

**AGENDA MINUTES
CITY COMMISSION MEETING
CITY HALL, 501 W MEADOW STREET
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 10, 2025 5:30 PM**

1. CALL TO ORDER

The City of Leesburg Commission held a regular meeting on Monday, November 10, 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
Commissioner Mike Pederson
Mayor Alan Reisman

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. None

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!

There were no public comments offered.

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 Connell	Yes
Commissioner Burry	Yes
Commissioner Pederson	Yes
Commissioner Berry	Yes
Mayor Reisman	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 27, 2025

B. PURCHASING ITEMS:

- 1. Purchase request for four (4) Ford Interceptor Utility AWD vehicles in the total amount of \$174,172.00 from Bozard Ford, contract holder for the Florida Sheriffs Association light vehicle, contract FSA 24-VEL-32.**
- 2. Purchase request to approve the purchase of services for Fiscal Year 2026 with Compost USA of Sumter County for sludge hauling services, in the total amount of \$260,000.00.**
- 3. Requesting approval to purchase Odor and Corrosion Control Services from Evoqua Water Technologies LLC, in the total amount of \$87,992.00, contract holder of Lee County Commissioners Contract No. RFP240129DJN.**

C. RESOLUTIONS:

- 1. 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 2025-26 with Community Development Corporation of Leesburg, Inc., Leesburg Area Chamber of Commerce, Inc., Leesburg Art Festival, Inc. DBA Leesburg Arts Center, Leesburg Yellow Jacket Booster Club, Inc. and Leesburg Yellow Jacket Booster Club, Inc (for Leesburg High School Band); and providing an effective date.

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 12,060

2. Resolution of the City Commission of the City of Leesburg, Florida, authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute a construction services agreement with Mark Cook Builders, Inc., for the Air Traffic Control Tower Rehabilitation project at the Leesburg International Airport; and providing an effective date.

ADOPTED RESOLUTION 12,061

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. An Ordinance of the City of Leesburg, Florida, annexing certain real property consisting of approximately 596.29 +/- acres; and being generally located east of County Road 48 and south of Ronald Reagan Turnpike, lying in Sections 28, 29, and 32, Township 20 South, Range 24 East, Lake County, Florida; providing that said property so annexed shall be liable for its proportionate share of the existing and future indebtedness of said city; providing that such annexed property shall be subject to all laws and ordinances of said city as if all such territory had been a part of the City of Leesburg at the time of passage and approval of said laws and ordinances; providing that such annexed territory shall be placed in City Commission District 3; and providing an effective date. (Oak Ridge ANNX)

ADOPTED ORDINANCE 25-57

Mayor Reisman asked the city attorney to perform the swearing-in. **CA Watson** asked anyone wishing to provide testimony on agenda items 6.A.3 (Oak Ridge) or 6.B.1 (Banning 5) to stand and raise their right hand. He swore them all in.

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

Commissioner Pederson made a motion to adopt the ordinance and Commissioner Burry seconded the motion.

Mayor Reisman requested comments from the Commission and the audience.

PZD Miller stated this project was known as Oak Ridge. It is generally located east of CR 48 and south of the Florida Turnpike. The project includes an annexation, large-scale comprehensive plan, and a rezoning. The site consists of approximately 596.28 plus or minus undeveloped acres. The request is for the future development of nine hundred and ten attached and detached single family residential units with associated amenities. The overall proposal includes a comprehensive plan request going from Lake County Rural to City of Leesburg Estate Density Residential. The zoning request would go from Lake County Agriculture to City of Leesburg PUD. Under the PUD requirements, the proposal consists of nine hundred and ten single family units split into two home types. There would be six hundred and forty-two detached single-family units and two hundred and sixty-eight villa units which are duplexes. There are no other uses permitted. For the detached units, there will be eighty-three of those scattered around the exterior boundaries on the sixty-foot and seventy-foot-wide lots with seventeen hundred and eighteen hundred square foot houses. Again, this would be around the perimeter of the development. Then the remaining five hundred and fifty-nine units will be on fifty-foot lots with fifteen hundred square feet of living area as defined under the roof. There are architectural and design standards required which are shown in the exhibits. Two floors will be the maximum height and each house will be required to have a minimum of two off-street parking spaces. Thirty-five percent of the property is required to be open space. However, they are showing much more than that. The dark sky lighting is required and trees in each yard. There is a twenty-five-foot landscape buffer required along the entirety of the property boundaries except where it is not needed due to existing wetland area or where the property backs up to a marsh. There is a three-foot berm or a four-foot fence along CR 48. The fence will run along the perimeter except for where a berm or a wetland is present. There will be sidewalks throughout the development. There is a requirement for Bahia or Bermuda grass in place of St. Augustine.

With the site access and signage, there is access shown along CR 48 on the site plan. There is a requirement for turning lanes, acceleration and deceleration lanes, etc. by Lake County. The main access point in the front is required to be a boulevard-type roadway with a landscape median of at least eight feet in width and enough width in the lanes to allow emergency vehicles to maneuver. There will be signage in the front, which is required to be a decorative entryway feature made of concrete, brick, or stucco. It will be at least five feet in height on each side of the entryway, or they could have that within the landscaped area at the boulevard entrance. There is interconnectivity between this subdivision and the adjacent subdivisions.

He wanted to point out that to the north of this proposal, there is the intersection of CR 470, CR 48, and CR 33, and depending on the time of day, this is one of the busiest and most difficult intersections to get through. At that time, while he did not have specific details, staff was aware that there are developers working on the intersection of CR 33, CR 470, and CR 48. We know they are working together to get some studies done along with some signal warrants, and review of potential funding mechanisms. So, the development community itself is working toward planning improvements to that intersection. In the long haul, that will require coordination between the city, county, developers, and staff. He would provide updates as they came in, but he wanted to let them know that there had been a lot of thought being put into that. He believes the county has earmarked some money for that intersection.

Under recreation, this PUD requires 4.18 acres, which could include; a pool, cabana, children's park, playground, dog park, those kinds of things. A walking nature trail has been designed to blend into the

neighborhood and the wetland areas. When it comes to utilities, everything will be on City of Leesburg water and wastewater. There will be no wells or septic on the property. Finally, they included the phasing or expiration clause which requires the development to move forward with substantial commencement within four years, or it reverts to a one acre per unit zoning requirement. Mr. Logan Opsahl of Lowndes Law of Orlando is here to represent the case and answer any questions.

Logan Opsahl of Lowndes Law, 215 North Eola Drive, said this project has been before the commission a few times. To be brief, this project was continued to a date certain at its second reading, due to a letter they all received from the county addressing various maintenance obligations on CR 48. He knows there have been discussions and that the commission has likely been updated by the city attorney and that the city had provided a response to that letter. The applicant team also provided a response due to much of that letter being project specific. They are all in agreement on the interpretation of the items, and their understanding is that the county will maintain ownership of CR 48. Again, he addressed the project specifics, which included other matters specific to this project in relation to the ISBA that was cited by the county, including the intent and design of which to remove enclave areas such as this property.

Referring to a few slides, he said the planning and zoning director touched on most of this during his staff presentation. The amenities being provided here for activities exceed the minimum because they have just shy of five acres of amenity space that will include a pool and cabana. The main amenities are the nature trails and the multi-use trails throughout the project, which showcase the wetland areas and the areas of wetland that will be created as part of this project. The amenities amount to seventy percent of open space across the property, and they would add additional landscaping and natural vegetation to really set up for some proper stormwater management there that does not currently exist. Again, they would be creating some wetland and expanding it as well. With that he would be happy to answer any specific questions.

Commissioner Burry said he read the letter that was sent from Chairperson Campione. He wanted to know if he received a response back from them. **Mr. Opsahl** responded no. They had not received a response. **CM Minner** added that they received a letter from Chairperson Campione. He replied to that letter by email to the county manager. She then returned an email, which was submitted to all commissioners. **Commissioner Burry** wanted to confirm that all commissioners had seen everything that was generated. **CM Minner** agreed. **Mayor Reisman** asked if there were any other questions by the commission for the developer. There were none. He asked if there were any public comments. There were none.

Commissioner Connell pointed out that the planning and zoning director stated that the intersection of CR 33, CR 470, and CR 48 was terrible, but it is absolutely horrible, especially in the morning and afternoon. Yes, there are some discussions about addressing that intersection, but it would be a good idea to not add any more traffic to that intersection until it has been addressed and corrected. They are talking about another one thousand homes being added to that intersection. There may be some talk going on now, but who knows how far down the road that intersection will be addressed. He would like the commission to consider not putting any more traffic at that intersection until it has been completely redone. **Mayor Reisman** asked if there were any other commission comments. There were none.

The roll call vote was:

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

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

2. **An Ordinance amending the Future Land Use Map of the Comprehensive Plan of the City of Leesburg, changing the Future Land Use Map Designation of certain property containing 596.29 +/- acres from Lake County Rural to City of Leesburg Estate Residential, for a property generally located east of County Road 48 and south of Ronald Reagan Turnpike, lying in Sections 28, 29, and 32, Township 20 South, Range 24 East, Lake County, Florida; and providing an effective date. (Oak Ridge LSCP)**

ADOPTED ORDINANCE 25-58

Commissioner Pederson made a motion to adopt the ordinance and Commissioner Burry seconded the motion.

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

The roll call vote was:

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

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

3. **An Ordinance of the City of Leesburg, Florida, changing the zoning on approximately 596.29 +/- acres from Lake County A (Agriculture) to City of Leesburg PUD (Planned Unit Development) to allow 910 single-family attached and detached units, for a property generally located east of County Road 48 and south of Ronald Reagan Turnpike, lying in Sections 28, 29, and 32, Township 20 South, Range 24 East, Lake County, Florida; and providing an effective date. (Oak Ridge PUD)**

ADOPTED ORDINANCE 25-59

Commissioner Pederson made a motion to adopt the ordinance and Commissioner Burry seconded the motion.

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

The roll call vote was:

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

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

4. **An Ordinance of the City of Leesburg, Florida, amending the boundaries and changing the name of the Grace Key Groves Community Development District established pursuant to Ordinance 24-33, to 'Grace Groves CDD'; providing a severability clause; addressing conflicts; and providing an effective date. (CDD rev Grace Groves)**

ADOPTED ORDINANCE 25-67

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

Commissioner Pederson made a motion to adopt the ordinance and Commissioner Berry seconded the motion.

Mayor Reisman requested comments from the Commission and the audience.

PZD Miller said this request was to amend the boundaries of the Grace Groves Community Development District (CDD). This CDD was established under Ordinance 24-33 in July 2024. This CDD serves the BarKey subdivision, which is located off Dewey Robbins Road. It is located east of US Highway 27 and south of Dewey Robbins Road. This request basically adds in the additional thirty-nine acres. The request will revise the area of the Community Development District from six hundred and ninety-one to seven hundred and eighteen plus or minus acres. The property in question will be fully contained within the BarKey project. It was recently zoned under the BarKey conditions as BarKey II under Ordinance 22-67, which he believed to be the original BarKey. However, they recently approved another one after that for this specific property. So, the request is to simply add to the existing BarKey, it does not change the number of units or anything like that. **Mayor Reisman** asked if there were any comments or questions by the commission or the audience. There were none.

The roll call vote was:

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

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

B. FIRST READING OF ORDINANCES:

1. **An Ordinance of the City of Leesburg, Florida, changing the zoning on approximately 103.14 +/- acres from City of Leesburg PUD (Planned Unit Development) to City of Leesburg PUD (Planned Unit Development) to allow for 294 single-family detached units, consisting of 241 50' lots and 53 60' lots, for a property generally located east of County Road 48 and north of North Austin Merritt Road, lying in Section 32, Township 20 South,**

**Range 24 East, Lake County, Florida; and providing an effective date.
(Banning 5 PUD)**

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

Mayor Reisman requested comments from the Commission and the audience.

PZD Miller stated this request was the Banning 5 PUD rezoning. It is generally located east of CR 48 north of Austin Merritt Road. It is 103.14 plus or minus acres. The request is for a future development consisting of two hundred and ninety-four single-family dwelling units. The request would simply change the zoning from City PUD to City PUD with the revised conditions. If this was approved by the commission, this would create a spine road interconnecting CR 33 and CR 48 via the other Banning Ranch projects, which are all similar to this one. Again, there would be two hundred and ninety-four units on 103.14 acres. The lot sizes would be a mix of fifty and sixty-foot-wide lots. The sixty-foot lots would be on the exterior as typically done. In this phase they included all the same PUD features. They would need to choose five design features from the PUD architectural standards list. Thirty-five percent open space, dark sky lighting, landscaping plan buffers around the project, which is twenty-five feet around the entirety of the project except for where it is not needed due to existing wetlands. Two floors is the maximum height and sidewalks are required. Under site access, CR 48 is under Lake County jurisdiction, so the developers are required to make all improvements as required by Lake County and that language is written into all PUDs. The main access to the development will be a boulevard type roadway with a landscaped median. Signage will be the standard with a decorative entry feature that was described in the previous project and interconnectivity with the other subdivisions will be available with this plan. There is 1.35 acres of park and recreational land required, which includes one primary recreation area with three amenities; meaning a swimming pool, plus two other features, such as barbecue grills, play areas, ball courts, and picnic tables. Again, everything has to be on city water and wastewater. They also included the standard expiration phasing clause which reverts the property if substantial commencement has not begun within forty-eight months. Andrew McCown of GAI Inc., is here to answer any questions. **Mayor Reisman** asked if there were any commission comments.

Commissioner Burry wanted to confirm that there was a previous PUD on this property. **PZD Miller** replied yes. The current PUD had about the same number of units, but this proposal has a slight reduction in the number and it is all single-family units. The previous PUD included both town houses and single-family units. **Commissioner Burry** questioned if this proposal would match the other Banning developments. **PZD Miller** agreed. This mix of lots would match all the other Banning developments going back to CR 33.

Andrew McCown of GAI Consultants said he was there representing Hanover Land. He had a quick presentation he wanted to go over. Referring to slides, he showed where the site would be located between CR 48 and CR 33. Zooming in a bit more, he showed a recent aerial view of the site. As the planning and zoning manager mentioned, this was a previously approved PUD that consisted of 103 acres. It included three hundred dwelling units, which broke down into one hundred and forty-eight single family homes and one hundred and fifty-two town homes. It also included thirty thousand square feet of commercial space. When that plan was previously approved, it had two acres of recreation and about thirty-one percent of open space. He then showed the newly proposed PUD, which included two hundred and ninety-four dwelling units, which is a reduction of six units. As the planning and zoning director said, these will all be single-family homes. There will be no town homes, which just by itself means a reduction in traffic generation from the previously approved plan. With the elimination of the commercial program, there will be a reduction in traffic generation. This plan proposes two and a half

acres of recreation, which is an increase of .5 acres over the previous plan. It is significantly more than the 1.7 acre minimum based on the two hundred square feet per unit. There is over forty-one percent of open space as opposed to the thirty-five percent requirement in recent PUDs.

Referring to a slide, he showed how this development would connect with all the Banning Ranch phases. It would connect from CR 33 to CR 48. All phases would run east to west through the five different phases. Highlighted in blue would be the new spine road that would connect all the phases together from one county road to the other. Some of the benefits that the city gets from this new spine road would be that it would help distribute the traffic more efficiently between the two county roads. It would also allow for a much shorter route to the turnpike from CR 48, so instead of having to drive all the way up north to that intersection and coming back south, they could cut through the spine road to get to the turnpike. It would function as the utility corridor between the two county roads, and it would be an alternative emergency service route between the two roads. Instead of having one option, they would have additional access.

Referring to the development of phase five, they can see that they are planning two phases with the same number of units of one hundred and forty-seven units. The lot splits would be two hundred and forty-one fifty-foot lots and fifty-three sixty-foot lots. Some of the highlights include the amenity center on the eastern side of the phase, and that would be constructed first. He then showed the connection to the spine road heading east and the connection to the adjacent project to the south, which is called Blake Ridge. The main entrance on the west will be a boulevard-style entrance. Looking at the open space breakdown, there is a significant number of wetlands and stormwater on the site and the two and a half acres of parks that were mentioned earlier. There will be over ten acres of other open areas that will include floodplain and tree safe areas, along with a significant amount of landscape buffers. At this time, he wanted to mention that all phases would essentially be part of the same HOA. The residents would have access to park amenities in all phases.

As far as traffic, the directional split is anticipated to be about seventy and thirty. Seventy percent would go west to CR 48 and thirty percent would go to CR 33. He showed how that would break down with existing traffic and other approved projects. The green illustrated existing traffic on the road in terms of peak hour trips, and the orange illustrated all the other approved projects. It also included the Oak Ridge project that was just approved tonight. The red illustrated the Banning Ranch phase five contributions to the peak hour trips and the blue illustrated all the remaining available capacity by the year 2031. Then, likewise, since this would have connection to CR 33, they looked at that too. He showed how that intersection broke down. The green being existing traffic at the peak hour, and orange being all the other approved projects for that road. The red is the Banning Ranch phase five contribution and the blue is the available capacity left in year 2031.

The last slide was a description of changes to the ordinance. They originally requested a one hundred and fifteen-foot minimum lot depth for both the fifty-foot lots and sixty-foot lots. However, in the draft ordinance, one hundred and twenty-five feet was put in, so they are requesting it be reduced to one hundred and fifteen-foot lot depth, which would result in the various minimum lot size changes, since the minimum lot sizes were for the one hundred and twenty-five-foot-deep lot. **Mayor Reisman** asked if there were any questions for the developers.

Commissioner Connell wanted to know if this development would be a gated community. **Mr. McCown** replied no. This development would not be gated. **Commissioner Connell** said he referred to the road as being a spine road. Would that be a regular road that cuts through between CR 33 and CR 48? **Mr. McCown** answered yes. **Commissioner Connell** wanted to know if the spine road would be maintained by the CDD or the City of Leesburg? **Mr. McCown** stated it would be maintained by the CDD.

Commissioner Connell said he would then assume that the road would be fourteen-feet for travel instead of the typical eleven feet.

Ben Snyder of Hanover Land remarked that the spine road had been contemplated to be dedicated to the City. It would be constructed per city standards, just like every other project. Actually, the road is a little wider with fourteen-foot travel routes to accommodate the additional traffic and to help people move between CR 48 and CR 33. This would relieve traffic on the other roads. **Commissioner Connell** inquired if the spine road would allow sand trucks, semis, and everything else that would run through the subdivision. **Mr. Snyder** responded that they do not restrict who uses public roads. **Commissioner Connell** wanted to confirm that they were proposing the city be responsible for the maintenance of the spine road. **Mr. Snyder** said they were proposing to dedicate the road to the city, and it would be maintained just like all the other public roads. **Commissioner Connell** remarked that he was not sure if the city wanted to take more roads. Is this property already in the city? **Mr. Snyder** replied yes. **Commissioner Connell** wanted to know when the PUD was done. **Mr. McCown** said he believed that was approved around 2008. **Commissioner Connell** wanted to verify if that PUD had expired. **PZD Miller** answered yes, the PUD had expired. **Commissioner Connell** questioned the spine road and how many miles it would be. **Mr. Snyder** said he did not have that number. **Commissioner Connell** commented that he was trying to figure out how much roadway they were proposing the city to take over. **CM Minner** added that he believed it would be between four and five miles. **Mr. Snyder** mentioned that he would have that number for him at the second reading. **Commissioner Burry** asked if the 2008 PUD had expired. **PZD Miller** answered yes. **Commissioner Connell** said he did not mean to jump in, but since it was expired did this revert to a one-to-one ratio. **PZD Miller** replied no, since we only started doing that about a year ago. **Commissioner Connell** wanted to know what it reverted to then. What was the deal with this one? **PZD Miller** responded that since the PUD expired, it had to go back to the planning commission. They would have to consider whether to rezone it to PUD or change it to RE-1. There were some different wording back in 2008, and these were treated differently. The applicants have gone back through the process. **Commissioner Connell** wanted to confirm that this has gone back to the planning commission. **PZD Miller** confirmed that this had gone back before the planning commission. **Commissioner Connell** then asked about the planning commission recommendation. **PZD Miller** answered that the planning commission recommended denial. However, planning staff recommended approval. **Commissioner Connell** wanted to know what the planning commission's reasons were for recommending a denial. **Senior Planner (SP), Max VanAllen**, stated they recommended denial based on concerns about open space and the increased traffic on CR 48. Those were the two major concerns listed by the planning commission. **Commissioner Connell** said he knows this is the first reading, but the city commission just approved nine hundred plus more homes tonight. With this development, they would add over twelve hundred more homes that would use CR 33, CR 470, and CR 48. We have to remember that these roads are only two-lane roads. This would create a major traffic problem, and we would just keep adding to the problem. Also, this PUD has expired, and we have a road being proposed between three and five miles that would run right through the subdivision. Plus, they want the city to take ownership of it and maintain it. He really hoped that the commission at the second reading would take all of that into consideration.

Commissioner Burry asked in general on the planning side. Is it important to city services, meaning police, fire, and everything else, to have that spine road in place? **PZD Miller** answered yes, for all the reasons that the applicant had brought out. That road is very important for emergency access and the interconnection between CR 33 and CR 48 because it would alleviate traffic heading in either direction, and they would not have to go up to the intersection and back around. There are a number of reasons for needing that spine road. In addition, under the current zoning, which has expired, this is a much better plan. It allows a spine road to go through the different development phases to interconnect CR 33 and CR 48. We have never had that and we need it. However, remember this will take a number of years to come

to fruition. It would certainly not happen overnight. **Commissioner Pederson** said he heard a mention of tractor trailers. Is there a way to restrict them from using the spine road? **PZD Miller** responded that he saw no reason why the city could not restrict trucks from using that road. **Commissioner Pederson** mentioned that he would ask the developer what they wanted, but he wanted to throw that out for discussion. It would not be as big of an issue once construction has moved further along. He was just looking at that road cutting through residential areas, so he wanted to bring that up for discussion and thought between now and the second reading. **Mayor Reisman** asked if there were any other commission comments. There were none. He asked for public comments.

Tim Morris, County Commissioner of District 5, said the city was currently in the cat bird seat. They could basically ask for just about anything they wanted because CR 48 would be a nightmare. With the developers saying eighty trips with approximately one hundred and forty-seven houses is just ridiculous. He had no idea where that traffic study came from. However, at the county level, he was requesting that the county hire their own traffic study people to do the traffic studies because they need to get that out of the developer's hands. He wanted the commission to know that the county was currently working on that. The city should ask the developers to take care of CR 48 all the way to CR 33. They are looking at twelve hundred homes, so they are making a lot of money. The county is currently doing this with Howey in the Hills. Howey in the Hills has taken part of Number Two Road, and they are redoing the road all the way to US 19. The city could ask them to take care of CR 48, widen it, do whatever needs to be done to help the county with traffic because it would be a nightmare. It was already a nightmare in Okahumpka, and it will be the same way on CR 33. **Commissioner Pederson** pointed out that he triggered one more comment and, even though he appreciated his comments, he wanted to throw something out for discussion between now and second reading. Rather than the developer taking over CR 48, could the city push back on the spine road and make the developer maintain that road to city standards?

Tim Casey of 12198 West Golf Breeze Court, Crystal River, said he purchased a lot in Clearwater Lakes about a year ago. Referring to a picture, he said the little orange dot represented the lot that they purchased. To tie into the traffic coming into the area, all the blue represented the already approved developments coming into the area between CR 33, CR 48, and CR 470. He added up the units in those developments, and it came out to about thirty thousand more units being added to that area. With traffic, there are already thirty thousand units approved in that area and that does not include the Oak Ridge development that was just approved. **Mayor Reisman** asked if there were any other public comments. There were none. He stated this item would lay over until December 8th.

C. NON-ROUTINE ITEMS:

1. None

7. INFORMATIONAL REPORTS:

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

A. None

8. CITY ATTORNEY ITEMS:

CA Watson explained that he had an item he wanted to go over with the Commission. He was not sure if everybody had heard about the PFAS litigation that has been ongoing around the country. Basically, there are some lawsuits going on that relate to PFAS, which is a manmade chemical commonly found in non-stick cookware along with other things, more particularly in firefighting foam. It is very prevalent in that and widely used. It is a lot more controlled than it was years ago. However, all of these PFAS chemicals have found their way into groundwater, so there is damage and degradation that includes extra expenses and costs incurred by water system operators treating the water to remove PFAS chemicals. Many years ago, there were a number of companies that were involved in producing these chemicals and two of them are 3M and DuPont. Now, there are multidistrict federal litigations going on against DuPont and 3M and what 3M and DuPont did was create and allocate a settlement fund. They have gone through and listed a number of water systems that would be entitled to claim money from the fund. This was not a fund where we would have to prove causation, it was simply an allocated settlement fund and if you were on the list, then you were entitled to money from the settlement fund by DuPont and 3M. This settlement fund only relates to drinking water, it does not relate to sewers or airports. However, there are potential claims in the future that may become available for those. However, right now they are just talking about water systems/drinking water. This fund is about \$13 billion, so there is a lot of money there, but remember this is a nationwide claims fund and the City of Leesburg is on that list. The City of Leesburg is in a position to claim money from these settlement funds. Now, the way this generally works is that the source wells have to be tested and the PFAS level will be scored based on the test results. Then there is a matrix of sorts where they would take the test results against the number of wells and things like that, they would run that information through a formula to spit out a number that the city would be entitled to.

Backing up a little, there are some national law firms driving this train on the multidistrict litigation and there are some local law firms that have reached out to him who are working with the national law firms in regard to these claims. They are asking whether the city would like to sign up for their assistance. Now, the way the fund works, this is an opt-out claim against DuPont and 3M, where the federal court said if they put up \$13 billion in this fund, they would be free. They could not be sued by other people nor does the city have the ability to sue DuPont or 3M for the water system. From his perspective, there is money there and if the city does not make a claim on that money, whatever is leftover will go back to DuPont and 3M. In his opinion, this seems like a no-brainer, and they should make a claim. The funds would be unrestricted, so they could go into the general fund, and the city could spend it on the water system or wherever they want to. Basically, he had a couple of law firms reach out to him, asking if the city was going to sign up. They were all contingency deals, so the city would not pay anything out of pocket. The attorneys are looking to share in the proceeds of the money they would obtain for the city. Typically, that percentage is around twenty to thirty percent. Yes, it is a pretty hefty percentage, but one of the benefits is that they are motivated to get as much as they can out of that fund for the city.

At this point, he wanted to inform the commission about the situation. However, there are other companies. 3M and DuPont are not the only ones, because BASF is another company that recently put up a fund. However, as he understands, that time has passed for claiming under that fund, but there may be other avenues to get there. After talking to the other attorneys, what he understands is that they would like to make a claim on behalf of the city under the drinking water fund for both DuPont and 3M, and they would try to get as much money as they could. It was his understanding that this could be a seven-figure number. That is the estimate, so we are talking about a significant amount of money that the city could likely be entitled to. We would try to get as much as we can out of the DuPont and 3M through the drinking water fund. They also believe it to be a good idea to file claims for the sewer and the airport, because there will most likely be settlement funds established for those too. However, right now, the federal courts are more interested in dealing with drinking water. They would then deal with the other stuff after they are finished figuring out the drinking water. We would make a claim against DuPont and 3M. One benefit of being tied in with these attorneys is that they know about other claims going on, and

they know the other chemical companies potentially exposed. This could be a domino effect and there could be other settlement funds out there.

He wanted to know how the commission felt and to see if they wanted him to continue down the pathway of potentially trying to find an attorney to help make claims under these funds. With regard to the DuPont and 3M fund, there is only a deadline looming, by which they would have to sign up by the end of the year to make the claim. If they make the claim by the end of this calendar year, they would be entitled to testing reimbursement from the settlement fund. Each test cost around \$800. However, he was uncertain about the number of source wells the city had that would need to be tested. If there were twenty wells, that would be \$800 times twenty. If they have not signed up by the end of the year, the downside is that the city would not be entitled to claim reimbursement for the testing costs from the settlement fund. However, they would still be in line to claim the larger sum for the damage to the system. There could still be a chance of getting testing costs reimbursed, but the clearest way to have them reimbursed is to sign up before the end of the year. He was happy to field questions, but at this point he was looking for some form of approval to continue down this road. He could bring back a retainer agreement for the commission to decide on an attorney to use. He believed it would be a no-brainer, because they could continue down the road with a local attorney to help with the national law firms making the claim. **Mayor Reisman** asked if there were any commission comments.

Commissioner Berry asked if there were any other cities in the area involved. **CA Watson** answered yes. They are actively talking to all the cities that have water systems and airports. They are informing everyone with hopes of getting everyone signed up. However, right now, he does not know if anyone has signed up. He knows St. Cloud has talked with one of the attorneys, but other than that, he did not know a specific Lake County city that has signed up, but several are talking to the attorneys.

Commissioner Berry wanted to know if we have not met the deadline of signing up by the end of the year, would there be another roll out with others or is this it? **CA Watson** replied that this was only DuPont and 3M. He did not know how many chemical companies were manufacturing this stuff. These two companies basically said they did it, and they knew it was harmful to water systems. That is why they put up a gigantic chunk of money to pay for the harm.

Commissioner Burry commented that PFAS chemicals, in layman's terms, were forever chemicals. It had nothing to do with what the city was trying to do last year with the water system. These are a totally different set of chemicals. There were a lot of people trying to mash them together, but these are manmade chemicals that cannot be broken down because they have such a tight bond. When people introduce them into the system by putting them down the garbage disposal or whatever, the water treatment facilities have a hard time treating them, so they end up back in the water source, so he was all for pursuing this. **CA Watson** agreed. From what he understands, the firefighting foam was a large contributor to this and that was why airports were part of the discussion and analysis, because it was used widely in airports for training, which is why the PFAS chemicals ended up in those areas. Again, this is preliminary, and with the 3M and DuPont funds, they are talking seven figures for the drinking water.

Commissioner Pederson agreed with the recommendation. However, he questioned the risk of testing the wells. Could it come back that we do not have chemicals in the water? **CA Watson** responded potentially, but there was a list that essentially said if you were on that list, then you were in the game. Even if you tested a zero on the source wells, you may still be entitled to compensation. **Commissioner Pederson** commented that he did not want to get bogged down in that because he wanted to move forward. The only other question he had was directed at the city manager. He wanted to know if the city was already making efforts to get this out of our water. He looked at this fund as being more of a reimbursement for the efforts to get it out of the water. Is there a way for us to get it out of the water?

CM Minner replied that it was a tricky question, and he was not ready to say that it was in the water because the city has passed all applicable tests and all our water is clean. Our water has passed all the tests, so no one should wig out about it. However, it could be, which is why part of this includes the testing of water to examine whether it is in there. There could be de minimis amounts in it and that would not make us worry. There are three levels. There is a super high level where we would have to take care of it and that is what the settlement money would go towards. There could be a little bit where we would use some of the settlement money to take care of it and then there could be a de minimis/zero level, where we are entitled to money, but we do not have to do anything with it. The first thing we need to do is jump on board and start the testing, but in the interim, nobody should lose any sleep over it. **CA Watson** added that they are talking about testing the source, so this would be before it goes through the city's cleaning process. It could very well be that the city is eliminating all of this before it gets into the drinking water. Again, their focus is on the source. They want to look at testing it to see if the city is being forced to draw water that is contaminated with PFAS, because then we would have to spend money to clean it out. **Commissioner Pederson** mentioned that he believed his question was already answered, but is there technology today to take the chemicals out of the water at the city level? **CM Minner** replied that he assumed there was.

Mayor Reisman wanted to confirm that as long as they jumped on board before the end of the year, the fees would be covered for the testing. **CA Watson** agreed. **Mayor Reisman** pointed out that the city would have no out-of-pocket expenses. **CA Watson** agreed and pointed out that the attorney fees are contingent. The city would not pay hourly rates or anything like that and if they recovered zero dollars, the city would pay zero dollars. **Commissioner Pederson** thanked him for that clarification. **Mayor Reisman** asked if he needed a motion from the commission. **CA Watson** responded that a motion would be fine if somebody wanted to make a motion authorizing further exploration and to bring back a couple of retainer agreements for consideration.

Commissioner Pederson made a motion authorizing further exploration and to bring back a couple of retainer agreements for consideration, and Commission Burry seconded the motion. **Mayor Reisman** asked if there were any further comments by the commission or the audience. There were none.

The roll call vote was:

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

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

9. CITY MANAGER ITEMS:

CM Minner stated, as they may recall, about two months through Lake 100, they brought on the services of Levy Consulting countywide to examine the subsidy question about tax revenues and that type of stuff. Mr. Levy has finished his preliminary report and presented it to the city managers at their monthly luncheon, which was held on Thursday. Long story short, he is finishing up that report, and he will provide it to the cities and the county, but at a high level, he did consider that there was a subsidy for municipalities. Obviously, if you are in an incorporated area of the county, you pay incorporated and unincorporated property taxes. You would pay a city millage rate as well as the county. You pay a county property tax whether you are incorporated or unincorporated. However, through those general services provided by the county or city, Dr. Levy found that there was about a \$25 million subsidy for

incorporated cities in total that goes over to the county. At that time, there was no solution as to what to do with that, but he speculated that the number was about \$50 million. He also spoke with the county manager about that as a catapult into this study, and she felt the subsidy was about \$12 million, but Dr. Levy split the baby and that was not intended. He would provide more information on that study as it comes, but those numbers may be floating out there.

They also had an extremely good discussion at the manager's luncheon, and they made some progress on the no annexation zone concept, which he brought to the commission's attention a couple of meetings back. He has received some positive feedback back from the county manager about it, and they also received good feedback at the manager's luncheon. Right now, our draft concept is on the county manager's desk. It has only been there a couple of days because he sent it to her last Thursday. She will get back with him with her feedback. In the interim, he asked his executive office manager, Pam Hester, to begin putting together a local meeting, which meant everyone who was a party to the 2013 ISBA agreement would have to come back to the joint meeting on the concept. That includes Mascotte, Minneola, Groveland, Leesburg, Howey in the Hills, Clermont, and Lake County. We are trying to get that meeting done prior to the holidays. He was not sure if they could get it done before Thanksgiving, but certainly before the holidays in December. They are hoping to get everybody together at the table, because that concept seems to be gaining positive traction.

Wrapping up, he pointed out the Deputy City Clerk, Anna Rottermond, because the city clerks have courses they have to go through where they get their tickets punched and Anna's ticket has officially been punched. She has obtained her Master Municipal Clerk (MMC) certification. She received that certificate on October 22, 2025.

10. ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Burry had no further comment.

Commissioner Pederson had nothing to comment on.

Commissioner Berry congratulated and thanked the West Leesburg CDC on their third fall festival Saturday. They had great success in bringing the community together. She also thanked Lakefront TV for capturing the footage. Also, kudos to the Lake County School Foundation for another successful year putting on the Lady of the Lakes Renaissance Faire. It was very, very, very crowded.

Commissioner Connell had no further comment.

Mayor Reisman thanked the special events division and their team for putting on a fantastic Veterans Day parade. Coming up this Friday, Officer Hauser and K9 Nick will be competing in another K9 competition. On Saturday, we are hosting the Flapjack 5K downtown for all the runners. He thanked Lake County Commissioner Morris and fellow Commissioner Berry for attending two grand openings in the City this morning. Finishing up, he wished an early happy birthday to the city manager. His birthday is this Thursday.

Commissioner Connell pointed out that he forgot to mention something that he had already talked to the city manager and city attorney about. With regard to the shuffleboard court property, the property was posted closed as of November 7th. He spoke with the city manager and the city attorney about the timeline for conveying the property to Forward Paths while considering the pending lawsuit. He does not believe they should turn the property over to anyone until the lawsuit has been settled by the court system. In essence, the basis of that suit was that we did not have authority to give that property away, so

we should not proceed to give it away until the lawsuit has been settled. However, he was unsure about when the city manager and/or the city attorney's recommendation was for executing the deed. He believed that the city should wait until the lawsuit had been settled before transferring. **CM Minner** added that Commissioner Connell brought this to his attention on November 5th. Revisiting the timeline for clarification, when they approved the donation, the mayor did sign the official deed, but the deed was destroyed because, subsequently, to the commission's directions to dedicate the property, the city received contact from the shuffleboard club. The chronology for this was important, because the shuffleboard club contacted him directly saying they had a couple of events planned for November. At that time, they asked if they could still use the courts for their event since they had already put a lot of planning into it. The concept was to donate the property to Forward Paths because Forward Paths has a lot of work to do as far as professional services, surveys, planning, engineering, all those kinds of things. We knew there would be a timeframe between when Forward Paths really needed the property and the shuffleboard club asking to use it for their tournaments. So, he used his administrative judgment, and reached out to each commissioner to ask if they could execute the official deed on November 7th. At that time, the shuffleboard club representatives seemed happy, and the commission seemed content, so they were able to oblige that request. So, while the shuffleboard club seemed happy with that, they then filed a lawsuit against the city even after we extended the deadline. Then, the day before, on November 6th, Attorney Sabatini, who is the representative for the shuffleboard club, filed an injunction. The city attorney took that as they were scrambling to set a hearing date to speak about an injunction. An injunction is a court action, and it would officially stop any actions of the court, which means neither the city nor Forward Paths could do anything with the property because that injunction sought to stop any movement on that transaction. So the city attorney started prepping, and he got dates out and as he was doing that, he received a second notice from the court that said not only was an injunction filed, but that Attorney Sabatini amended his injunction by filing an emergency injunction. However, that action was squashed by the court. We are now back to square one, which is that there is an injunction on the property and that a hearing date is set. Now, giving the commission his recommendation before hearing from the city attorney because the commission could blend the two recommendations together. They are back to the question of an injunction on the property and the hearing is set for November 13th at 10:00 a.m. At that time, we are anticipating that the judge will determine whether to grant the injunction or not. The city attorney has filed a motion for dismissal, but that motion will not be heard until January. So, pretty much between November 13th and January, barring any other motions or actions filed by either side, we will sit still. His suggestion to the commission was that they not do anything with the property until the motion on the injunction is settled, which is set for November 13th. If the motion for the injunction is dismissed, he would suggest that the mayor execute the deed to put the ownership of the property in the hands of Forward Paths. He did not see a risk in that for the city. If we go through this lawsuit, and we lose, the city will not be out anything because we do not have finances involved. Other than the determination of whether the commission acted correctly pursuant to the charter, as the lawsuit alleges, he did not see the city having any financial, legal, or other type of risk. The worst outcome of the game would be that the court orders Forward Paths to give the property back to the city. He did not think that was the same risk for Forward Paths. He has spoken to Denise Burry, and he expressed his opinion on the matter. The important thing for this body to remember is that it was a four to one vote to donate the property. He did not see that flavor of the commission changing, so, in the affirmative, the quicker we can get Forward Paths attached to that property, the better because we have a very good case, and the city attorney agrees with that too. We have a good case on its own and if we encumber Forward Paths into the case by signing the deed, then our case becomes even better. However, right now we are at a stop until November 13th. We will see where that injunction goes and if the injunction is awarded, then we would probably need to stay at a stop to see what the terms of the case are, but if the injunction is overruled, then we need to move forward.

CA Watson agreed. A lot of what the city manager said was spot on. He wanted to clarify a couple of

things as far as the procedural posture for where we are. They filed a complaint asking for a declaratory judgment implying that the city violated the city charter by transferring the property, alleging that it was an activity the city prohibited by the charter without a referendum. They also asked for an injunction broadly prohibiting the transfer of the property. Filing these things on their own does not stop anything. It is just somebody filing a lawsuit and making allegations. We just have someone who filed a lawsuit and made allegations, but there is no court order that says the city cannot transfer the property. There could be a court order on Thursday that says we cannot transfer the property temporarily, but at this time we do not. Perhaps there was some wisdom in waiting to see how that hearing played out, but honestly, he did not know if that really mattered procedurally, because there was nothing that prohibits the transfer. However, after the hearing there could be a court order that prohibits the transfer. He did question why a temporary injunction was not sought sooner, and why they waited until basically the transfer was about to occur. They would have done themselves better if they had asked for it sooner. However, that is where we are. We have a hearing on Thursday, and we will see what the court has to say. He agreed with the city manager as far as exposure, because it is pretty minimal. If the injunction is entered and there is a declaratory judgment that the city violated the charter, then the worst day in court would be that the property goes back to the city. It does not hurt the city because there is no money in the deal because the city agreed to donate the land. He did not know what the downside would be. Maybe the more extreme, worst imaginable day, would be that the court orders the city to reconstruct the shuffleboard courts, but that is almost a non-existent possibility. Even if we went with their argument that the shuffleboard courts are an activity of the city, nothing prohibits the termination of an activity in the charter. The city could shut down the shuffleboard courts whenever they wanted and there would be no referendum requirement. For the courts to send it back and require the city to reconstruct it, if Forward Paths had demoed it would be very unlikely. The worst day in court would be that the judge said the city was wrong, and the city gets the property back. This is a healthy discussion for everybody to have and for Commissioner Connell to bring up, because it is worth everybody understanding where they are, what is currently in place and where we could end up if things were transferred. However, the risk is pretty minimal if they did move forward with the transfer. It would not matter whether they waited until after. Honestly, there was an argument about it being harder to undo it if the deed was delivered.

CM Minner pointed out that the city attorney's advice was different from his because he was saying to go ahead and execute. **CA Watson** indicated that it would be harder to unwind the transaction when it was already done. Typically, injunctions are prospective, and they are not undoing things that have already happened. **Commissioner Connell** remarked that they have the injunction coming up on Thursday, and we have the regular lawsuit in January. We are only talking about a couple of months. If we went ahead and transferred the deed, Leesburg would be held harmless on everything, because we would just take the property back. However, if the shuffleboard courts were demoed during that time period, we would get back a piece of raw property without the courts. He did not understand why we would even take that risk. Why not wait two months and let this suit be resolved one way or the other? Why take the risk of giving the property away to find out that we have to take it back, and we would then have lost half a million-dollars worth of shuffleboard complex. That did not seem to make a lot of sense nor did it seem worth the risk. **CA Watson** agreed. If the courts were demoed, then the city would get the property back as it stands without the shuffleboard courts. **Commissioner Connell** commented that he did not know why the city would potentially risk half a million-dollars worth of improvements being removed to find out in two months that we have to take the property back. **CA Watson** said he did not believe this would be resolved in two months because the temporary injunction hearing is Thursday. If a temporary injunction is not entered, then we do not know what the timeline is for the lawsuit. January 28th is the city's motion to dismiss the hearing and if we prevail on that motion they will most likely get another twenty days to refile. Then we will get another twenty days to respond once they refile, which could be another motion to dismiss. Maybe we answer, and move onto discovery. Then we would move to a trial date, but at this time we do not have a clear answer about what the end date might be for this

litigation. It has taken four months just to get a fifteen-minute hearing. We were able to get the emergency hearing scheduled sooner because this has slightly different circumstances, but a normal procedural hearing timeframe seems pretty far out.

Commissioner Berry wanted to understand if transferring a deed meant transferring and demolition or was it just the transfer of the deed? **CA Watson** clarified that the city voted to transfer the title. Forward Paths would ultimately need to demo the courts in order to improve the property. It would be completely up to Forward Paths once the city has signed, delivered, and recorded the deed. Honestly, the city would just need to deliver the deed to Forward Paths. Then it would be up to them about what happens to the property. They just have to be consistent with the covenants and restrictions. As long as they are consistent with the restrictions, they could do whatever they wanted. **Commissioner Berry** asked about the purpose of the injunction. Was the purpose to stop it? **CA Watson** said there was no injunction, it was a request for an injunction. **Commissioner Connell** said, in essence, they could give it away. Forward Paths could demo the courts for us to find out six months that they have to give it back. We would then get 1.6 acres back with no shuffleboard courts.

Commissioner Pederson remarked that he could not speak for the whole commission, but he would make a recommendation to transfer the property now. However, part of him says to wait for the injunction, but if the city attorney was comfortable doing it now, he would support it. As far as the shuffleboard courts, this whole lawsuit is ridiculous because they cannot stop the city from transferring property. Even if we did not transfer it, and we still owned it, we would not be resurfacing or doing anything with the shuffleboard courts. At this point, he had no issues with transferring it. He would not care if Forward Paths knocked them down because the city was not rebuilding shuffleboard courts. **Commissioner Connell** said they would not be rebuilding the courts because they would already be there. **Commissioner Pederson** clarified that he would not support resurfacing them. **Commissioner Connell** wanted to know what his issue was with the shuffleboard courts because they voted to spend one million dollars on twelve pickleball courts even though we already have twelve pickleball courts in town at PEAR Park. However, he did not want one single shuffleboard court in the city. He did not understand what his issue was with the shuffleboard courts. **Commissioner Pederson** indicated that he would start with how they handled everything at the first meeting where they came in here demanding that the city resurface the shuffleboard courts by October 1st. **Commissioner Connell** stated that he did not believe that they came in here with demands. **Commissioner Pederson** pointed out that a gentleman came in and pounded his fist on the podium demanding that it be done. He did not want to argue this point, he urged everyone to go back and watch the video. They did not handle it very well, and we determined that the only people using the courts were the shuffleboard club. We also determined that there were only a handful of members that actually lived in the city who paid city taxes. They also secured the shuffleboard courts. It was said that they were locked, but then it was just a dummy lock. Over the past seven years being on the commission, he was never made aware of anyone complaining that they could not access the shuffleboard courts. The residents, in his opinion, do not care about the shuffleboard court because they are not playing shuffleboard. Yes, they have a club, and he did have some sensitivity to that, but there are other courts in Leesburg. They may not be within the city limits, but they are there. He supports the transfer to Forward Paths, and he would like to see this move forward. He was over the shuffleboard courts and, whether anyone agreed or not, they lost him a long time. **Commissioner Connell** pointed out that he said only five or six of the members reside in the city, yet we are building an \$11 million-dollar sports complex at Susan Street for rugby. How many rugby players do we have in town? **Commissioner Pederson** pointed out for the record, that he voted against that. **Commissioner Berry** commented that the difference between the shuffleboard courts and Susan Street is the youth. There will be youth programs at the Susan Street complex and all the recreation programs will be run through that complex too. The usage will be by the taxpaying families that live here in Leesburg. We are building rugby fields so we can recruit tournaments. That is the largest field that we need; it will include rugby fields, lacrosse

fields, soccer fields, and football fields. **Commissioner Connell** said he gets what he is saying. **Commissioner Burry** continued to say that there was no one playing recreational shuffleboard from Leesburg. Their membership included about five members that actually resided in the city. **Commissioner Connell** clarified that they were bringing people into the city and that was the whole concept. That was the whole concept for why Susan Street was sold on and that we would be bringing economic tourism into town. **Commissioner Burry** added that they are also spending half a million dollars to do that. **Commissioner Connell** exclaimed that all they asked for was to have the courts resurfaced. We were also going to resurface the tennis courts, and build some pickleball courts. **Commissioner Burry** asked if he read the proposal that they sent in. **Commissioner Connell** indicated that whatever their proposal was, is not what was spoken about. He had a conversation with the city manager about this, and it was to resurface the shuffleboard courts and the tennis courts. Then we were going to build some pickleball courts. We were going to make this the Palmetto Recreational Complex. **Mayor Reisman** pointed out that they have two different recommendations on the floor; one from the city manager and one from the city attorney.

CA Watson wanted to provide some clarity because the city commission made a decision. While he understands the idea of waiting until after the hearing because it is only two days, they could wait to see what happens. However, that risk is pretty low, barring having to receive the property back and the courts being demoed. Most of the downside would be on Forward Paths even if it comes back to the city without the shuffleboard courts. The city is not paying fees, or paying a bunch of money to anyone for doing anything wrong and there are no development costs being sunk into it. He did not see any harm even if the judge decided that it had to be taken back. Even if they signed it a couple of days before the hearing because he doubted Forward Paths would be building within the next two days. Also, there are advantages to continuing down the path that we started because there was a decision made. There is a lawsuit filed with allegations, but there is nothing that says we have done anything wrong. If we continue forward as planned, then it looks like we are moving along with the plan that we had. However, if the commission wanted to wait until after the hearing, that would not bother him. He was happy to report back to everybody, but from his perspective, it would not make a difference.

Commissioner Pederson made a motion that if the temporary injunction was denied, he recommended that the Mayor sign the deed to transfer to Forward Paths and Commissioner Burry seconded the motion. **Mayor Reisman** asked if there was any further discussion by the commission and the audience. There were none.

The roll call vote was:

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

Four yeas, one nay, the Commission approved the motion.

Moving on, **CM Minner** indicated that this now brings up another matter, which he needs direction on. Commissioner Connell talked to him about this too and the commission needed to direct him on how to move forward. During the FY 26 budget meeting, the commission allocated \$1 million for what they dubbed the Palmetto Street Sports Complex. When that concept was introduced in July, that concept was to resurface the shuffleboard courts, build pickleball courts, and resurface the tennis courts. However, through the summer, it was his opinion that the commission changed that direction when they voted to

donate the property of the shuffleboard courts to Forward Path. Therefore, when we contemplated and approved the FY 26 budget, there was \$1 million allocated for pickleball courts and resurfacing of the tennis courts. There was no contemplation about doing anything with the shuffleboard courts because they were being transferred to Forward Paths. We then sent out into the marketplace an RFP to start designing the pickleball courts, which is why he needed to know if that was still the direction of this commission and if the commission wanted to include shuffleboard courts in any part of that \$1 million allocation. **Commissioner Pederson** indicated that his answer would be no. **CM Minner** pointed out that he would prefer a motion and a vote on this item just for clarity. The motion would be to move and instruct the city manager to move forward to procure an engineer to design the Palmetto Street Sports Complex, which would include resurfacing the tennis courts, constructing new pickleball courts along with associated parking. Again, the motion would include direction to start on pickleball construction, resurfacing tennis courts, and associated parking.

Commissioner Pederson made a motion to instruct the city manager to move forward with procuring an engineer to design the Palmetto Street Sports Complex, which included resurfacing the tennis courts, construction of new pickleball courts along with associated parking, and Commissioner Berry seconded the motion.

Commissioner Connell stated there was \$1 million to be allocated, and we already have twelve pickleball courts in town at PEAR Park. That does not count the other retirement communities that have pickleball courts. He knows of three in South Leesburg. He could not see spending \$1 million on pickleball courts while completely shutting out the shuffleboard people. If the commission wants to spend \$1 million, it should be split between pickleball and shuffleboard courts. They should not dump it all into pickleball while the shuffleboard people get nothing because that is not fair. They have no courts at all, and we have none publicly in the city, yet we have twelve pickleball courts. He believed the money should be split. **Commissioner Berry** commented that she recalled during the budget discussions that it was for tennis courts and pickleball. **Commissioner Connell** pointed out that the original proposal included the resurfacing of the shuffleboard courts. This all came up before the discussions with Forward Paths. **Commissioner Berry** said this was done during the budget meeting, and she was referencing her notes. So, she did not recall that being part of the discussions. **Commissioner Connell** responded that the resurfacing of the shuffleboard courts was included in the original proposal for the Palmetto Sports Complex. **Commissioner Berry** stated she would have to refer back to the minutes on that. **CM Minner** pointed out for clarity that Commissioner Connell was correct. **Commissioner Burry** asked for clarification, because when he said there were pickleball courts in the City, was he referring to PEAR Park? That park is not located within the City. **Commissioner Connell** said Pear Park was located in the city limits, but it was a county park. He was almost positive that it was in the city limits. **Commissioner Burry** said that was news to him. However, close to Leesburg there are multiple shuffleboard courts. **Commissioner Connell** wanted to know where. **Commissioner Burry** said there were some at Hawthorne. **Commissioner Connell** stated those were private communities and people cannot just go to them without being a resident. **Commissioner Burry** said a third of the shuffleboard club lives in The Villages, and they have tons of shuffleboard courts. **Commissioner Connell** said he was referring to the people that live in the city and the commission is just assuming that nobody uses these shuffleboard courts, outside the shuffleboard club. He believed there were other people who resided in the city that play. He could not understand the resistance to giving something back to the shuffleboard people. We took eighteen to twenty courts away, and now they have nothing, yet we are going to put \$1 million into pickleball when we already have twelve courts located in the city. **Commissioner Pederson** indicated that it was really simple for him. In his opinion, the residents of Leesburg want to see pickleball. **Commissioner Connell** wanted to know if he had had a referendum done throughout the city. **Commissioner Pederson** said he did not want to argue and he has already made a motion. **CM Minner** added that it was the feedback received from the recreation board, which is the board that the commission

appointed. The recreation board stated that they wanted pickleball courts. **Commissioner Connell** remarked that the donation of the shuffleboard courts did not go before the recreation board for their recommendation. It did not go to that board and that was one of his issues. **Mayor Reisman** asked if there were any further commission comments.

Commissioner Connell asked for clarification on the motion. **CM Minner** stated the motion on the floor was that the Palmetto Street Sports Complex's \$1 million allocation for FY 26 included pickleball courts, resurfacing of the tennis courts, and associated parking. It had nothing to do with shuffleboard.

Commissioner Pederson mentioned that the city did not need to compete with Pear Park. They did not need some big number of pickleball courts. We will see what we can squeeze in on this parcel, and it needs to include adequate parking. **Commissioner Berry** pointed out that the tennis courts are still utilized by the high school and that was first and foremost. She wanted to make sure she understood that the pickleball courts were to be added because that was a popular and most requested sport. That was her understanding and that is where she thought they were going when they first started these conversations. **Commissioner Pederson** agreed. **Mayor Reisman** asked if there were any public comments.

Josh Brewster of 1515 Crest Avenue, Leesburg, said he has been in the city for twenty years. He had no idea there were shuffleboard courts in this city until the shuffleboard club people came and started their stuff. He knows pickleball is huge. **Mayor Reisman** asked if there were any other public comments. There were none.

The roll call vote was:

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

Four yeas, one nay, the Commission approved the motion.

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 Pederson and a second by Commissioner Burry, the meeting adjourned at 7:03 p.m.