be ahead of that January 2026 deadline. The intent of alternate two was, if we were worried about SB 180 and the timeline of the declaration, that was intended to be one year after that point in time. The city would be sidestepping that, while staying within the timeframe to get it done by January.

CM Minner asked the city attorney if he had a preference. **CA Watson** answered no, but if it were a perfect world, he would think the first alternative would be better because it has a cleaner legal path. However, either one is okay. **Mr. Ocasio** said in terms of next steps for how to move forward. They need consensus on the implementation method and if they want to go with the standard approach or the extraordinary circumstances approach and implement it faster. There is some research that still needs to be done on the potential impacts of SB 180. Then the city would publicly notice the meetings for the workshops and the ordinance reads as a part of that process. The city would adopt the proposed fees at the fully calculated level and comply with the impact fee act requirements, the ninety-day grace period, and update them after four years.

Commissioner Berry wanted to know if it was possible to get the updated version of the presentation because he provided pages that were not included in the packet. **CM Minner** stated it was modified after the packets went out, and he could get it to her. He said he talked to the city attorney this morning, and they were leaning towards options one or two. However, they are looking for feedback from the commission to move forward with implementing the extraordinary circumstances. **Mayor Reisman** said he knows this was for wastewater and water, but do we need to address police and fire impact fees? **CM Minner** replied that those impact fees should be reviewed and looked at separately. We should not hold up the water and wastewater impact fees. However, yes, at some point, that is something we need to talk about. Leesburg has six local impact fees for water, sewer, police, fire, recreation, and library. We also need to look at the possibility of adding a road impact fee. However, he would have to defer to Mr. Ocasio on that one and how we would do that, but there was a difference between the increasing impact of fees and the implementation of new ones. **Mr. Ocasio** agreed, that is their understanding. If it is a first-time implementation, then there is no increase to be calculated. It would be a brand-new thing. **CM Minner** said he would get back with the commission at a later date to look at other impact fees and whether they need an increase along with the possible creation of a new one. That would be a separate assignment, but we need to keep pushing forward on water and sewer. **Commissioner Burry** asked the city attorney if he would recommend option one, and if he could expand on that. **CA Watson** explained that option one would be cleaner. He liked the idea of having the ordinance implemented. It also has a ninety-day grace period, so everything will run before January 2026, when the law changes. However, either one is okay, and if we can get everything done before the law changes, that would be the better process.

Commissioner Burry made a motion to pursue option one for the expansion, and Commissioner Connell seconded the motion.

Mayor Reisman asked if there was any further discussion from the commission or the audience. There were none.

The roll call vote was:

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

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

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS:

This section is reserved for members of the public to bring up matters of concern or opportunities for praise. Please note that issues raised during this time will not be

discussed in detail during the current meeting. They will either be referred to the appropriate staff or scheduled for consideration at a future City Commission Meeting. Each speaker is allocated three minutes to provide their comments. Kindly adhere to this time limit to ensure equal opportunity for all participants and to support the efficient conduct of the meeting. Thank you!

Mayor Reisman asked the audience if they were there to speak about the shuffleboard courts, if they could kindly hold those comments for the August 25th city commission meeting, because that is when this item will be heard and voted on.

Steve Clark of 109 South Lake Drive, said he was exercising his right to public comment regarding the Palmetto Street Shuffleboard property dispute. The Leesburg Shuffleboard Club (LSC) and Forward Paths are two valuable Leesburg nonprofits that are unnecessarily being pitted against each other over the Palmetto Street Shuffleboard courts. Demolishing the courts to benefit Forward Paths would dissolve the LSC. It is an inequitable outcome that the City of Leesburg can avoid by accommodating both organizations. The LSC has used and maintained the shuffleboard courts for decades, and it has remained respectful despite Forward Paths false allegations that the LSC inflated membership numbers and/or opposed their mission to support homeless youths. They insinuated a "not in my backyard back" mentality, but no evidence of any such treatment has been observed by anyone. This conflict stems from Commissioner Jimmy Burry's proposal favoring Forward Paths where his wife and son hold leadership roles. That is a conflict of interest. Commissioner Burry's actions raise a clear conflict of interest under Florida's Code of Ethics, Chapter 112, Florida Statutes, and the Sunshine Amendment, Article 2, Section 8. Public officers may not use their position to secure a disproportionate benefit for family or affiliates, even without financial gain. By prioritizing Forward Paths, Commissioner Burry disadvantages the LSC, a similarly situated nonprofit, violating fairness principles described in both the above statutes. In the legal context, the LSC's fifty-four-year use and forty-year maintenance of the courts may establish legal claims, including prescriptive easement or equitable estoppel, supporting their right to continue using the property. Former Mayor Bill Polk also noted the potential for discrimination lawsuits if the city favors Forward Paths over the LSC. Impact on similarly situated parties, both nonprofits serve vital community roles. Forward Paths for homeless youths and LSC for seniors. Demolishing the courts grants Forward Paths a disproportionate benefit while dismantling LSC. Undermining equitable treatment required by Florida ethics laws. Call to action, the city must resolve this conflict transparently. Investigate Commissioner Burry's actions and find a solution that preserves both organizations.

Carolyn Colucci of 4952 Sawgrass Lake Circle said she was here a month ago with concerns over the Manor Oak development. They wanted access to their property, and their community attorney addressed them in a letter stating that this is private property and, hopefully, that has resolved the issue, so they are not burdened by having strangers on their property. However, she was there to reference an article from the Daily Commercial from February 13, 2023. That article was about the city's significant growth and development. There is a poster-sized map hanging in City Manager Minner’s office with proposed housing developments marked in big pink chunks. If the shapes were weighted, they would tear off the south end of the map because that map shows a doubling of the size of the City of Leesburg's population within a few years. Now, there was a statement in the same article that said we do not go out seeking growth. Minner said last January, when the city commission unanimously approved the 2,300 single-family and 740 multif-family units in the Whispering Hills development. Growth comes to us, and it is the city's job to manage growth and, if annexed, to provide services. We are not going to stop growing. That has become very obvious to many residents in this town. The amount of growth that has been happening is exponential for the services and the community. What should be a ten-minute ride from the Plantation to city hall at ten o'clock this morning according to Map Quest, would take twenty-three minutes. At five o'clock this evening, it said it would take closer to forty-five minutes, barring any accidents. The communities are being burdened to a ridiculous amount by this growth. We need to put control down and look at the utilities, facilities, and roads. The roads cannot handle it and when she hears that The Villages are all golf carts, that is garbage, because every golf cart driver potentially has one or two cars at their home and the roads cannot handle it.

Kaitlin Brody of 146 Bullfrog Lane, Umatilla, said she was there because of one of the commission members. The Commissioner for District 3 has made decisions that directly impact her, her property, and her neighborhood. This individual is also the building official for Umatilla. Holding both positions is a violation of Florida law, Article 2, Section 5(a) of the Florida Constitution. It clearly prohibits anyone from holding two public offices simultaneously unless specifically authorized by law. Additionally, Florida Statute 468.619 recognizes that building officials, because of the powers and duties they exercise, are considered public officers. That means serving as both a city commissioner and a building official at the same time is not permitted. It has been confirmed that there is no interlocal agreement between Leesburg and Umatilla that would make this dual role lawful. However, this issue goes beyond a legal technicality. As Umatilla's building official, he allowed un-permitted work, allowed deviations from signed and sealed engineering plans, issued certificates of occupancy that do not reflect actual conditions, and failed to verify required legal documents. Even worse, he has communicated about residents, including her, with developers through personal emails and phone calls. Florida law requires building officials to act without favoritism and avoid conflict of interest. This is not happening. This is about accountability and it is about trust. The communities deserve fair and equal enforcement of the law, not special treatment for developers with connections, and she sees that the city's residents here do not like development. What is more concerning is that the same developers and builders who are allowed to cut corners in Umatilla are also building here in Leesburg. This raises serious questions about whether similar issues may have already been happening or could happen in your own city. She asked the city to take a serious look into this situation and take corrective action, because when one person holds too much power and uses it carelessly, it is not just unethical, it is dangerous. Both cities and the people who live in them suffer the consequences. We cannot allow conflict of interest and abuse of power to be swept under the rug. She was not there to speak up for herself, but for every resident who deserves transparency, fairness, and integrity in their local government. It is time to bring accountability. It is time for darkness to come to light, because what is happening is not right, and it is not fair. She directly addressed Commissioner Connell, by saying she would continue to uncover everything. She will not stop until there is accountability and the full truth comes to light.

Mayor Reisman asked the city attorney to address the allegations against the commissioners. However, before that, he wanted to say that our staff does a phenomenal job, and we have one of the best building officials in the state. When someone comes up saying that about our staff, you are undermining their talent, their ability, and their work ethic here in the City of Leesburg. **From the audience, Ms. Brody** said she was not talking about Leesburg's building department. **Mayor Reisman** continued to say that she said there were false things going on in this city. **From the audience, Ms. Brody** said she was referring to Umatilla. **CM Minner** agreed. The way it sounded, it sounded like she was referring to the Leesburg building official, but she was actually referring to the building official for Umatilla. **Mayor Reisman** added that she also mentioned that those same builders are building homes here, which alludes to our building officials and our staff doing a horrible job. **Commissioner Connell** stated he wanted to address that because he was familiar with her. Just to clear the record, when he first ran for office back in 2019, he addressed this issue with the former City Attorney, Fred Morrison. He was not an elected official of Umatilla. He was a hired employee, and he was a part-time employee at that. As far as her situation, he did not inspect her home. He did not do her plan review because that was all done by a third party. He is just a building official of the city and when they elect to use a third party, all the building official does is process paperwork. He had nothing to do with the construction of her home. Nor did he have anything to do with the builder who built her home. He did not know if he had ever done an inspection for the builder who built her home. What goes on here in Leesburg with the builders he has no control over nor does he have anything to do with the daily permitting or inspections of what goes on in this city. Her claims are outrageous and to come to a public meeting and say that is absolutely borderline slanderous. It is absolutely outrageous for her to come here and make these statements. Just to clear the air, he had nothing to do with her home or anything. **CA Watson** said he appreciated Commissioner Connell addressing that specific situation. He has great respect for the former City Attorney, Fred Morrison, for his role and the discussions that they had about that issue. Also, with Commissioner Burry's situation. This is something that we addressed at the last meeting. We have looked into this, and he has talked to Commissioner Burry. Since the last meeting, he has spoken to him again about additional issues and found that there was no conflict at that point. Again, we have looked at all the statutes and constitutional provisions that are in play. He had questioned him multiple times and there is no factual information to support that there is a conflict of interest. He would welcome any information from the community. If anybody has any information, they are welcome to submit it to him, and he would be happy to review it. However, to clear the air here. The issue here is a little bit different because of volunteerism as opposed to being a paid employee-type scenario. He understands what has been said, but he has read many ethical opinions on the issue, and he has talked to Commissioner Burry about all the issues and factual allegations that have been floating around, and he does not have any concerns about a conflict based on those discussions. Again, if anybody has any information they would like to submit, they can submit it to him via email grant@stoneandgerken.com. Anyone can email him information. He would be happy to look at it, and talk to them about it. However, he had talked to Commissioner Burry multiple times about it, and he was not concerned based on the information that we had. He would like to move on at this point, and he does appreciate everybody's concern and comments on the point. **Mayor Reisman** asked if there were any further public comments. There were none.

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 Berry moved to adopt the Consent Agenda as presented, and Commissioner Burry seconded the motion.

The roll call vote was:

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

Four 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. Approval of Art Advisory Board Meeting minutes from September 21, 2022

2. **Regular Commission meeting held July 14, 2025**

B. PURCHASING ITEMS:

1. **Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute Amendment No. 4 to an existing contract with Odyssey Manufacturing Company; and providing an effective date.**

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 12,071

2. **Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida, authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute an amendment to the existing contract with Greg Brown Painting, LLC,; and providing an effective date.**

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 12,072

3. **Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute a Fixed Unit Price Agreement with Puff 'n Stuff, LLC for Emergency Food Services for City Response Personnel in the event of a disaster; and providing an effective date.**

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 12,073

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 fifty-one (51) cancer-blocking particulate hoods as a portion of the firefighter protective clothing; and providing an effective date.**

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 12,074

2. **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 2025-26 school year starting in August 2025; and providing an effective date.**

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 12,075

3. **Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida, authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute a Tower Operating Agreement with the Federal Aviation Administration related to the Air Traffic Control Tower at the Leesburg International Airport; and providing an effective date.**

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 12,076

4. **Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida, accepting a Utility Easement affecting the property described therein from SECP LEESBURG LLC, joined by STUDIO BANK; and providing an effective date.**

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 12,077

5. **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 Walton Acquisitions FL, LLC, regarding natural gas service to the development known as Denham Village Phase 1; and providing an effective date.**

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 12,078

6. **Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida, authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute FAA Grant Agreement 3-12-0042-033-2025, for the Taxilane Rehabilitation Design, for the Leesburg International Airport; and providing an effective date.**

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 12,079

7. **Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida, authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute a Task Order with AVCON, Inc. for Taxilane Rehabilitation Design Services, for the Leesburg International Airport; and providing an effective date.**

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 12,080

8. **Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida amending the Building Permit Fee Schedule; repealing the existing Building Permit Fee Schedule adopted via resolution 10,477; and providing an effective date.**

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 12,081

6. PUBLIC HEARINGS AND NON-ROUTINE ITEMS:

During Public Hearings and Non-Routine Items, the Commission requests that those in attendance respect the process and maintain order. As such, in accordance with Robert's Rules of Order, please refrain from speaking out, cheering, or applauding during these proceedings. Your cooperation helps ensure a fair and respectful hearing.

A. SECOND READING OF ORDINANCES:

1. NONE

B. FIRST READING OF ORDINANCES:

1. An Ordinance of the City of Leesburg, Florida, Amending Section 13, "Motor Vehicles and Traffic," of the Code of Ordinances by amending Section 13-5 to Adopt the Maximum Rates for Towing and Storage of Vehicles as Set Forth in Florida Administrative Code Rule 15B-9.010; providing for conflicts, severability, codification; and an effective date.

Mayor Reisman asked the city attorney if he needed to do the swearing-in. **CA Watson** answered no not this evening since there were no quasi-judicial hearings.

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

Mayor Reisman said this was a first reading. He asked if there were any comments by the commission and audience. There were none. He stated this item would lay over until August 11th.

C. NON-ROUTINE ITEMS:

1. Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute a Lease Agreement Extension with Blue Heron CPA for space at the Leesburg Incubator; and providing an effective date.

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 12,082

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

Commissioner Burry made a motion to adopt the resolution and Commissioner Bery seconded the motion.

Mayor Reisman requested comments from the Commission and the audience.

CM Minner said this item was the Blue Heron lease extension. It was brought up at the last meeting and the commission asked that it be placed on the agenda. The existing lease at the incubator is set to expire at the beginning of September or the latter part of August and Blue Heron has requested an extension. In the packet, the staff report said that we favorably recommend the extension of the lease, but that was an error because city staff did not recommend the lease as requested. While negotiating a renewal of the lease, we could not come to an agreeable term, so the lease that is on the agenda are the terms requested by Blue Heron. It was not by staff. Blue Heron petitioned the commission at the last meeting and their request was subsequently sent to them. However, long story short, their request is the lease that was included in the packet. It is a one-year lease at $250 a month and city staff are in opposition to the proposal for two reasons. First, he was not sure at this stage if Blue Heron met the intent of the incubator because the incubator is a place where businesses start and germinate. It would be for businesses who are not already in existence. Blue Heron also has other offices in the region, so they are clearly a quality firm that may not need incubator support. Secondly, the extension would be a decrease from their current rental rate. Their current rent is about $400 a month. That information was included in the packet, but he may have misstated the amount. For those reasons, he recommended either letting the current lease expire and not renewing it or, at the very minimum, extending it at the current rate. The owner of the business was present, and he may want to present information explaining his side of the request. However, at the last meeting, the petitioner requested the extension of the lease because they help local businesses by finding fraud and, due to their expertise in accounting, they felt they were a benefit to startup businesses. Therefore, they should be eligible to be in the incubator. This matter is for the commission to decide. **Mayor Reisman** asked if there were any questions from the commission.

Commissioner Burry wanted to know when a new business comes in, how much do they pay for rent? **CM Minner** responded that it would resemble this business' lease. We typically run three-year leases. The first twelve months at $300 per month, it then goes to $350 per month for the second year, and it is then $400 to $450 for the last twelve months. He affirmed that $250 per month would be way below what the current tenant pays and below what we could bring into the incubator. **Commissioner Burry** wanted to know if there were any potential tenants interested in the space. **CM Minner** replied that at this time we do not have potential tenants ready to move in there. However, over the past twelve months, we have had different petitioners seeking interest, so it should not be hard to fill that space at the typical standard of thirty-six months. **Commissioner Berry** wanted to know how long Blue Heron had been in the incubator. **CM Minner** reported that they have been there three years and their lease is about to expire.

Nathan Gauger of 1318 Quail Court said this was their only physical office. They do not have multiple offices throughout the state. We traditionally go into incubators to help small businesses grow and to provide their expertise. The initial phase is the largest phase for issues and mistakes, because, often times, it bankrupts the business. We have only one office. It is the smallest office in the building, and it is located in the back corner. There are currently thirteen offices in that building and six of them are occupied by the Leesburg Chamber of Commerce and four are occupied by the Lake Economic Area Development. One office is a storage closet for liquor and in the back kitchen they are currently warehousing restaurant goods. His approach and what he sent in an email is that he hoped to help small businesses expand and do better in this city without facing the same financial non-compliance issues that the vast majority of them do. Whether they see it or they do not see it. It usually leads to issues five to ten years down the road. Main Street here has a consistent churn of businesses, and they have helped many of those stay alive. In this case, we have three of them that would have been non-compliant had they not been with Blue Heron because they received prior advice from someone else and because we fixed their situation, they are still in business here. He was not trying to use that room as a constant business. So, if there was a case where someone wanted to move in, that could be added to the lease. They could add a thirty-day out. The city has the ability to kick him out, so he would not complain if the city took a thirty-day out. Currently, there are two offices that are unutilized. If they choose to have the liquor storage and if they choose to have some of the offices filled by tenants that do not pay, that is fine, but he wants to pay what he believes is a fair market value rent. If they look at the square footage, the price per square foot is beyond what the vast majority of other businesses pay per square foot for co-working space. He just wanted to be 100% fair. This is the smallest office in the entire building, and he was not really asking for much here.

Commissioner Berry asked him to explain why he was not willing to pay the additional amount and if that was due to the square footage of the office. **Mr. Gauger** answered that he did not believe that it was fair to pay $70 a square foot when other real estate around the city is maxed out at $40 to $45 a square foot for co-working space. He felt that $70 a square foot was a bit much. **Mayor Reisman** wanted to know what his current monthly rate was now. **Mr. Gauger** responded that he currently pays $350 monthly. It was $300 and it went to $350. They were subsidized by the USDA rule grant in the original contract. He had not seen that grant, so he was not sure how that really worked. He had not seen any funds being distributed since 2019, so that grant may not exist. In his email he explained that this is what other incubators are doing across the nation. They involve professionals to help businesses succeed. If the city did not want to have him in the incubator, he requested that they utilize it as an incubator space and put small businesses in that space. There were two small businesses that were there, Deb Jane Consulting and a mental health facility. However, the mental health facility left because of financial issues. It was his understanding that it was financial fraud that caused that for-profit business to remove itself from that building. **Mayor Reisman** mentioned that he would be in favor of the current rate. He could not approve a decrease because he has a lease at the airport, and he pays CPI increases every year and if he were to receive a decrease, he would be here requesting a decrease in his rent. So, he would approve the current rate for a year with a thirty-day out notice. He could not approve anything outside of that. **Mr. Gauger** stated he would not argue with the current rate. He would just argue with a $100 rate increase when he does not utilize that office forty hours a week, and it is not a great space to build a business. He welcomed the commission to walk through it so they could see it and get more information. **Mayor Reisman** asked if there were any other further commission comments?

Commissioner Connell wanted to clarify that he was okay with paying the lease as proposed. **Mr. Gauger** replied with the lease. If the commission wanted to increase it to the current rate, he would be more than fine with that. They could also include the thirty-day out clause. However, he would like to request that the commission add a suite number to the lease because right now it looks like he is leasing the entire building and there are occupants in the other thirteen rooms. He would prefer the lease to state a singular suite. **CA Watson** said the modification could be easily made. He believes the concern dealt with liability associated with suites that are not being rented by this particular business. He understood the perspective, and it was a pretty easy change to make. If the commission was in favor of that, they would need to modify the motion and add that as a condition. He would be happy to make that change. To clarify again, he is only renting one suite with certain access rights to common space. **Commissioner Burry** wanted to know if his purpose in the incubator was to help other businesses in the incubator or was he doing private work outside the incubator? **Mr. Gaguer** replied both. He would love it if he could help other businesses that were in the incubator, but there are no other businesses currently in the incubator. **Commissioner Burry** wanted to know if he was currently helping any businesses inside the incubator. **Mr. Gauger** stated that currently there were no opportunities because there are no other tenants. Eleven of the thirteen offices in the incubator are filled and occupied by non-profits. **Commissioner Burry** then said, in essence, he was using it to help run his business because he was being paid by other entities for his services. **Mr. Gauger** agreed. **Commissioner Burry** stated he could agree with the current contract rate of $350, but he could not go with a reduction to what someone new to the incubator would pay. That would not be fair. **Commissioner Berry** questioned if he was requesting $250. **Mr. Gauger** responded that he would not be opposed to $350, but he was opposed to paying $450 or $500. That was where his opposition came in, because he looked at traditional square footage. Also, if the commission wanted to put a mandate in the agreement that said he would have to offer his services for free to businesses or residents, he would make time available. He could give two hours or do a quarterly seminar on what is happening with taxes or what is happening in the world as far as business, because that is much-needed. Currently, residents travel to Eustis or Clermont for that information. We could make that available here if we wanted to really push that. However, that would require participation from the economic development entities that are already inside the incubator, because they are there to manage the growth of Lake County. **Mayor Reisman** questioned the current proposed lease amount. **CM Minner** said the lease that was in the packet which the current motion is based on is for a one-year period at $250.

Commissioner Burry made a motion to amend the current lease and raise the rental rate to $350 per month. The lease will be for a one-year period to include a thirty-day out clause and specify which suite he occupies as the leaseholder, and Commissioner Berry seconded the motion.

Mayor Reisman asked if there were any further comments from the commission and audience. There were none.

The roll call vote on the amendment was:

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

Four yeas, no nays, the Commission amended the motion.

Mayor Reisman stated with regard to the incubator he would like the city to put an advertisement plan together or work with someone to advertise that facility so it can get back to its full potential. **CM Minner** pointed out that the motion was a motion to amend, so they needed to vote on the matter as amended.

Commissioner Berry made a motion to approve the lease as amended, and Commissioner Connell seconded the motion.

Mayor Reisman asked if there were any further comments from the commission and the audience with the amendment in place. There were none.

The roll call vote as amended was:

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

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

Anthony Washington of 1011 East Boulevard said he was listening to this, and he did not think it was a major issue. When a gentleman wants to provide a service, the city should not be majoring in minor things. If they look around, and talk about square footage that is in every real estate and every city. That is what they base the dollar amount on. He wanted to support the gentleman as a resident, and he did not think he was asking for much. For a person to come up who wants to provide that service to the community, the city should commend him.

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 May 2025

Mayor Reisman asked the commission if they had any questions regarding the financial reports. There were none.

8. CITY ATTORNEY ITEMS:

CA Watson had no items to address.

9. CITY MANAGER ITEMS:

A. FY 26 Budget Update

CM Minner wanted to provide some information about an incident that took place about a month ago and without speaking out of turn, or accepting or denying any liability for the incident that took place. A young lady was hit by a foul ball at a Lightning Game. She received some damage to her face, and since that time we have put up some signage and the recreation director has started looking at costs for netting that would run down the third base side. We are going to move forward with procuring those numbers and bringing forward a price to add that netting. However, those numbers are going to be significant when they come forward, but nothing will be done as far as installing the netting without coming to the commission first. He believes the proper way to trigger this would be to go ahead and commence a procurement process to get the numbers and bring them to the commission. He thinks netting that third base field line will be in the six-figure range. He did not want to say a number because he did not want to prejudice any bids, but we are anticipating an expensive endeavor. Nonetheless, we are moving forward with that and the commission can provide direction when it hits their desk.

On the second issue, he has spoken to the mayor about it a number of times, but about a year ago the commission passed a resolution that authorized the construction of a baby box. The purpose of a baby box is for a mother or a family who are unable to care for an infant. They can place the infant in the box so that the infant can reach public personnel safely. There was a long discussion about it a year ago. However, the state legislature this year passed a law that now said the boxes were legal. In that regard, one of the things that stopped us from putting in the baby box a year ago was a concern that the baby box did not have the proper product approvals, and that we would not be able to get a building permit. However, at this stage, those fears have subsided to a degree. There are two issues that still give him some pause in signing the agreement that the resolution gave him the authority to do. First, he did not want to prematurely sign off on the contract because it would leave the city liable for the purchase of a product even if we were not able to install it. Then that installation could become problematic if the building official was concerned about product approvals. Secondly, we need engineering and design because the baby boxes are built right into the wall of the facility, so that was a concern because we would have to remove a portion of the wall to add a header along with some other things. So, design engineering will be needed. He has also been working with Amanda McLea of the Sunrise Rotary on this, because they are willing to pay for the baby box, which costs about $25,000, and they are going to provide a letter that indicates that. In the interim, the Deputy City Manager is working on gathering price estimates to figure out what we need to do to procure construction services to cut the hole in the wall of that building. At this point, we have no idea what those costs are, but he would bring that matter back to commission as a contractual item. Even if it falls below the threshold of his authority, he would still bring it back to the commission as an informational item. We will be working on the procurement for netting at Pat Thomas along with procurement for a contractor to cut a hole in the wall for the baby box. He noted that the scheduled place for the baby box would be at Fire Station 61 on Canal Street. **Commissioner Berry** asked if the person that was injured at the lightning game was a child or an adult and do we know how serious it was? **CM Minner** answered that it was a young female. She appeared to be in her early 20s. **Commissioner Berry** wanted to know if there had been any netting on the third base side? **CM Minner** replied no and there never has been. Right now we are not sure if they have filed a claim, but we did receive some information, and it was forwarded to our risk manager. She will be managing that case, and he will provide further details as they become available.

10. ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Burry had no further comment.

Commissioner Berry said she wanted to congratulate herself because this past weekend she represented the City of Leesburg at the Stepping out for Education event that was held on Saturday. She walked away as being the top female dancer. It was a great experience, and it was for a wonderful cause. It will help the children in the Lake County Schools along with the teachers.

Commissioner Connell mentioned that he had already spoken to the city manager and the city attorney about a publication that came out that he thought was putting the cart in front of the horse. He was going to quote a portion of the publication because it says this publication shall serve as a notice of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida, and the intent was to dispose of real property at 309 South Palmetto Street. It says it shall serve as notice of the City Commission and that it was our intent. However, we have not had a vote on this. This should have been discussed and voted on that said it was their intent to dispose of this property before a notice came out. Again, from time to time, this commission puts the cart in front of the horse on things. He believes they should have had a major conversation because it was not their intent to do away with almost two acres of recreational property before the notice was posted. He did not know how the city manager felt like it was their intent when they had not voted on it. He was not asked if that was his intent one way or the other, and he was not sure if the city manager had spoken to any of the other commissioners about it. He did not think this notice should have gone out prior to the commission having a discussion and a vote. **CA Watson** remarked that there was a notice published regarding this property that invites proposals from the community. So, if anybody has any proposals for the redevelopment of the property, there is a thirty-day window to submit that information to the city. They can submit a proposal to the city for the commission to consider in the context of considering whether to dispose of the property. As Commissioner Connell mentioned, it did indicate an intention to dispose of the property, but the city is not required to dispose of the property even after having run that notice. It is a notice to invite proposals from anyone who may be interested who may have a proposal for redevelopment of the property. However, to clarify, this does not guarantee that the city will get rid of the property. It is just a procedural requirement that needs to be met because it is within a CRA's boundaries. The idea was to invite proposals, so the commission could have everything they need to make a decision on what the best proposal is for the property. **CM Minner** added that, based on the Commissioner's comments that were pointed at the city manager, he would say the following: this is a standard operating procedure for when the commission considers the disposal of surplus property. This process was not done in prior years before Stone and Gerken became our city attorneys. His commentary was not to throw anybody under the bus, but rather discuss standard operating procedures (SOP) in a public forum, which we have no issue with. When we operated with Mclin Burnsed under the direction of Fred Morrison, we never made advertisements seeking ways to have clear title prior to disposing of or selling property. He could not speak for the former city attorney, but that was the process. Now, under Stone and Gerken and the city attorney's leadership, the directive, which is part of the statute, was to make sure we have clear title before disposing of lots, and we needed to advertise. More specifically, we need to advertise property that is located within a community redevelopment district. So, as we endeavor to move off into this concept with the shuffleboard courts and Forward Paths about what to do with this specific two-acre tract, it has now been agendaized has directed by the commission for August 25th and, in doing so, he received a call from the city attorney that said we needed to advertise this property. He explained that to Commissioner Connell when he asked about it late last week, and no, he had not talked to any other commissioner about it because it was a SOP and the advertisement used the standard language. The only quibble he would add about putting the cart before the horse is that, as the city attorney has educated him on the process for when we consider donating, selling or disposing of property, as the city attorney explained the definition of intent, we need to have all the information available prior to taking any action to dispose of property. We are asking for other proposals even though he was sure there would be a Catch-22 there. If we endeavored to vote without the ad, then we would not have other proposals come forward that offer to purchase the property or to give us other options that may be better than what we think is available. The purpose of the ad was to flush out all the options. So, in the next thirty days, we may have somebody, or we might not. We might have somebody that says we will give the city half a million dollars for that property. That half a million dollars might look better than keeping the shuffleboard courts or donating the property to Forward Paths. The purpose of the advertisement was to simply inform the public that this was under consideration, so when the matter comes before the commission for deliberation on August 25th, they will have all the information to make the best determination according to what the collective wisdom of the commission is. **Commissioner Berry** questioned the tennis courts that used to be behind Big Lots. When they made that decision, did they have to go through all of this before deciding to remove the tennis courts? **CM Minner** responded that we did not advertise for the sale, disposal or demolition of those courts other than to consider all the things that we talked about in order to bring forth the concept of the Susan Street project. With the Susan Street concept, we contemplated rectangle sports at that facility, and we talked about demolition of other facilities that would be there. However, in reference to an advertisement to dispose of property, we never advertised that it would be demolished. **Commissioner Berry** thanked him for the explanation because at one point she knew they were there, and then they were gone. **CM Minner** explained that the scenario there was different because we demolished the tennis courts at Susan Street. That was a different concept than the legal requirement for disposal of land. We were talking about a facility versus the question of disposing of property. **CA Watson** agreed. It is the disposal of property that has triggered this under the CRA's statute. **CM Minner** added one more thing about putting the cart before the horse, because recently we donated a couple of parcels to the CDC. Those advertisements went out ahead of when the commission approved to donate the two parcels. He could not remember which properties they were, and granted they were not 1.7-acre lots. However, the process of the advertisement was with the intent of donating parcels that were owned by the community redevelopment agency and that went out prior to the commission voting on the warranty deed to the Leesburg CDC. This is the exact same process, so on August 25th they may or may not choose to donate the property and, if you do not, they have covered the basis and all we have done is set ourselves up in a position to either keep the property and move forward as is or donate it with the notation that this property is located within the Greater Leesburg CRA, and it has been advertised. **Commissioner Connell** stated that he understands the legalities of why it had to be advertised. His point was that it should have been discussed and voted by the commission to say that it was their intent to dispose of the property before the advertisement went out. He did not know if it was their intent to dispose of the property. He understands that they will decide on August 25th, but that decision should have been made prior to the advertisement going out. However, the point is that it should have been discussed and voted on before saying it was the intent of the commission to dispose of this property.

Mayor Reisman gave a heads-up that, on August 8th, at the Lake Square Mall, the Chamber will be hosting the Back-to-School Teacher Appreciation event. It starts at 7am. There will be teachers there from ten different schools. It is pure chaos, but it is a lot of fun. They will be serving the teachers breakfast and providing them with gifts. He really appreciates what the chamber does. Lastly, he wanted to thank all the city staff for what they do. We are the city we are because of you and we appreciate you. It is a little disheartening when people come in and discredit or challenge our staff. The city staff here have years of experience, and we rely on that. He wanted to thank everyone for all their hard work and for everything they do day in and day out to keep this city running.

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 Burry and a second by Commissioner Berry, the meeting adjourned at 6:58 p.m.