

The Board of County Commissioners of Citrus County, Florida met in regular session on the above date at the Citrus County Courthouse in Inverness.

Present: Vicki Phillips, Chairwoman; Gary Bartell, First Vice-Chairman; Jim Fowler, Second Vice-Chairman; Dennis Damato and Joyce Valentino

Attorney: Robert B. Battista

Administrator: Richard Wm. Wesch

Clerks: Betty Strifler, Clerk; Glenda Brown and Theresa Steelfox, Deputy Clerks

The Chairwoman called the meeting to order, Commissioner Fowler gave the invocation, and Commissioner Bartell led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

---

3- **CONSENT AGENDA**

***Upon motion by Commissioner Bartell, seconded by Commissioner Damato, and carried unanimously, the Board pulled item 3-Q (Tree Enhancement Program), 3-GG (Request for Proposal No. 041-05, Public Works), and 3-HH (Request for Qualification No. 075-05, Engineering) for discussion, approved the balance of the following consent agenda items, and authorized the Chairwoman to execute all related documents:***

3-A Minutes of the regular meeting held on April 12, 2005.

3-B Payroll registers dated May 10, 2005, for \$564,345.52, and dated May 12, 2005, for \$29,447.67. Accounts payable register dated May 20, 2005, for \$3,264,191.22. Emergency check register dated May 24, 2005, for \$22,000.

3-C Budget Resolutions:

RESOLUTION NO. 2005-093

A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF CITRUS COUNTY, FLORIDA, AMENDING THE UTILITY REGULATION BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004-05

WHEREAS, on August 22, 2003, the Office of Utility Regulation received a check in the amount of \$3,000 from the Florida Governmental Utility Authority (FGUA) for filing fees in the matter of the sale of Florida Water Services' water and wastewater systems in Citrus County to the FGUA ; and

WHEREAS, the amount of reasonable direct costs to Citrus County equaled or exceeded the filing fee and these funds will be used to send a Water and Wastewater Authority board member to the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners Utility Rate School; and

WHEREAS, this was not included in the original budget process; therefore, it is necessary for the Board to amend the budget for fiscal year 2004-05; and

WHEREAS, Section 129.06(d), Florida Statutes, provides that the Board may amend its budget by resolution spread upon its minutes to appropriate and expend funds from a source not anticipated in the Board's regular budget; and  
 NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of County Commissioners of Citrus County, Florida as follows:

1. The Board does hereby amend its budget to include the estimated revenues and expenditures listed in Exhibit "A" attached hereto and made a part hereof by reference.
2. The Clerk of the Board is hereby directed to spread this resolution upon the minutes of the meeting held this date.

ADOPTED, in regular session this 24<sup>th</sup> day of May 2005, by the Citrus County Board of County Commissioners.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS  
 OF CITRUS COUNTY, FLORIDA

ATTEST:

/s/ Betty Strifler

BETTY STRIFLER, CLERK

/s/ Vicki Phillips

VICKI PHILLIPS, CHAIRWOMAN

<b>EXHIBIT "A"</b>			
	ACCOUNT NUMBER	ACCOUNT DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT
Revenues	645-329-500	Utility Regulatory Fees	3,000
		Total Revenues	\$3,000
Expenditures	645-6400-54000	Travel & Per Diem	2,000
	645-6400-55417	Training	1,000
		Total Expenditures	\$3,000

RESOLUTION NO. 2005-094

A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF CITRUS COUNTY, FLORIDA, AMENDING THE ROAD IMPACT FEES BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004-05

WHEREAS, on April 26, 2005, the Board of County Commissioners approved a contract with the transportation consulting firm Dyer, Riddle, Mills and Precourt, Inc.; and

WHEREAS, the above firm will prepare a Roadway Level of Service Analysis; and

WHEREAS, this was not included in the original budget process; therefore, it is necessary for the Board to amend the budget for fiscal year 2004-05; and

WHEREAS, Section 129.06(d), Florida Statutes, provides that the Board may amend its budget by resolution spread upon its minutes to appropriate and expend funds from a source not anticipated in the Board's regular budget; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of County Commissioners of Citrus County, Florida as follows:

1. The Board does hereby amend its budget to include the estimated revenues and expenditures listed in Exhibit "A" attached hereto and made a part hereof by reference.
2. The Clerk of the Board is hereby directed to spread this resolution upon the minutes of the meeting held this date.

ADOPTED, in regular session this 24<sup>th</sup> day of May 2005, by the Citrus County Board of County Commissioners.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS  
 OF CITRUS COUNTY, FLORIDA

ATTEST:

/s/ Betty Strifler

BETTY STRIFLER, CLERK

/s/ Vicki Phillips

VICKI PHILLIPS, CHAIRWOMAN

<b>EXHIBIT "A"</b>			
	ACCOUNT NUMBER	ACCOUNT DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT
ROAD IMPACT FEES – DISTRICT A			
Revenues	662-400-200	Cash Carry Forward	\$12,136
Expenditures	662-2831-53100	Professional Services	\$12,136
ROAD IMPACT FEES – DISTRICT B			
Revenues	663-400-200	Cash Carry Forward	\$12,136
Expenditures	663-2832-53100	Professional Services	\$12,136
ROAD IMPACT FEES – DISTRICT C			
Revenues	664-400-200	Cash Carry Forward	\$12,136
Expenditures	664-2833-53100	Professional Services	\$12,136
ROAD IMPACT FEES – DISTRICT D			
Revenues	665-400-200	Cash Carry Forward	\$12,136
Expenditures	665-2834-53100	Professional Services	\$12,136

3-D Budget Transfers: **Landfill:** \$50,000 from #401-5212-60050 to #54603. **Development Services Division:** \$300 from #107-3441-54000 to #54700. **Fire Training Center:** \$3,742 from #051-3225-56400 to #55120. **Fire Rescue:** \$500 from #154-3200-54605 to #54160. **Public Works Administration:** \$300 from #102-4103-54100 to #54600. **Utility Fee Trust:** \$722 from #645-6400-54612 to #55270. **Water Quality:** \$25,000 from #062-5415-60060 to #59100. **Volunteer Florida Mentor Center Grant:** \$100 from #134-5834-54005 and \$100 from #54676 to #54700. **Utilities:** \$5,000 from #450-9000-53408 to #53100. **Article V Technology:** \$40,000 from #093-5703-60050 to #605-56400.

3-E Releases of Liens for special assessments that had been paid in full: Resolution No. 86-29, reconfirmed by Resolution No. 93-216 for Shirley and Weaver Claypool and Mary Ann Dewitt, Alternate Key (AK) No. 1183049 (H). Resolution No. 99-099 for Gene and Mary Z. Bartholomew, AK No. 2620919 (Z), and Henri B. and Camelia D. Rosemond, AK Nos. 1646456 and 1646464 (Z). Resolution No. 2000-135 for James and Rosemary Mullarkey, AK No. 1642981 (OB). Resolution No. 2001-202 for James A. and Gisela Taudte, AK No. 1970865 (1E), and Edward and Olga Trebelev, AK Nos. 1980283, 1980356, and 1980321 (1E). Resolution No. 2003-156 for James Giroux, AK No. 2343044 (3D).

3-F Write-offs of uncollectible accounts for April 2005 at \$212.01 payable to Citrus County Utilities.

3-G Travel expenses for the County Attorney and the Assistant County Attorney to attend the 24<sup>th</sup> Annual Florida Municipal Attorneys Association Seminar at Amelia Island, Florida, July 21 through 23, 2005.

3-H **(1)** A resolution approving the preliminary assessment roll and reported costs for the 2005 Limerock Road Paving Program and setting the final public hearing on July 26, 2005, at 5:00 P.M., and **(2)** a public hearing set for July 26, 2005, at 5:00 P.M. at the Citrus County Courthouse, 110 North Apopka Avenue in Inverness to receive public comment on a resolution adopting and certifying a non-ad valorem assessment roll for the 2005

Limerock Road Paving Program pursuant to Section 197.3632, Florida Statutes.

**RESOLUTION NO. 2005-095**

3-I & J Public hearings set as follows in the Citrus County Courthouse, 110 North Apopka Avenue in Inverness on resolutions adopting and certifying non-ad valorem assessment rolls pursuant to Section 197.3632, Florida Statutes:

Date and Time	Non-Ad Valorem Assessment
July 26, 2005, at 3:00 P.M.	Southern Woods Phase IIB Municipal Service Street Lighting Unit (MSSLU)
July 26, 2005, at 3:05 P.M.	Southern Woods Phase IV MSSLU

3-K Appointment of Richard Mehlenbacher to a building trades position on the Affordable Housing Advisory Committee for a term that would expire on April 25, 2007.

3-L State of Florida Department of Transportation State Highway Lighting, Maintenance, and Compensation Agreement with reimbursement of \$9,833 for the first fiscal year and an agreed upon amount for future years.

3-M Commissioner Phillips' travel expenses to Sunrise, Florida on May 25, 2005, to attend the Florida Healthy Kids Conference on May 26, 2005.

3-N Host Agency Agreement with the AARP (American Association of Retired Persons) Foundation Senior Community Service Employment Agency to provide work opportunities for older individuals and others within the Library Services Division.

3-O Steri Safe Service Agreement with Stericycle, Inc., for removing and disposing of biomedical waste from the Citrus County Animal Shelter beginning May 24, 2005, for a 12 month term at \$40 a month.

3-P **(1)** Permanent Reassignment of Development Rights Agreement for residential properties within municipal services benefit units for installation of water and wastewater systems for Chassahowitzka Water Quality Assessment District for Gary R. and Terri Lewis, DVR No. 2004-058, AK No. 2929405, and **(2)** that the agreement be recorded in the public records.

3-R **(1)** Special Warranty Deed from Timber Pines Plaza II, L.L.C., for additional right-of-way on the westerly side of Croft Road at State Road (SR) 44, Section 10, Township 19 South, Range 19 East, and **(2)** that the deed be recorded in the public records.

3-S **(1)** Substantially Similar Plat of Rowland Acres Subdivision (PLT-05-05) and **(2)** that the plat be recorded in the public records.

3-T Public hearings set as follows in the Citrus County Courthouse, 110 North Apopka Avenue in Inverness to consider amendments to the Comprehensive Plan

(COMP) Ordinance No. 89-04 as amended and the Land Development Code (LDC) Atlas Ordinance No. 90-14:

Date and Time	Application
<u>Adoption Workshop:</u> July 26, 2005, at 2:00 P.M.	<b>CPA/AA-05-01:</b> Department of Development Services (DDS) - Citrus County Resource Center/VA Clinic
<u>Adoption Hearing:</u> August 9, 2005, at 5:01 P.M.	<b>CPA/AA-05-02:</b> DDS for Buckhorn Property Holdings, Inc. (A/K/A Heritage)
	<b>CPA/OA-05-01:</b> DDS - Interchange Development Standards

3-U Use of the Historic Courthouse by the City of Inverness in celebration of Flag Day on June 14, 2005.

3-V **(1)** General Warranty Deed from Peter A. and Trina Perone for Parcel 34100 of Section 26, Township 18 South, Range 19 East for the Croft Road Intersection Project, and **(2)** that the deed be recorded in the public records.

3-W Information concerning a "Complaint" that had been filed in the Circuit Court in the matter styled Susan C. Barber and her husband Kenneth G. Barber vs. Citrus County Board of County Commissioners.

3-X Notice of Commencement with Gaudette Electric for Permit No. 2005-06245 to upgrade the lighting at the Crystal River Armory.

3-Y A resolution authorizing an application and execution of a contract for funding of a National Senior Service Corps Program with the Corporation for National Service to provide services under the Retired Senior and Volunteer Program beginning September 30, 2005, and ending September 30, 2006, in an amount to be determined.

**RESOLUTION NO. 2005-096**

3-Z A resolution authorizing an application and execution of a contract for funding of a Volunteer Florida Foundation Program for the establishment of a mentor center beginning July 1, 2005, and ending June 30, 2006, in an amount to be determined.

**RESOLUTION NO. 2005-097**

3-AA & BB Public hearings set as follows in the Citrus County Courthouse, 110 North Apopka Avenue in Inverness to consider amendments to the LDC Ordinance No. 90-14:

Date and Time	Application
<u>Workshop:</u> June 14, 2005, at 3:00 P.M.	Planned Development Overlay (PDO) 05-03, Heinz Van Niersen of Riverside Lodge
<u>Hearing:</u> July 12, 2005, at 3:00 P.M.	
<u>Workshop:</u> June 14, 2005, at 3:15 P.M.	OA-05-04, DDS - Old Homosassa Special Overlay
<u>Hearing:</u> July 12, 2005, at 5:01 P.M.	District

3-CC & DD Department of Public Works' (DPW) recommendations to release the development loans for Hunt Club and Foxfire and place the facilities on private perpetual maintenance.

3-EE Grant application with the Florida Department of State, Division of Historical Resources at \$350,000.68 for the Historic Hernando School Project.

3-FF Work Authorization Form Schedule "A" with Schenkel Shultz, Inc., at \$39,385 for the reconstruction design of the Parks and Recreation Division administrative offices.

3-II Application for Revenue Sharing 2005-2006 State Fiscal Year with the Florida Department of Revenue.

3-JJ Recommendation of the Utilities Division to award Bid No. 056-05, submersible pump repairs, to Barney's Pump, Inc., for \$90,399.33 as the only bidder meeting the specifications.

3-Q **TREE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM**

Chairwoman Phillips expressed concern about the three-year term of an agreement with the Key Training Center (Center) for distributing trees to the public. She said that the Center already had a nursery and if they were unable to dispense the trees, they might not want them taking up their space. She requested that the Board approve the agreement for a one-year term with two-year renewals.

***A motion was made by Commissioner Phillips and seconded by Commissioner Bartell to approve and authorize the Chairwoman to execute the Cooperative Venture Agreement with the Key Training Center to facilitate dispersal of tree saplings as provided in Administrative Regulation 13.20 for a one-year term with two year renewals.***

Commissioner Fowler asked if the Center would agree to the change, and Mr. Wesch replied that he believed the one-year term would be acceptable.

***The Chairwoman called a question on the motion and the motion carried unanimously.***

(1:04 P.M.)

3-GG **REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP) NO. 041-05, PUBLIC WORKS**

Chairwoman Phillips stated that this item was to approve the ranking of three firms for general contracting services on projects less than \$10,000; however, she was concerned that the recommended action stated that the County would solicit quotes from those firms on all projects over \$10,000 and under \$200,000. She remarked that she thought the County should obtain bids on projects between \$150,000 and \$200,000.

Mr. Wesch explained that the intent was to expedite smaller projects rather than having to go through the bid process. Short discussion followed.

***A motion was made by Commissioner Phillips and seconded by Commissioner Bartell to approve the ranking of firms for general contracting services (Request for Proposal No. 041-05) and to award John Rife Building Contractors, Inc., as the primary contractor, Winkel Construction, Inc., as the Alternate No. 1 contractor, and***

*Daly & Zilch (Florida), Inc., as the Alternate No. 2 contractor. The primary contractor would be utilized for all projects less than \$10,000 unless they were unable to perform, then the second and third ranked contractors would be contracted as necessary for projects less than \$10,000, but projects over \$10,000 would go through a bid process.*

Commissioner Bartell questioned if the three firms would understand that the County would be obtaining bids on projects over \$10,000. Mr. Wesch replied that staff would notify them of the change.

Commissioner Fowler commented that staff had used their best judgment, that construction was a major challenge, that this request would speed up the process, and that having three pre-qualified firms with excellent reputations would be beneficial to the County; therefore, he would not support the motion.

Commissioner Damato pointed out that some of the firms might object to the change because of the difference in the markup of projects over \$10,000 and up to \$200,000.

Commissioner Bartell suggested that the item be pulled from today's agenda so staff could notify the firms and report their responses to the Board at the next meeting.

***Commissioner Phillips rescinded the motion and Commissioner Bartell rescinded his second to the motion.***

Mr. Wesch affirmed that he would contact the firms of the change and inform the Board of their reaction at their next meeting.

Commissioner Bartell asked Mr. Wesch to provide examples of projects between \$10,000 and \$200,000 that had been delayed because of the bid process. (1:11 P.M.)

3-HH **REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATION NO. 075-05, ENGINEERING**

Chairwoman Phillips declared that she would not support this request because of the Board's action taken on April 26, 2005, which she thought was to approve only a footprint for a business park; however, she had been informed that the DOT (Department of Transportation) viewed the items of the Plan as one project. She commented that when the Board discussed the business park on April 26, she understood that the airport extension was not being voted on at that time. She expressed appreciation to Ken Frink (DPW Director) for providing information to her regarding the JPAs (Joint Participation Agreements), but stated that there were too many pieces of the Plan being approved outside of the entire issue. She mentioned an e-mail that had been sent by Jim Speckman with the DOT, which indicated that the Inverness Airport Master Plan was one concept, and she understood that to mean the Plan was all or nothing.

***A motion was made by Commissioner Fowler and seconded by Commissioner Bartell to (1) approve ranking of the firms for the environmental assessment for the Inverness Airport Runway/Taxiway Expansion Project, and staff's***

*request to negotiate a contract with the top ranked firm, Hoyle, Tanner & Associates, Inc., and (2) to negotiate with the second and third ranked firms (The LPA Group and URS Corporation) if negotiations fail with Hoyle, Tanner & Associates, Inc.*

Mr. Wesch verified Commissioner Bartell's comment that this request was strictly to rank firms for the environmental assessment (EA) as previously directed by the Board. Mr. Frink advised that after approval of the ranking of firms, staff would present a contract to the Board for the EA.

Chairwoman Phillips stated that at the April 26 meeting, Commissioner Bartell and she were told that the Board would be voting on the business park. She then quoted verbatim questions from Commissioner Bartell and Mr. Frink's answers regarding that discussion. She mentioned that due to confusion over the Board's April 26 discussion and newspaper reports on the issue, Mr. Speckman sent an e-mail to Mr. Frink asking for clarification. She said that Mr. Speckman indicated that the DOT did not view the tasks (runway/taxiway expansion, terminal area improvements, and development of a business park) as separate projects of the Plan approved in 2000; however, she did not support the Inverness Airport runway expansion.

Mr. Wesch explained that the DOT recognized that 100 percent of the Plan could not be accomplished at one time and acknowledged that certain steps were necessary. He stated that the Board's discussion in December focused on the business plan and the EA, that the sole issue on the agenda at the April meeting was the business plan, and the only issue today was the EA for the runway expansion. Chairwoman Phillips proclaimed that the recommended action on the agenda April 26 referred to the business park and the Inverness Airport Master Plan.

Commissioner Fowler remarked that he thought the Plan was approved in 2000 unanimously by the Board and if the Board voted against this motion today, the Plan would end and millions of dollars would have to be returned to the DOT. Mr. Frink added that the JPAs with the DOT required the Board to proceed with the Plan. Commissioner Fowler stated that voting against the airport project meant voting against the extension of the runway for airport safety, water quality for the east side of the County, economic development for the business park, plus reimbursing millions of dollars to the DOT.

Commissioner Valentino said that even though grants were received and money was reserved in the budget for the Inverness Airport, she had not seen any improvements. She stated that it was very confusing and difficult to vote on the airport projects when they were combined. She specified that she supported the Inverness Wastewater Treatment Plant upgrades and did not understand the reason that project could not move forward regardless of the airport expansion. She remarked that the focus had been on the business park, but other issues needed to be resolved, and she was uncomfortable with the all or nothing perception. She said that staff's answer to Mr. Speckman's e-mail stated that the Board unanimously approved all the projects, which she thought was misleading. She then questioned if any grant funds had been lost due to the Governor not wanting to extend grants. Mr. Frink replied that in the past the DOT had extended deadlines for



expending grant dollars; however, due to the Governor's latest decree, two grants from older airport projects were lost, but he was not aware of the exact amount.

***The Chairwoman called a question on the motion. Motion carried. Voting aye: Commissioners Bartell, Damato, and Fowler. Voting nay: Commissioners Phillips and Valentino.***

(1:22 P.M.)

2- **PUBLIC HEARINGS - WORKSHOPS - PERSONS TO APPEAR**

2-A **OPEN TO THE PUBLIC**

Frank Yetner spoke in favor of the Emergency Operations Center (EOC) (item 6-A), especially since the hurricane season was near. He stated that he hoped the request would be expedited without some of the problems mentioned in the previously discussed items. The Chairwoman informed that this project would be well over \$200,000 and would undergo a bid process.

Morris Harvey, representing the Fiscal Watch Committee of the Citrus County Council (CCC) addressed item 2-L (Gas Tax), and asked the Board to reject approval of a new gas or sales tax. He said that the CCC was concerned about the debt levels involved with the proposed gas tax and believed more preparation was needed before making this type of decision. He recommended that the Board consider the following suggestions of the CCC while working on the current budget and before imposing new taxes:

- Develop a plan for revenue versus expense over the next 10 or 20 years to coincide and integrate the many 10 to 25 year plans already in the budget.
- Establish priorities and tighten the budget.
- Convert to studies of population growth rate as a cost and per capita tax limit standard, as opposed to the amount of accessible tax value in the County.
- Eliminate corporate and special interest subsidies and require developers and others to pay for their impacts on the community.
- Certify carrying capacity on County roads.
- Impose more user fees and implement benefit analysis for all sewer, water, and community building projects.
- Demand increased levels of justification for all capital improvements.
- Update the impact fee schedule planned for 2006 to the maximum legal levels.

Gordon Leonard informed the Board that he was a retired architectural engineer with over 35 years experience and that he would be happy to provide professional input for expediting RFPs and RFQs (Request for Qualifications) for construction. He also requested that the Board slow down on their projects and spend the taxpayers' money wisely.

(1:28 P.M.)

2-B **CERTIFICATES OF RECOGNITION**

2-B.1 **SPECIALIST DENNIS BOLES**

***Upon motion by Commissioner Fowler, seconded by Commissioner Bartell, and carried unanimously, the Board approved and authorized all Commissioners to execute a certificate of recognition posthumously to Specialist Dennis Boles.***

2-B.2 CHIEF WARRANT OFFICE AARON WEAVER

**Upon motion by Commissioner Fowler, seconded by Commissioner Bartell, and carried unanimously,** the Board approved and authorized all Commissioners to execute a certificate of recognition posthumously to Chief Warrant Officer Aaron Weaver.

6- COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

6-C LOCAL AGENCY PROGRAM AGREEMENT

**Upon motion by Commissioner Bartell, seconded by Commissioner Fowler, and carried unanimously,** the Board approved and authorized the Chairwoman to execute the State of Florida Department of Transportation Local Agency Program Agreement, FPN: 411139 1 38 01 to provide \$190,000 for landscape enhancements at the drainage retention areas along State Road 44 near the Clearview Subdivision, Croft Avenue, and County Road 581 intersections. (1:35 P.M.)

7- COMMISSIONER VICKI PHILLIPS, CHAIRWOMAN

7-A SPECIAL LIBRARY DISTRICT ADVISORY BOARD

Commissioner Bartell nominated Richard L. Brynes to fill a regular member position on the Special Library District Advisory Board for a term that would expire September 30, 2006.

**Upon motion by Commissioner Phillips, seconded by Commissioner Fowler, and carried unanimously,** the Board ceased nominations. (1:36 P.M.)

11- COMMISSIONER JOYCE VALENTINO

11-A CERTIFICATE OF RECOGNITION - VETERANS OF CITRUS COUNTY

**Upon motion by Commissioner Phillips, seconded by Commissioner Fowler, and carried unanimously,** the Board approved and authorized the Board to execute a certificate of recognition to the veterans of Citrus County for their commitment to protect the freedom of the United States of America. (1:37 P.M.)

2-C CERTIFICATE OF RECOGNITION - CITRUS COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE

**Upon motion by Commissioner Phillips, seconded by Commissioner Bartell, and carried unanimously,** the Board approved and authorized all Commissioners to execute a certificate of recognition to the Citrus County Sheriff's Office for their hard work and dedication to serve the public throughout the past year. (1:40 P.M.)

**The Chairwoman recessed the meeting and reconvened at 1:55 P.M.**

2-D ORDINANCE AMENDMENT OA-05-06, DDS

Chuck Dixon, Director of Community Development Division (CDD), stated that this was the final public hearing for an ordinance amendment concerning accessory uses and structures and vegetative debris disposal at former sand pits. He then read the ordinance preamble into the record.

Sue Farnsworth, Environmental Planner, CDD, advised that included in the agenda materials was a revised draft ordinance, a memorandum regarding lot coverage,

and alternate language for Section 4420 of the ordinance, which reflected changes the Board discussed at the public workshop. She stated that revisions in the ordinance consisted of **(1)** the allowance of an accessory structure up to 75 percent of the house footprint, **(2)** a 25-foot height requirement, **(3)** that detached accessory structures over 1,200 square feet should match the exterior colors and materials of the principal structure, and **(4)** houses outside the PSA (Planned Service Area) on 2.25 acres or more were allowed an accessory building not limited in size.

She explained that staff was not able to locate a community that regulated structures according to lot coverage, and although staff prepared three scenarios of lot coverage at three, four, and five percent on four lot sizes, there would be problems with that approach. She defined four of those problems as follows: **(1)** percentages were not popular with the public and were not user friendly; **(2)** clarification would be needed as to the percentage of the lot (upland areas, entire parcel, or dry building areas); **(3)** combining multiple lots into a single household would require a recorded affidavit to tie the site plan to the permitted accessory structures; and **(4)** accessory structures could be over 10,000 square feet on five-acre and greater lots. She stated that staff had prepared an alternative approach to the lot coverage concept with language for smaller lots and percentage coverage for larger lots in a table format that a homeowner could understand. She added that the format would allow an increasing size and height for large lots, that outside the PSA the lot interior for larger structures was defined, and a 1,200 square foot building would be allowed regardless of the house size inside the PSA.

She then addressed the vegetative debris disposal in former sand (borrow) pits. She said that there was not much discussion on this item from the Board, the PDRB, or the public; however, language had been modified to address two items discussed at the workshop, prohibiting burning unless it was otherwise permitted under the section that regulated incinerators as a conditional use, and adding language that precluded access through a residential neighborhood. She advised that the DEP (Department of Environmental Protection) regulated this type of facility similar to a C & D (construction and demolition) landfill type of permit. She added that the DEP required a five-year permit with annual inspections, that plans must be submitted regarding the operation and closing of the facility, and there were requirements to place fill on top and vegetate the surface once the facility was full.

She responded to Commissioner Damato's questions regarding compliance with federal standards, the DEP, SWFWMD (Southwest Florida Water Management District), and other agencies, and water and air resources. She stated that this code was coordinated as much as possible with DEP regulations and language used for clean wood and clean vegetative land clearing debris was from the DEP definitions. She also stated that the DEP handled the air resources and that air quality permits were not used unless there were emissions in the air, such as burning. She explained that the DEP had jurisdiction over solid waste and SWFWMD had input over surface water permits, but typically, the DEP would regulate those permits because of an agreement to prevent facilities from being regulated by both operations as much as possible.

The Chairwoman opened the public portion of the hearing for comment and asked if anyone wished to speak in favor.

Lee Cloward spoke in favor of the ordinance amendment; however, he was concerned about the County's definition of compatible because the large accessory structure on Pineaire Street was deemed compatible to the community when it was built. He read a letter into the record from a first time homebuyer living near the structure on Pineaire Street who expressed concern and disappointment that the County had allowed the large building in the neighborhood. He stated that the term compatible should be clearly defined because the word appeared repeatedly in the building codes. He also stated that he had sent a letter to the Board (included in the agenda backup material) expressing concern about Section 4420 (General Standards) C.3 regarding detached accessory structures not having to be compatible with the exterior colors and materials of the principal structures. The Chairwoman explained that the statement referring to detached accessory structures also specified that those structures must be 1,200 square feet or less in size, and the intent was to allow appropriate ready-made storage units. Mr. Cloward replied that his concern was that even though this might be the intent, the word compatible was used, and that meant the detached building should conform to the principal structure. (2:09 P.M.)

Lorraine Wilcox commented on the large accessory building on Pineaire Street, and Ms. Farnsworth addressed her question regarding height restrictions by stating that height limits were addressed in Section C.2.

Mr. Dixon answered questions from Commissioners Damato and Bartell concerning the height of accessory structures by stating that the definition of height was clarified in the LDC. He discussed the proposed table that listed accessory structures according to lot size, square footage, height limit, and location of property, and stated that height was measured from the slab or ground to the top of the roof.

Mr. Dixon clarified for Morris Harvey that a 4,000 square foot building up to 25 feet high would be allowed on a 2.25-acre parcel outside the PSA. He stated that the accessory structure in the Highlands (Pineaire Street) would not fit in the proposed perimeters because it was well over 1,200 square feet and that a similar building would require a conditional use under the proposed ordinance. He explained that the limitations did not apply to buildings on agriculturally designated land use or buildings on airstrips.

Lee Lyvers, Philip Mauro, Joseph Hogan, and Suzanne Gray spoke about the large building on Pineaire Street being detrimental to the neighborhood and that water from the structure was draining onto adjacent property.

Ms. Gray read a letter from a resident living on Pineaire Street expressing disdain about the building. Ms. Gray also had questions about small lots and multiple adjoining lots, and requested that the ordinance be very clear. Commissioner Bartell pointed out that the table in the proposed ordinance listed lot sizes, maximum height, set backs, and square footage. Mr. Dixon explained that if a property owner wished to build an accessory

structure on an adjoining lot, the owner would be required to sign an affidavit to combine the lots, and because impervious surface area standards for the land use district must be adhered to, that could further limit the size of a structure. He added that staff was also reviewing zoning district standards for accessory buildings.

Mr. Dixon responded to Commissioner Bartell's question regarding lot reconfiguration by stating that building permits could be issued for multiple lots, but this ordinance would provide extra protection for purposes of permitting because it would require a signed recorded affidavit. He added that if an adjoining lot were sold with an accessory structure, it would create a nonconforming use and a code violation.

Commissioner Bartell suggested establishing a procedure similar to the one that allowed property owners to combine adjoining lots because of an assessment (Permanent Reassignment of Development Rights Agreement) to assure that properties would not be sold separately. Mr. Dixon said that was an option and language could be added to require property owners to combine multiple adjoining lots in order to obtain a permit for an accessory structure. The Commissioners concurred.

Discussion followed about making the requirement revocable only if an accessory structure could be removed, multiple lots creating nonconforming situations, problems with easements and impervious surface ratio (ISR), the advantages of combining lots, and so on.

Development Services Director Gary Maidhof advised that a policy in the COMP encouraged lot reassembly, which was utilized in coastal areas to take advantage of ISR issues; however, if lot reassembly were a requirement, there would be ramifications because there were many subdivisions with multiple lots (Highlands, Old Homosassa, and others) where it was impossible to build on a single lot. He specified that if this requirement was adopted, proposals of this type could not move forward without a survey (currently not required for residential homes), another survey showing the lot lines had disappeared, as well as recording of the document. He also stated that all existing homes on multiple lots would become nonconforming and would be required to undergo the lot reconfiguration process for remodeling or expansion. He added that this would be a major impact on the current permitting business and recommended that staff develop this policy under a separate ordinance as opposed to adding the language into this ordinance.

Commissioner Bartell explained that he was not suggesting that the requirement be inserted into this ordinance, but that it would eliminate the 45-foot lots and many variances. Mr. Maidhof added that it would also clean up many easement issues; however, he cautioned the Board that this was a large issue and the impact was well beyond the accessory structure aspect.

Commissioner Phillips requested that staff prepare a detailed report regarding lot reconfiguration listing all circumstances and ramifications that could occur, and then present the report to the Board as a separate item. Short discussion followed regarding

problems with accessory structures on small lots, title searches identifying nonconforming uses by revealing recorded affidavits, and so on.

Noe Lindo voiced disappointment because he had purchased a home on Pineaire Street just prior to the large building being constructed.

Mike Sorrell stated that he manufactured the type of buildings that was constructed on Pineaire Street. He mentioned that the buildings must comply with the Florida Building Code and they would be compatible on five-acre properties and outside the PSA. He expressed concern about interpreting compatibility for his customers and said that even on small lots, the 7.5-foot setback from the property line was not sufficient. The Chairwoman agreed, and Mr. Dixon stated that the setback on smaller lots could be increased to 10 feet. The Commissioners approved Mr. Dixon's suggestion.

The Chairwoman asked if anyone wished to speak in opposition. With no further public comment, the Chairwoman closed the public hearing. She then addressed Mr. Cloward's concern again about the word compatible in Section 4420 C.3 by stating that the Board's intent was that the material and color of an accessory structure be compatible with the existing structure. Mr. Dixon added that any building over 1,200 square feet must be compatible in color and design, particularly with a conditional use product.

***Upon motion by Commissioner Bartell, seconded by Commissioner Fowler, and carried unanimously, the Board adopted and authorized the Chairwoman to execute an ordinance amending the Citrus County Land Development Code Ordinance No. 90-14, by amending standards for accessory uses and structures, with an adjustment of a ten foot setback on lot sizes less than one acre, and alternate language as recommended by staff in Section 4420; by creating standards for vegetative debris disposal in former sand (borrow) pits; by providing for codification, severability, and an effective date.***

**ORDINANCE NO. 2005-A14**

Mr. Dixon advised that staff would monitor this ordinance and convey any necessary adjustments, in addition to proposing a requirement for lot reconfiguration as a separate item. (2:45 P.M.)

2-E **FLORAL CITY TOWN CENTER PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

Frank Peters, a member of the Floral City Heritage Council (Council), discussed the Floral City Town Center (Center) Proposed Development Plan (Plan), which was comprised of a County-owned library, community building, and a closed fire station. He furnished background information about the design for the Center beginning in 1999 through April 2004 when the Council presented a community-approved plan to the Board, who directed staff to seek funding for the concept. He added that the Plan was being presented again because the Council had not heard from staff.

He stated that the citizens of Floral City were very involved in activities that would benefit the community and were ready to assist staff in implementing the Plan. He mentioned that over \$30,000 had been spent, that a gazebo, kiosk, two-rail fence, and plantings had been completed, and that a gateway sign had been constructed with the

generous cooperation of the Board on the eastern end of the community, which was maintained by volunteers of the community. He discussed the renovations that had been done to the local community building, surveying and evaluation of historic oak trees along Orange Avenue, design and installation of gardens at the elementary school campus, the library, the trail on Orange Avenue, in front of local businesses, and policing of litter along SR 48 into the community. He said that the Center would not only benefit the local community, but others as well because Floral City was a strategic location and an entry point into the County. He gave examples of various events held in the community center building. He indicated that the creation of a park in front of the buildings would become a venue for outdoor events and draw visitors from outside the County.

He then proceeded with a PowerPoint presentation of the Plan (filed with the Clerk's agenda) that portrayed pictures of existing buildings, grounds, parking spaces, and proposed improvements. He reported that in 2003 the Board agreed to purchase an acre of land behind the complex of buildings for a parking lot, which would remove the parking in front and provide a great aesthetic enhancement. He specified that the community building was the only historic structure within the complex of three buildings. He described the limestone facades, porticos, pillars, walkthrough arbors, and fences that would connect the buildings visually together to create the look of Floral City, a small, old-time rural Florida town. He showed pictures of the park like setting in front of the buildings connected by sidewalks, sitting areas under live oak trees, arbors, and rail fences. He stressed that the parking lot had been purchased, the library was being enlarged, the process of improvements had begun, the community had worked hard and endured long hours on this project, and the vision was brought to staff who developed the PowerPoint presentation. He added that the project was almost completed with the exception of converting the library into Heritage Hall and constructing the park. He informed that the expenses had decreased from about \$80,000 last year, and he implored the Board to consider approval of the Plan and to fund the renovation of the fire station and the park. He added that the community was anxious to supply physical labor and to assist in any other appropriate way to make this vision happen.

Commissioner Fowler praised the Floral City citizens on attaining a truly remarkable design concept and stated if successful, the concept would spread to other areas of the County.

Chairwoman Phillips concurred that the community had done a wonderful job, and although it would benefit the entire County, it would benefit the Floral City community more. She recommended a special assessment through an MSTU (municipal services taxing unit) as the proper method to fund the project. She indicated that the only part of the Plan she could support would be funding the parking area behind the library. She stated that the County was responsible and obligated to use taxpayer dollars to pay for projects, such as roadways, water and sewer, housing for constitutional officers, and so on, and funding community projects was "icing on the cake."

Assistant County Attorney Kenneth Saunders responded to the Chairwoman's questions regarding the cost of roofing the library, and the parking and retention areas by

stating that the community building had been re-roofed, and the cost of the parking and retention areas would be reduced from \$75,000 to \$45,000 if the improvements were done by the Road Maintenance crew. Chairwoman Phillips expressed concern about the amount of time staff might be involved with the project.

Commissioner Damato emphasized that he viewed this project as County government acting as a facilitator and catalyst for the future redevelopment of Floral City. He discussed the neighborhood revitalization opportunities for the historic district, the Center being a model for future state and county infrastructure upgrades, streetscape, private development, and grant funding for proposed public and private initiatives. He stated that the project would provide the County a return on its investment later; for instance, the Crystal River Redevelopment District that was started in 1989 with a taxable value of \$15,000,000 was now providing a taxable value of \$40,000,000. He encouraged the Board to approve the Plan and support this community enhancement. He added that establishing an MSTU was an excellent funding idea; however, since the County owned the buildings, the Board should adopt the Plan and upgrade the buildings accordingly.

Commissioner Valentino stated that she had seen the tremendous accomplishments of the Floral City residents and realized their dedication and pride in their historical community and heritage. She supported the Plan and agreed with the idea of funding through an MSTU.

Commissioner Fowler read the Floral City Mission Statement and suggested that a phrase be changed from "*all residents of Floral City will feel welcome and nurtured*" to "*all residents will feel welcome and nurtured.*" He stated that an assessment district (MSTU) would not be successful because the community was too small. He also stated that the Board had recognized years ago that there were two entry points from Floral City into the County, that the Board was responsible for the County owned buildings, and had previously committed to helping the Floral City community fulfill their dreams and visions. He further stated that he was still committed and hoped the other Board members were as well.

Mr. Wesch responded to Commissioner Bartell's questions concerning the funding, the parking lot, and the expansion of the library. He advised that staff had not identified a grant that would be applicable to this project, that the parking lot related to the expansion of the library, but not to the extent contemplated by this Plan, and that regular routine maintenance was provided to the County buildings; however, there had been no upgrades.

Commissioner Bartell specified that he had mixed emotions about funding this Plan because other communities had made similar requests; however, he felt the Board did have a certain obligation because the County owned the buildings and had purchased property for parking. He agreed that the best answer for funding was through an MSTU. He added that he fully supported the concept and thought a good first step would be for the County to complete the parking area.



Discussion ensued concerning the process of creating and establishing an MSTU, encouraging and working with other gateway communities to the County, the Board's responsibility to communities (safe roadways, police protection, fire protection, water and sewer services), determining if an MSTU in the Floral City area would produce enough revenue to help finance the Plan, the Floral City area was different from other communities because the County owned the buildings and the property that was purchased for parking, finding a way to make the vision happen, and so on.

Commissioner Fowler specified that in fairness to the Floral City community, the Board should include the Plan in the budget this year. Commissioners Bartell and Phillips remarked that they would not support the Plan as a budget item. Commissioner Valentino remarked that the Board had made promises to people and communities in the past without having funding in place, and they should not continue to do so. She said this vision could be accomplished whether it was in the budget this year or not; however, the Board could make a commitment to move forward with the parking lot.

***A motion was made by Commissioner Damato and seconded by Commissioner Fowler to adopt the Plan (Floral Center Town Center Development Plan) in concept and allow staff to bring back a funding strategy and a timeline to implement the Plan, the parking, the implications of the Plan and parking to the library, and all other items that were discussed by the Board today.***

Commissioner Damato responded to Commissioner Bartell's question regarding the parking lot by stating that his motion was to develop a funding strategy and did not commit the Board to finance the parking lot. Commissioner Bartell advised that the Board had essentially agreed to the same thing last year, and the Council was here today because staff had not responded.

Commissioner Damato remarked that it did not seem viable that the Board would purchase property without having plans to develop a parking lot when they wanted to expand the library. He added that staff should evaluate everything discussed today and come up with a strategy. Commissioner Phillips agreed that the parking lot was needed and concurred with exploring a funding strategy; however, she did not want to adopt the Plan in concept because motions should be very specific; otherwise, too much was left to interpretation. She specified that in her opinion, staff should examine funding mechanisms, including an MSTU, present them for consideration, and then the Board would vote for or against the Plan. Commissioner Damato respectfully disagreed. He talked about projects that had been done in the City of Crystal River that had taken 15 years to bring into fruition, such as the "River Walk." He stressed that projects must be identified and that funding would always be an issue; however, for the benefit of the people, a funding method must be found. He said that he was not implying that the Plan be accomplished all at once, but he was adamant about not ending it because he felt it could be achieved and would be successful.

Commissioner Phillips declared that she was a stickler for fairness and remarked that it was not fair to budget one community's plan when others had paid for their own.

Commissioner Valentino agreed that funding should be available in the budget before making a promise to the Floral City community. She stated that unlike Crystal River, Floral City was not a charter city and could not collect taxes or acquire grants. She reiterated that she would commit today to paving the parking lot for the expansion of the library.

Mr. Wesch answered Commissioner Valentino's question about whether the Floral City citizens could help the County with the renovation of the buildings by stating that the community could assist, but they could not do any type of work that would require a state contractor license.

Commissioner Bartell said that due to the library expansion, he would rather the motion be amended to fund the parking lot without committing dollars to the remainder of the Plan until the Board knew the amount of revenues from this year's budget. The Chairwoman replied that she preferred a separate motion concerning the parking lot so staff would have a clear direction.

Commissioner Damato restated his motion as follows: *"to adopt the Plan (Floral City Town Center Proposed Development Plan) in concept and allow staff to bring back a funding strategy and a timeline to implement the Plan, including parking, parking implications to the library, and all other items discussed by the Board today."* He pointed out that this would address everything each Commissioner had discussed.

***Commissioner Fowler called a question on the motion. Motion carried. Voting aye: Commissioners Bartell, Damato, Fowler, and Valentino. Voting nay: Commissioner Phillips.*** (3:44 P.M.)

2-F ***CHAPTER 74 - CITRUS COUNTY CODE***

Mr. Battista explained that this was an ordinance amendment to Sections 74-102 and 74-105 of the Code pertaining to the Kings Bay idle speed zones during the Memorial Day, Fourth of July, and Labor Day holidays. He added that the ordinance also defined Kings Bay and clarified when the ordinance would be effective if the Fourth of July fell on a Saturday or Sunday.

Chairwoman Phillips opened the public portion of the hearing for comment and asked if anyone wished to speak in favor or in opposition. With no comment, the Chairwoman closed the public portion of the hearing.

***Upon motion by Commissioner Bartell, seconded by Commissioner Phillips, and carried unanimously, the Board adopted and authorized the Chairwoman to execute an ordinance amending Sections 74-102 and 74-105 of the Citrus County Code relating to vessel control and water safety; amending section 74-102 providing for the definition of Kings Bay; amending Section 74-105 pertaining to regulated dates and times; providing for severability; providing for inclusion in the Citrus County Code; and providing for an effective date.*** **ORDINANCE NO. 2005-A15**

2-G LB CABLE FRANCHISE AGREEMENT PUBLIC HEARING

The Chairwoman announced that this item would be rescheduled. (3:46 P.M.)

**The Chairman recessed the meeting and reconvened at 4:07 P.M.**

6-A EMERGENCY OPERATIONS CENTER/SHERIFF'S ADMINISTRATION BUILDING AND VEHICLE MAINTENANCE FACILITY

Mr. Wesch stated that this presentation was regarding the EOC/Sheriff's Administrative Building and Vehicle Maintenance Facility, which was currently listed in the Five Year Capital Improvement Program (CIP Project No. GF2005-10). He mentioned that the Board had given staff direction to evaluate potential sites for the location of this facility and that he worked with Commissioner Phillips, Assistant County Administrator Ken Saunders, Sheriff Jeff Dawsy, Commander Robert L. Blume, and EOC Director Captain Joe Eckstein on this task. He advised that the following site locations were identified: (1) expansion of the existing EOC, (2) site adjacent to the Central Landfill, and (3) parcel on Sovereign Path opposite the Lecanto Government Building (advantages and disadvantages for all three sites filed with the backup material). He requested Board approval of a site selection and stated that the working group recommended the Sovereign Path site for the location of the EOC/Sheriff's Administration Building.

***Upon motion by Commissioner Bartell, seconded by Commissioner Fowler, and carried unanimously, the Board approved the Sovereign Path site for the Emergency Operations Center/Sheriff's Administration Building.***

Mr. Wesch proceeded with a slide presentation of the Highlands County EOC and the state EOC buildings (filed with the Clerk's agenda). He explained that the Highlands County EOC building had metal walls (rated to withstand up to 200 mile per hour winds) surrounded by a concrete wall, with one side of the building without the concrete wall to allow for future expansion. He added that in the center of the building was a large meeting room with smaller breakout rooms around the meeting room (offices, pressroom, sleeping facilities, kitchen facility, public information/citizen response room, facility generator, and so on). He also showed a slide of the case hardened fuel tank for the generator located outside of the building. He showed slides of the state EOC building and discussed some of the differences between that building and the Highland County's EOC building.

He discussed the need for a new Vehicle Maintenance Facility for the Sheriff's Office due to the current space being leased and too small. He referred to a County owned site along Woodland Avenue (known as Jail Road), which was the access point for the County's Detention Facility and site location of the communications tower for the Sheriff's radio network. He added that this site would allow the County to construct the 20,000 square foot Vehicle Maintenance Facility per the Sheriff's request.

***A motion was made by Commissioner Fowler and seconded by Commissioner Bartell to authorize staff to prepare and disseminate a Request for Qualifications for architectural services to design a 15,000 square foot Emergency***

*Operations Center Building, a 12,000 square foot Operation Center, and a 20,000 square foot Vehicle Maintenance Facility.*

Discussion ensued regarding Highlands County's EOC costing \$160 to \$180 per square foot, consideration of other locations or commingling vehicle maintenance operations (County and Sheriff), the type of roofing and windows used in the Highlands and state EOC buildings, the RFQ not being limited to construction types, and so on.

Sheriff Dawsy replied to Commissioner Fowler's question regarding the EOC building having enough room to accommodate evacuated Florida Power employees in case of an emergency (flooding, nuclear) by stating that he had talked to John Stevenson of Progress Energy and he had indicated that they had alternative plans. Sheriff Dawsy added that he would follow up on those alternative plans. He advised that there had also been discussions with Progress Energy regarding financial assistance for the EOC building and that he would continue those discussions throughout the process.

Commissioner Phillips stated that an alternate EOC location would probably be needed during certain times, and if the new EOC building was built on Sovereign Path the Lecanto Government Building, Room 166, was case hardened and could be used for that alternate site. Sheriff Dawsy stated that his staff had also looked at the continued use of the current 9-1-1 Center that could meet short-term needs in time of disaster and could meet some long-term needs by freeing up some additional space in the Sheriff's Administrative Building.

Discussion ensued regarding Progress Energy being involved in the planning of the EOC building, the need to know what Progress Energy was planning prior to disseminating the RFQ, sending a letter to Progress Energy to see if they were interested in partnering with the County on the EOC building, there being no funds for buildings from Homeland Security grants, the Sheriff's staff continuing to research other grants, the need for renovations in the Sheriff's Administrative Building, and so on.

***The Chairwoman called a question on the motion and the motion carried unanimously.*** (4:45 P.M.)

2-H ***D-04-01 - NOTICE OF PROPOSED CHANGE - BEVERLY HILLS 1981 DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT (DRI)***

Rhonda Lake, Coordinator, CDD, showed a slide presentation and Jenette B. Collins, AICP, Principal Planner, CDD, gave the following staff report:

<b>Application Number/Name:</b>	D-04-01, Clark A. Stillwell, on behalf of Beverly Hills Development Corporation, Inc.
<b>Property Data:</b>	Sections 1, 2, 11-15, and 22, Township 18 South, Range 18 East, and Sections 6 and 7, Township 18 South, Range 19 East, more specifically described as the 1981 Beverly Hills DRI, 2,233 ± acre project.
<b>Staff/PDRB Recommendation:</b>	Approval with conditions
<b>Proposed Project:</b>	Request a Notice of Proposed Change (NOPC) to the

	Development Order for the Master Development Plan of the 1981 Beverly Hills DRI
<b>Public Hearing:</b>	June 14, 2005 at 5:01 P.M.

Mrs. Collins explained that the application requested the following: **(1)** extend the build out date to October 20, 2011, five years from the last requested extension; **(2)** add a condition that after completion of the expansion of County Road (CR) 491 and CR-486, the developer would undertake a transportation analysis, which would address the traffic impacts of the 1981 Beverly Hills DRI; and **(3)** add a condition that within one year the developer would submit a revised and restated 1981 Beverly Hills DRI Development Order.

She then reviewed the history of the Beverly Hills DRI and stated that less than one-third of the project had been developed, that it was reasonable to expect that the developer would request an extension, and that the request served as a precursor to the applicant submitting a separate NOPC to incorporate the Tuscany Community Development District in the future. She added that the developer originally requested a 20-year extension; however, following discussions with staff the developer reduced the request to 5 years and agreed as a condition of approval, to provide a full transportation analysis. She advised that there were no physical or conceptual master plan changes as part of this application.

Assistant County Attorney Michele Lieberman interjected and polled the Board for ex-parte communications regarding all of the land use applications. All Commissioners replied that they had no previous communications concerning those applications.

Attorney Clark Stillwell discussed the three components of the NOPC, and talked about the 1989 traffic study that had been completed in Beverly Hills, the need for an accurate traffic baseline for this project, the new traffic study after the completion of the CR-491 and CR-486 road construction, the need for the additional time extension, and so on.

The Chairwoman opened the public portion of the workshop and asked if anyone wished to speak in favor or in opposition. With no public comment, the Chairwoman closed the public portion of the workshop. (4:54 P.M.)

2-1 **ATLAS AMENDMENT - AA-05-03 - JOHN AND EDNA SKAGGS**

Mrs. Lake showed a slide presentation and Margaret A. Beake, AIA, AICP, Senior Planner, CDD, gave the following staff report:

<b>Application Number/Name:</b>	AA-05-03, John and Edna Skaggs
<b>Land Use:</b>	Low Density Residential (LDR) to LDR* (mobile homes allowed)
<b>Property Data:</b>	Section 8, Township 21 South, Range 20 East, Parcel 11330, located in the Floral City area.
<b>Staff/PDRB Recommendation:</b>	Approval
<b>Proposed Project:</b>	To allow for the placement of a mobile home

<b>Public Hearing:</b>	June 14, 2005, at 5:01 P.M.
------------------------	-----------------------------

Mrs. Beake added that the surrounding property allowed mobile homes or there were nonconforming mobile homes and a nonconforming business. She explained that a neighbor telephoned to object and that a letter of objection had been received. She advised that the request would not change residential density, the request for land use redesignation did not require an amendment to the GFLUM (Generalized Future Land Use Map), the proposal was consistent to land use designations and development patterns of the surrounding area, and would not be detrimental to present and future adjacent land uses.

Commissioner Bartell questioned Mrs. Beake about the surrounding properties showing that mobile homes were not allowed, and she replied that the surrounding properties were LDR; however, there were mobile homes in the area. Commissioner Bartell and Commissioner Phillips were not in favor of allowing a nonconforming use when there were site built homes around the parcel.

Mr. Skaggs stated that he purchased the property with the understanding that site built or modular homes would be allowed, and that he thought a modular home and a mobile home was the same. He explained that he intended to place a doublewide mobile home on the site and did not believe the property values would decline.

The Chairwoman opened the public portion of the workshop and asked if anyone wished to speak in favor or in opposition. With no public comment, the Chairwoman closed the public portion of the workshop. (5:05 P.M.)

2-J **ATLAS AMENDMENT - AA-05-04 - IDA MAE CARROLL**

Mrs. Lake made the PowerPoint presentation and Mrs. Beake presented the following staff report:

<b>Application Number/Name:</b>	AA-05-04, Ida Mae Carroll
<b>Land Use:</b>	Medium Density Residential District (MDR) to General Commercial District (GNC)
<b>Property Data:</b>	Section 11, Township 19 South, Range 19 East, Golden Terrace Estates, south half of Lot 18, 0.94 acres.
<b>Staff/PDRB Recommendation:</b>	Denial
<b>Proposed Project:</b>	To match the GNC designation on the north half of Lot 18 and to sell the property to be used as a quiet commercial business
<b>Public Hearing:</b>	June 14, 2005, at 5:01 P.M.

Mrs. Beake presented the Board with letters of opposition that were received after the agenda packages were distributed (filed with the Clerk's agenda). She stated that the site was located within the commercial infill area of the COMP and did not require an amendment to the GFLUM. She added that in order for this application to be approved to commercial, the zoning change would have to be compatible with the surrounding area. She advised that there had been several verbal objections to the application. She

summarized by saying that approval of the application would result in additional commercial impact into an established residential neighborhood, which was accessed by a local residential street. She noted that the request was not compatible with the surrounding area.

Wanda J. Wells, representing Ida Mae Carroll stated that this was one piece of property and should be zoned with one GNC designation. She made brief comments about the history of the property, that it had been difficult to sell the property with two land use designations, that the property was on a paved road, and so on.

The Chairwoman opened the public portion of the workshop and asked if anyone wished to speak in favor and in opposition. With no public comment, the Chairwoman closed the public portion of the workshop. (5 10 P.M.)

2-K ATLAS AMENDMENT - AA-05-05 - AGNES FAYE BELLAMY

Mrs. Lake showed a slide presentation and Cynthia L. Jones, E. I., Planner, CDD, reviewed the following staff report:

<b>Application Number/Name:</b>	AA-05-05, Agnes Faye Bellamy
<b>Land Use:</b>	GNC to GNC*
<b>Property Data:</b>	Section 04, Township 17 South, Range 18 East, tracts 44400-0030 and 44400-0040 of LLRS-04-01 an unrecorded subdivision located in the Dunnellon area, approximately 2.0 acres
<b>Staff/PDRB Recommendation:</b>	Approval
<b>Proposed Project:</b>	Create a row of three mobile home lots along the east side of North Goldendale Avenue
<b>Public Hearing:</b>	June 14, 2005, at 5:01 P.M.

Mrs. Jones stated that the request would remove a nonconformity that existed with the current mobile home on parcel 44400-0030 and would allow a mobile home to be placed on parcel 44400-0040 for the applicant's daughter. She advised that the surrounding parcels were designated RUR (Rural Residential District) RUR\* (mobile homes allowed), CL\* (Low Intensity Coastal and Lakes District, mobile homes allowed), or CLR\* (Coastal and Lakes Residential District, mobile homes allowed), and that there were mobile homes to the north of the subject parcels. She explained that staff had received several calls and letters in favor of the application. She noted that staff believed that this request was consistent with the GFLUM.

Mrs. Bellamy stated that she was present for questions.

The Chairwoman opened the public portion of the public workshop and asked if anyone wished to speak in favor or in opposition. With no public comment, the Chairwoman closed the public portion of the workshop. (5:15 P.M.)

**The Chairwoman recessed the meeting and reconvened at 5:28 P.M.**

2-L **GAS TAX**

Director of Engineering Ken Cheek reviewed the 25 Year Transportation Master Plan Update (filed with the Clerk's agenda). His presentation showed the current projects, the status of those projects, project rankings, project sequencing, and total costs including financing for the capital improvements. He stated that the total 25 year funding requirement for the projects would be \$405,000,000. He added that the proposed 2006-2010 projects would cost \$121,000,000 for the design, right-of-way, and construction or \$139,000,000 including financing.

Office of Management and Budget Director Cathy Taylor reviewed the revenue sources that were available to fund transportation projects, which were Transportation Impact Fees, gas tax, and local discretionary sales surtax (filed with the Clerk's agenda). She showed the history and projected revenues of the Transportation Impact Fees, projected gas tax revenues, gas taxes not currently levied (Ninth Cent Fuel Tax and 2nd Local Option Fuel Tax), local sales tax revenues, existing and projected transportation funding sources of revenue, and so on. She then reviewed the financing alternative options as follows:

	<b>Available Sources</b>	<b>Five Year Capital Budget Required</b>	<b>Shortfall</b>
<b>Option I - "Pay as you go" Existing annual gas tax revenues and annual impact fee collections</b>	\$79,000,000	\$142,000,000	(\$63,000,000)
<b>Option II - Bonding of existing gas tax revenues plus annual impact fee collections</b>	\$87,000,000	\$142,000,000	(\$55,000,000)
<b>Option III - Same as Option II above, plus extend expiration date of existing annual gas taxes</b>	\$108,000,000	\$142,000,000	(\$34,000,000)
<b>Option IV - Same as Option II above, plus levy and bond the 2nd Local Option Gas Tax (5¢)</b>	\$136,000,000	\$142,000,000	(\$6,400,000)
<b>Option V - Same as option IV above, plus levy and bond the Ninth Cent Gas Tax</b>	\$142,704,000	\$142,969,000	(\$265,000)

Mr. Battista explained the four proposed ordinances by stating that the first two would amend the existing gas tax ordinances extending them to the year 2040, and the other ordinances would be for the Five Cent Local Option Fuel Tax and the Ninth Cent Gas Tax, which were structured similar to the existing gas tax ordinances. He explained that the Five Cent Local Option Fuel Tax would be shared among the municipalities and the County through interlocal agreements. He added that the Ninth Cent Gas Tax would not be shared among the municipalities. He advised that the effective date of the Five Cent Local Option Fuel Tax and the Ninth Cent Gas Tax would be January 1, 2006, through December 31, 2040.

The Chairwoman opened the public portion of the hearing for comment and asked if anyone wished to speak in favor.



Frank Shepard stated that he agreed with the gas tax increase, that the users should pay for what they use, and that he thought the sales tax referendum would not pass.

The Chairwoman then asked if anyone wished to speak in opposition.

Jim Bierly suggested waiting for the impact fee study and Morris Harvey requested that the gas tax decision be postponed until more planning was completed. Mr. Harvey added that the plan needed to include all of the expenses and taxes necessary to complete those projects.

With no further public comment, the Chairwoman closed the public portion of the hearing.

Mr. Battista advised that a four to one minimum vote was needed in order for the ordinances to pass.

Discussion ensued regarding the traffic capacity analysis being completed by August, moratoriums, the Bert Harris Act, the options if nothing was done today, the Level of Service (LOS) classifications in the COMP and the LDC, the fair apportionment that should be supplied by impact fee revenues versus other revenue sources, the Transportation Impact Fees adopted at 100 percent, bondable sources were sales tax and gas tax, impact fees not being bondable, all impact fees being reviewed next year, and so on.

Mr. Cheek explained that there were pavement wear and structural issues with Grover Cleveland Boulevard; therefore, if the ranking of that project were postponed the resurfacing and structural problems would still need to be addressed. He advised that a flat rate cost per mile would be \$5,000,000 due to right-of-way increases, materials and construction increases, and so on. Commissioner Fowler commented that the Board would be required to either build the road or impose a moratorium on the construction, which meant that the County would have to buy land that could not be developed. He added that the gas tax was the most fair and equitable way to build roads and that the cost would never be cheaper than it was now.

***A motion was made by Commissioner Fowler and seconded by Commissioner Damato to adopt and authorize the Chairwoman to execute the following ordinances: (1) amending Section 94-1 of the Citrus County Code, which imposed a Four Cent Local Option Gas Tax to provide for imposition of said tax from May 24, 2005, to December 31, 2040, both dates inclusive; providing for severability; providing for inclusion in the Code; and providing an effective date, (2) amending Section 94-2 of the Citrus County Code, which imposed a Fifth and Sixth Cent Local Option Gas Tax to provide for imposition of said tax from May 24, 2005, to December 31, 2040, both dates inclusive; providing for severability; providing for inclusion in the Code; and providing an effective date, (3) imposing the Ninth Cent Fuel Tax on motor and diesel fuel sold in Citrus County and taxed under the provisions of Section 336.021 and Chapter 206 of the Florida***

*Statutes; providing for distribution; providing for uses of the Ninth Cent Fuel Tax; providing for distribution; providing for authority; providing for an effective period; providing for use as collateral; providing for severability; providing for inclusion in the Code; and providing for an effective date, and (4) levying a Five Cent Local Option Fuel Tax on all motor fuel sold in Citrus County and taxed under the provision of Part I of Chapter 206 and Section 336.025 (1) (b) of the Florida Statutes; providing for uses of the fuel tax; providing for distribution; providing for authority; providing for an effective period; providing for use as collateral; providing for severability; providing for inclusion in the Code; and providing for an effective date.*

Commissioner Phillips stated that she felt that the gas tax was the fairer way to pay for roads because it was a user fee; however, she was concerned with confusing people about the timing of the gas tax adoption and the sales tax referendum. She explained that the two new gas taxes would have to be adopted prior to July 1, 2005, and would be effective January 1, 2006. She further explained that if the sales tax referendum in November 2006 was successful, the sales tax would be implemented in January 2007, the gas tax would be repealed by notifying the Department of Revenue within 60 days to terminate the gas tax, and the expiration of the gas tax would be December 31, 2007. She expressed concern with the possible overlap of taxes and people not believing that the Board did what they had agreed to do. She commented that the Board had a responsibility to provide the citizens with new roads as well as safe roadways to drive.

Commissioner Bartell suggested aborting any effort toward the sales tax issue because the referendum would probably not pass and because it would put a burden on people other than those who use the roads. Commissioner Phillips agreed and said that if a sales tax referendum was ever needed, it should be used for other projects outlined on a referendum when no other funding sources were available.

The Chairwoman suggested that if the Board agreed, they should make a follow up motion removing any reference to a sales tax referendum in the new gas tax ordinances.

Commissioner Valentino agreed that the citizens would be against a sales tax. She requested waiting for other funding sources and until the impact fees were addressed again. She said that she would vote against the motion because she had promised the citizens that she would not support any other tax options until the impact fees were completed, the budget was processed, and so on.

Commissioner Damato stated that there had been a local funding deficit due to the lack of Transportation Impact Fee collection for many years, the increase of the gas tax would provide a bondable source of funding to upgrade the roadways identified in the CIP, local funding sources were a requirement of state growth management guidelines, and the increased gas taxes would ensure the safety and viability of the roads for now and in the future.

**The Chairwoman called a question on the motion. Motion carried. Voting Aye: Commissioners Bartell, Damato, Fowler, and Phillips. Voting Nay: Commissioner Valentino.** (6:28 P.M.)

**ORDINANCE NOS. 2005-A16, 2005-A17, 2005-06 AND 2005-07, RESPECTIVELY**

**The Chairwoman recessed the meeting and reconvened at 6:41 P.M.**

2-L **GAS TAX CONTINUED**

**Upon motion by Commissioner Fowler, seconded by Commissioner Damato, and carried unanimously, the Board directed staff to remove all references to the sales tax referendum from Ordinance Nos. 2005-06 and 2005-07.**

2-M **ORDINANCE AMENDMENT OA-05-03 - GITHENS**

Chuck Dixon stated that this proposed amendment was initiated by an applicant to change a portion of the LDC text, specifically Section 4340 - Tree Preservation and Protection Standards. He read the ordinance preamble into the record.

Ms. Farnsworth reported that the applicant's proposal would remove the Planned Development (PD) exemption paragraph from the tree preservation and protection standards stated in the LDC Ordinance No. 90-14. She explained that since this amendment was publicly initiated, the Board would only decide to keep the paragraph or remove it from the LDC. She referred to a memorandum dated May 12, 2005, which addressed the Board's concern with PDs that would be affected by this amendment. She stated that this application only addressed the PD exemption and that no other aspects of tree preservation or of the ordinance would be affected. Ms. Farnsworth and Mr. Dixon explained that when staff reviewed redevelopment of existing PDs, they encouraged higher standards.

Gary Stocker, representing Keep the Nature in Nature Coast Committee, stated that they were not opposed to development; however, wanted development to be done in an environmentally responsible manner and that existing laws applied equally to everyone. He showed a presentation that indicated their intent, showed pictures of tree clearing of lots, lots cleared for road construction, tree specimens, Homosassa Tradewinds Resort, and clear cutting trees in Homosassa, and summarized his presentation (filed with the Clerk's agenda). Mr. Dixon explained that when the Homosassa Tradewinds Resort went through the public hearing process the tree ordinance had not been adopted. He added that staff had recommended additional tree preservation standards within the Homosassa Tradewinds Resort; however, those standards were removed through the public hearing process. Mr. Stocker then addressed comments made at the public workshop from the Board, Avis Craig, and Clark Stillwell. He added that he agreed with Mr. Stillwell's suggestion regarding the reducing of the right-of-way from 60 feet to 50 feet, which would allow for additional trees and plantings.

The Chairwoman opened the public portion of the hearing and asked if anyone wished to speak in favor.

Several residents spoke in favor of the ordinance and provided documents (names and documents filed with the Clerk's agenda). Extension Services Director Katherine Allen made a presentation titled "Construction - Keeping Trees Alive in the Urban Forest" (filed with the Clerk's agenda).

Mr. Maidhof explained the tree preservation procedures, and stated that staff operated on a complaint basis regarding tree preservation, that the Board decided not to hire additional staff to address complaints, and so on.

The Chairwoman then asked if anyone wished to speak in opposition.

Attorney Clark Stillwell stated that lot clearing would not be resolved by appealing the exemption. He spoke about the existing PDs having tree preservation standards and master plans that indicated the roads, the drainage retention areas, the lots, and the golf courses. He said that PDs often exceeded the County's tree ordinance standards.

Avis Craig, representing Citrus Hills Development, asked that her presentation from the public workshop be included as part of the record. She explained that the exemption stated that PDs were exempt; however, they should comply on an individual lot basis when lots were developed. She added that PDs were no different than individuals when the home was built. She talked about the pictures that were presented at the public workshop and explained that many of those homes were built prior to the latest tree ordinance, that sometimes trees must be removed for drainage and to accommodate the home to the lot, that Citrus Hills Development preserved trees whenever possible, and so on.

Dan Galbraith, president of the Citrus County Builders Association (CCBA), stated that most builders made efforts to protect trees or to plant new trees. He added that the PD communities needed the latitude to create parks and other amenities. He commented on all of the work that was put into the tree preservation ordinance by staff and the CCBA and requested that the ordinance remain as is. Frank Shepard commented on the necessity to remove some trees in order to build a home and that if someone wanted to live on a treed lot they should build outside of a PD.

With no further public input, the Chairwoman closed the public portion of the hearing.

Mr. Stocker rebutted by stating that most people loved trees and would plant trees if there were none on their property, that the amendment was requested to address the few PDs that had an exemption, and that the law should apply to everyone equally.

***A motion was made by Commissioner Fowler and seconded by Commissioner Bartell to deny Ordinance Amendment OA-05-03, Githens.***

Discussion followed regarding the deletion of the exemption not correcting the problems brought forward by the citizens, the need to review the penalties for not

preserving trees, PDs having vested rights and master plans, addressing the right-of-way width, the possibility of a future Citrus County Dogwood Festival, residents reporting violations, educating the public, and so on.

Mr. Dixon stated that an applicant could request right-of-way widths less than the required width during the PD process.

**The Chairwoman called a question on the motion and the motion carried unanimously.** (8:17 P.M.)

**The Chairwoman recessed the meeting and reconvened at 8:30 P.M.**

2-N CPA/AA-05-09, WALKER FOR CARNAHAN

Mr. Maidhof read the ordinance title into the record, Mrs. Lake presented a slide presentation, and Mrs. Beake reviewed the following staff report:

<b>Application Number/Name:</b>	CPA/AA-05-09, Wayne Walker (Crystal Engineering) for Carnahan (Carnahan's Supply Co.)
<b>Land Use:</b>	<b>GFLUM:</b> from MDR to GNC <b>LDC Atlas:</b> from MDR* to GNC
<b>Property Data:</b>	A portion of lot 1A350 of Mayfield Acres-Hillside South Unrecorded Subdivision, in the NW 1/4 of the SE 1/4 of Section 2, Township 19 South, Range 18 East, 1.5 acres ± of 4.02 acres ± under ownership
<b>Staff/PDRB Recommendation:</b>	Approval
<b>Proposed Project:</b>	To have a single land use for the entire property

Mrs. Beake explained that this request would change the rear portion of the parcel from MDR to GNC. She clarified that this request was not to expand an existing business; however, there had been a building permit issued since August 2004 for a building supply company with development into the amendment area.

She explained to Commissioner Phillips that the rear property line of this parcel would be the same as the previously approved land use change to the property left of this parcel (Color Country Nursery). Commissioner Phillips expressed concerned with continuing to move the GNC designation further off SR 44 and encroaching into residential areas.

Mr. Walker showed a PowerPoint presentation (filed with the Clerk's agenda), which displayed a zoning map of the surrounding properties, plans for the development, and photographs of the parcel and the surrounding area. He explained that there would be a 20-foot dense landscape buffer in the rear of the property and a large berm constructed as part of the parcel. He added that this was a good transition between residential and commercial areas.

The Chairwoman opened the pubic portion of the hearing for comment and asked if anyone wished to speak in favor or in opposition.

Scott Carnahan, owner of Carnahan Supply, stated that he had resided in the County all of his life and intended to run his business in the County for the remainder of his life. He added that he planned to be a good neighbor, and he requested the Board's support.

With no further public comment, the Chairwoman closed the public portion of the hearing.

***Upon motion by Commissioner Bartell, seconded by Commissioner Damato, and carried unanimously, the Board adopted and authorized the Chairwoman to execute an ordinance amendment amending the Comprehensive Plan (Ordinance No. 89-04 as amended) and an ordinance amending the Land Development Code Atlas (Ordinance No. 90-14), in accordance with CPA/AA-05-09, Wayne Walker for Carnahan Supply.***  
**ORDINANCE NOS. 2005-A18 AND 2005-A19, RESPECTIVELY**

6-B **CONSTRUCTION INSPECTOR PAY CHANGES**

Mr. Wesch stated that in a continuing effort to be competitive with the market pay rates for construction inspectors and trademaster inspectors, staff was requesting the following pay grade changes: construction inspectors from pay grade 111 to pay grade 113, and trademaster inspectors from pay grade 112 to pay grade 114. He advised that those positions were part of the Building Division, which was funded by the fees generated by that Division, and that there would be no impact on the General Fund.

***A motion was made by Commissioner Fowler and seconded by Commissioner Valentino to approve and authorize the following pay grade changes: (1) construction inspectors from pay grade 111 to 113, and (2) trademaster inspectors and plans examiners from pay grade 112 to 114.***

Mr. Wesch replied to Commissioner Bartell's question about employees currently in those existing pay grades by stating that staff would make equity adjustments so that new employees would not be hired at a higher pay grade than current employees. He stated that staff's recommendation today would include plans examiners from pay grade 112 to pay grade 114 (per the amended agenda memorandum).

Commissioner Phillips agreed that the County needed to be competitive with other counties; however, she requested that staff continue to make sure there were no payroll inequities within our own County. Mr. Wesch stated that staff would be reviewing the current pay plan and recommending any changes necessary to the Board in the future. He added that staff would also be reviewing the fee structure in the Building Division next fiscal year to make sure that they continued to be self-funding.

***The Chairwoman called a question on the motion and the motion carried unanimously.***

10- **COMMISSIONER DENNIS DAMATO**

10-A **LEASE SPACES FOR THE CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS**

Commissioner Damato addressed a letter sent to Richard Wesch from Property Appraiser Melanie J. Hensley (filed with the backup materials) concerning the Crystal River Satellite Office. He said that Mrs. Hensley addressed some of his concerns; however, his main concerns were with the parking and access of that facility since the recent addition to the building directly in front of the plaza (American Pro Diving Center). He recommended that the Board authorize staff to negotiate a lease with the owner of the former Publix in Crystal River (Kings Bay Plaza) because buildings of that size were limited in the Crystal River area, the additional space could provide a location for record storage, the building had never flooded, there was adequate parking and access, and so on.

Commissioner Phillips stated that she was concerned with placing County offices and County records on the west side of US 19.

Discussion ensued about the current Crystal River Satellite Office (Revco Building) lease expiring in 2007, the renovation costs of the former Publix facility costing \$80 to \$85 per square foot for offices and \$60 for the storage area, expanding the search for another facility east of US 19 or land to construct a building, relocating into the Lecanto Government Building, constructing a building on property owned by the County on Sovereign Path, and so on.

Mr. Wesch stated that staff would look into the options and report to the Board.

12- **COUNTY ATTORNEY'S REPORT**

12-A **BRENTWOOD TOWNHOMES PHASE III**

Mr. Battista stated that this was a request for a construction variance from right-of-way width for Brentwood Townhomes Phase III.

***Upon motion by Commissioner Bartell, seconded by Commissioner Fowler, and carried unanimously, the Board approved the construction variance as requested with conditions as outlined by the Department of Public Safety, in accordance with PLT-05-13, application for preliminary plat.***

12-B **APPROVAL OF MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS RECEIVED AFTER THE CLOSE OF AGENDA DEADLINE**

12-B.1 **BEVERLY HILLS MUNICIPAL SERVICE BENEFIT UNIT**

***A motion was made by Commissioner Phillips and seconded by Commissioner Damato to set a public hearing on June 14, 2005, at 3:45 P.M. at the Citrus County Courthouse, 110 North Apopka Avenue in Inverness on an ordinance of Citrus County repealing Sections 90-641, 90-642, 90-643, 90-644, 90-645, 90-646, and 90-647 of the Citrus County Code relating to the Beverly Hills Municipal Service Benefit Unit; amending Section 90-31 providing for the inclusion of certain land within the Citrus County Fire Protection Taxing District; providing for severability; providing for inclusion in the Citrus County Code; and providing for an effective date.***

The Chairwoman stated that she appreciated Property Appraiser Melanie Hensley's cooperation on this issue.

***The Chairwoman called a question on the motion and the motion carried unanimously.*** (8:52 P.M.)

14-A **ANY OTHER BUSINESS OR PERSONS WISHING TO ADDRESS THE BOARD**  
**JUNE 28, 2005, BOARD MEETING**

The Chairwoman advised that she would be out of town for the June 28, 2005, Board meeting and that Commissioner Fowler would not be available for that meeting either. Mr. Wesch requested that the meeting be maintained so that routine business could be kept on schedule. Commissioners concurred.

There being no other business to come before the Board, the Chairwoman adjourned the meeting. (8:54 P.M.)

ATTEST: \_\_\_\_\_, Clerk \_\_\_\_\_, Chairwoman