Official Minutes of
MARION COUNTY
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

May 23, 2025

CALL TO ORDER:

The Marion County Board of County Commissioners (BCC) met in a special session in Commission Chambers at 2:00 p.m. on Friday, May 23, 2025 at the Marion County Governmental Complex located in Ocala, Florida.

INTRODUCTION OF PUBLIC HEARING BY CHAIRMAN KATHY BRYANT

Chairman Bryant advised that the public hearing was scheduled this afternoon to consider an Ordinance amending Transportation Impact Fees.

Chairman Bryant provided a brief history of Impact Fees, noting when the BCC suspended Impact Fees, it was done because Marion County's economy was in the tank. She stated in 2010 Marion County was the third highest in the State in foreclosures, lost almost 40 percent (%) of its property values, and had a 14.3% unemployment rate. Chairman Bryant stated although the Commission is not in the economic development business, the one thing it could do was try whatever it could to spur some economic development for the private sector. Obviously, the County has come a long way since then and our economy is booming. She opined that a lot of the things that have happened over the course of the past 12 to 13 years have put this community in a position so that it will never see what we saw going through the Great Recession. The County has been very successful as a community, including the private sector, municipalities, and County governments. The BCC has been extremely successful in its efforts to create a space in the community and to diversify the economic base to where it will never be in that position again. In 2017, the Commission reinstated the Transportation Impact Fees (TIFs) at a small percentage of what they were deemed to be because it was still worried about the economy. Chairman Bryant opined that the COVID-19 pandemic highlighted Florida as the "Free State" and really drove a lot more people to Florida, noting the State has experienced a population explosion. She advised that the Commission is trying to take a look at all of the tools in the toolbox in order to address infrastructure needs and specifically transportation infrastructure needs. The BCC has reviewed this issue thoroughly and no one has taken it lightly. Chairman Bryant opined that regardless of the outcome of today's hearing, it's going to be the best decision to move the community forward and to set Marion County up for long term success over the next 20 years. She noted Sales Tax revenue, although helpful, will not cover the County's transportation needs. Chairman Bryant advised that there is already $1,400,000,000.00 to $1,500,000,000.00 in projected transportation infrastructure needs over the next 20 years.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The meeting opened with the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of our Country.

ROLL CALL

Upon roll call the following members were present: Chairman Kathy Bryant, District 2; Vice-Chairman Carl Zalak, III, District 4; Commissioner Craig Curry, District 1; Commissioner Matthew McClain, District 3; and Commissioner Michelle Stone, District 5.

Also present were County Attorney Matthew G. Minter; County Administrator Mounir Bouyounes; and Assistant County Administrator (ACA) Tracy Straub.

PROOF OF PUBLICATION

Deputy Clerk Windberg presented Proof of Publication of legal ad No. 11303035 entitled, "Notice of Public Hearing" published in the Star Banner newspaper on May 13, 2025. The Notice states the Board will consider the adoption of an Ordinance amending Transportation Impact Fees.

The Deputy Clerk was in receipt of a 146 page Agenda Packet to follow along with the PowerPoint presentation.

STAFF PRESENTATION

1. PUBLIC HEARING to Consider an Ordinance to Amend Chapter 10 of the Marion County Code Providing General Standards and Definitions Applicable to All Marion County Impact Fees, And Specifically Updating Transportation Impact Fees Including Findings, Rates, Technical Study, Administrative Procedures, And Finding Extraordinary Circumstances Supporting Rate Increases

ACA Tracy Straub presented the following recommendation:

Description/Background: This Public Hearing is required to adopt an Ordinance that amends Chapter 10 of the Marion County Code regarding Impact Fees. As impact fees for fire protection and emergency medical services (EMS) are also being contemplated, limitations to only "Transportation Facilities" are shown striken; and in some cases, findings and actions specific to transportation are moved to new sections.

Transportation impact fees were suspended in 2011, updated in 2015 and reinitiated with a discounted rate in 2017. In accordance with Florida Statute, the County retained Benesch to conduct an up-to-date comprehensive study of transportation impact fees. Further, to re-establish or increase the impact fees, Florida Statute 163.31801, allows the Board to consider "extraordinary circumstances" necessitating the need to exceed the phase-in limits associated with the impact fees. "Extraordinary circumstances" are necessary should the Board increase fees by more than 50% of the current rate or increase fees by annual increments greater than 12.5%.

In accordance with Florida Statute, the two required public workshops for consideration of "extraordinary circumstances" were held on April 8, 2025 and May 6, 2025.

Marion County's continued growth requires additional capital transportation improvements. The study and extraordinary circumstances findings support impact fee rates to provide for such improvements. Upon adoption, updated transportation impact fee rates will go into effect for all Building Permit applications received on October 1, 2025 and thereafter.

Budget/Impact: None.

Recommended Action: Motion to approve and authorize the Chairman to execute the Ordinance to amend Chapter 10 of the Marion County Code providing general standards and definitions applicable to all Marion County impact fees, and specifically updating transportation impact fees including findings, rates, technical study, administrative procedures, and finding extraordinary circumstances supporting rate increases.

ACA Tracy Straub presented a 2 page letter dated May 1, 2025 from City Manager Peter Lee, City of Ocala; a 3 page letter dated May 22, 2025 from the law firm of Gooding & Batsel; a 2 page letter dated May 23, 2025 from the law firm of Gooding & Batsel; a 12 page letter dated May 22, 2025 from the law firm of Stearns Weaver Miller Weissler Alhadeff & Sitterson; and a 2 page letter dated May 15, 2025 from the Ocala Metro Chamber & Economic Partnership (CEP) all relating to TIFs. She also presented a 1 page response letter dated May 21, 2025 from Chairman Bryant to the CEP and a 1 page handout entitled, “Transportation Impact Fees Credits and Balances”.

Ms. Straub provided a brief history of the BCC’s work on this matter. She advised that a TIF workshop was held on January 29, 2025, and then on April 8 and May 6, 2025 the BCC held two workshops as required to consider extraordinary circumstances for TIFs in order to contemplate raising the fees in either a single step or incremental steps beyond 50 percent (%).

Nilgun Kamp, Benesch, advised that the County is continuing to experience growth as it ranks 17^{th} out of 67 Florida Counties in projected population growth rate, and 15^{th} in residential permitting. She noted Impact Fees were last updated in 2015 and were adopted at a reduced rate at that time. The study is really to update the variables and reflect current data, as well as meeting the legal requirements. Impact Fees are a one-time capital charge to new development to cover the cost of capital facilities and help implement Capital Improvement Plans (CIPs). Impact Fees’ main purpose is to maintain the level of service (LOS). The fees calculate the cost of growth and are most needed when there are high growth levels and limited alternative funding. In terms of the legal requirements, in 2006 the Impact Fee Act passed and some of its key requirements are that studies are based on most recent and localized data; a minimum of 90 day notice is given for any fee increases; and if there is a challenge to the fee, local governments need to demonstrate that their calculations are correct instead of the other side showing that they are not correct. In 2001 House Bill (HB) 337 passed, which set some limits on how much the fees can be increased and how those increases need to be implemented. For example, if the increase is up to 25%, it needs to be implemented over 2 years; 25% to 40% increase over 4 years; the fees cannot be increased more than 50%; or be increased more than once every 4 years. Ms. Kamp stated there is an exceptions clause that is utilized by preparing a study that demonstrates extraordinary circumstances; holding two public workshops to discuss those circumstances; and the increase needs to be approved by $2/3^{rds}$ of the governing body. She advised that Senate Bill (SB) 1080 has been unrolled, but has yet to be signed or vetoed by the Governor and if it is not vetoed, then it becomes effective on October 1, 2025 and puts further restrictions on Impact Fees. It stipulates that jurisdictions that have not increased their fees within the past five years cannot use the extraordinary circumstances clause, and the increase needs to be approved unanimously as opposed to $2/3^{rds}$ of the governing body. In 2024, HB 479 further addressed TIFs. Ms. Kamp advised that the Bill states that if a jurisdiction or municipality and the County are both collecting TIFs, they need to enter into an Interlocal Agreement (ILA) and show that there is no double charging. It also requires that studies are completed within one year and utilize consumption-based methodology, which is very common in Florida. She advised that consumption-based methodology charges new growth based on the value of the infrastructure that it is consuming and ensures that the new development is not being charged for any existing deficiencies. It looks at the cost to add capacity, which is the cost of building roads. Any non-impact fee revenues used for the same type of infrastructure and generated by future development are subtracted so that the County is not double charging.

Ms. Kamp provided a brief overview of how the formula for transportation works, which begins by estimating how much it costs to build one lane mile. The cost for Marion County is estimated at $4,700,000.00. For example, if the County is building 1 mile of roadway with two lanes that cost is approximately $9,000,000.00. It is estimated that most roads carry a capacity of 15,000 vehicles so then the cost per vehicle miles of capacity is $310.00. She clarified that every time a car is added to the roadway for them to travel a mile is costing that infrastructure about $310.00. An average home generates 26 vehicle miles daily and those two multiplied give the total cost, which is about $8,000.00. After subtracting the credit contribution from other revenue sources, the net fee is about $5,300.00. The primary component for TIFs has three main parts: 1) the daily trip generation, how many trips each land use generates; 2) trip length, how long those trips are; and 3) the final component is the percentage of new trips. Ms. Kamp stated the data sources used for the study include the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation book (11th edition published late 2021), as well as the Florida Studies Database that includes studies from different establishments throughout Florida that measures all three variables. She stated Benesch also used the travel demand model on the cost component. In regard to the cost component, the firm started by reviewing any recent local improvements completed by the County, and any future estimates for upcoming projects, and then supplemented that data by utilizing data from other Florida jurisdictions for similar projects.

Ms. Kamp advised that in addition to construction, with the rights-of-way (ROW) acquisition, design, engineering, inspection, etc., the total cost of a County road is approximately $4,300,000.00 per lane mile. She stated the construction cost for a State road is estimated about $4,000,000.00 per lane mile and a combined County and State road project is approximately $4,700,000.00 as they are combined by the lane miles that will be billed as part of the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). Ms. Kamp advised that Benesch then looked at how much capacity these roads add and the cost per capacity is calculated at $310.00. She stated on the credit side, Benesch looked at all revenue sources that are contributing to this network. Ms. Kamp advised that there is about $53,000,000.00 being contributed from other revenue sources to transportation capacity projects and most of it (about 2/3rds) is from County revenues, most likely the Sales Tax. She stated one of the reasons communities are always struggling with transportation funding is because transportation's dedicated revenue source is fuel taxes. Ms. Kamp advised that fuel taxes are a very inefficient revenue source collected on a per gallon basis, noting State pennies are indexed, local pennies are not indexed. She stated you have a situation where the costs are increasing, but the dedicated revenue source is losing ground and that gap is growing. This is why the County is finding itself having to use Sales Tax and other revenue sources.

Ms. Kamp referred to the TIF comparison chart on page 69 of the Agenda packet, noting the total calculated fee for a mid-size single family home is about $5,300.00. Currently Marion County fees are about $1,400.00. If that were to cap at 50%, it would rise to $2,100.00. Some Counties are charging anywhere from $1,400.00 to about $5,400.00 while others charge anywhere from $3,000.00 to $10,000.00. In terms of revenues, the total calculated fees, if adopted at full rate, have the potential of generating about $24,000,000.00 to $29,000,000.00 annually. In terms of the extraordinary circumstances,

one situation was that the 2015 calculated rates have been heavily discounted. So not only did the cost increase, but the starting point was a large discount. She reiterated that Marion County is a fast growing County, noting permitting levels increased from 360 permits in 2011 to over 7,000 permits in 2024. There have been significant cost increases since 2015 as well. In addition, the LRTP indicates that after all the projects in the cost feasible plan are built, the County will still have about 20% of County roads over capacity with a cost estimate of about $1,600,000.00 to take care of that 20%. Ms. Kamp advised that the County is projecting that Sales Tax revenues will bring approximately $900,000,000.00 over a 20 year period and if the entire $900,000,000.00 is dedicated to just the capacity projects and TIFs are currently bringing about $200,000,000.00 over that same timeframe, then there will still be a major shortfall. If the full calculated fees were adopted with the 2019 through 2023 permitting trends, the County could adopt the rates at 84% and fund that need. If the revenue projections are based on 2020 through 2024 permitting trends, the County could adopt them at as low as 72% and still fund this need.
In response to Commissioner McClain, Ms. Kamp stated the County's transportation LOS is an exceptions standard, which stipulates that no road will be worse the than a LOS "D". She opined that without Impact Fees, over half of the County roads will be below a LOS "D".
General discussion ensued in regard to the ITE standards for roadway safety.
Ms. Kamp advised that Ordinances allow for alternative study calculations to be utilized.
Heather Encinosa, Nabors Giblin & Nickerson (NGN), advised that the Ordinance unlike the Fire Rescue Ordinance is a little bit more complicated and has more moving pieces because it is amending an existing part of the County Code. She clarified that there already is an existing Article 11 in Chapter 10, which addresses TIFs; however, the recommended changes will be applicable to all Impact Fees that are being brought up to current standards with regard to all of the recent Legislative changes. The first Section includes things like title, authority, applicability, intent and purpose. It includes some general definitions applicable to all Impact Fees. It includes those provisions for an independent Impact Analysis. Ms. Encinosa clarified that the proposed Ordinance contains a procedure for a developer to perform an independent Impact Analysis and the County to consider that as in lieu of the fee and the fee schedule. It includes procedures for a local appeal process with review hearings and a hearing officer. She stated Division 2 of Chapter 10 is amended to deal with just TIFs and contains new transportation only definitions and provisions for how to compute the fees. The proposed language would allow for Developer credits; wherein, a developer coming in to build a County Road would receive a credit on a dollar-for-dollar basis at fair market value for that contribution. This Ordinance repeals the indexing provision and the County's indexing procedure due to the changes in State law that now stipulates the County can only increase fees once every four years.
In response to Chairman Bryant, Ms. Encinosa stated the County could adopt a "phased-in" fee schedule that is in accordance with the phased-in limitations of State Statute. She noted a phased-in schedule is not included in the proposed Ordinance. Ms. Encinosa clarified that the fee schedules that would be adopted into Division 2 of Chapter 10, Article 11 is the 100% fee schedule, assuming that the Board made the finding of extraordinary circumstances.
Chairman Bryant questioned if the BCC adopted at a percentage without the phased-in fee schedule, does the Board have the ability to come back next year and adopt fees 50% higher than what they are set at today. Ms. Encinosa advised that the BCC would have

to do a new Impact Fee Study, as well as a new extraordinary circumstances study, hold the two public workshops and come back at a public hearing to approve. She noted if HB 1080 is signed, it would have to be a unanimous vote at that time.

General discussion ensued.

In response to Commissioner Stone, Ms. Encinosa advised that if the Board wanted to take these rates up gradually over a four year period, it would have to have four rate schedules with language that stipulates here are the rates on October 1, 2025, here are the rates on October 1, 2026, etc.

Ms. Straub advised that if the Board wanted to go to 60% above the new study rate and then increase those rates by 10% annually, the BCC would have to do that by declaring extraordinary circumstances today and include that phased-in schedule in the proposed Ordinance.

Ms. Encinosa stated there is proposed language that includes provisions for penalties and liens, as well as provisions for the uses of the fees. One thing that is changing in that section of the Ordinance with regard to the current system is proposed to have three Road Construction Districts instead of two. The County currently has a District West of Interstate 75 (I-75) and one District East of I-75, and this is proposed to create a third one that is the City of Ocala as it exists today, and it includes enclaves that are in the City of Ocala. There is language; however, that if there is a planned project with a road that cuts across all three Districts, then the Board can make a finding of that and use Impact Fee funds from all three Districts to support that road infrastructure because it will provide a benefit throughout that area.

Ms. Encinosa stated developer credits are done ultimately by a credit agreement with the individual developer if they are going to build some road infrastructure. One change that was previously discussed was to limit the duration of those agreements to five years as opposed to 10 years. This is ultimately a policy decision for how long the Board wants those agreements to go on. The five years with a five year extension is what is currently in the Ordinance. She opined that the BCC could also negotiate the duration of those agreements on a case by case basis.

Commissioner Curry opined that it seems to be inherently unfair to ask developers to negotiate year after year on their projects, not knowing what the economy is going to look like further down the road. He advised that limiting the duration of those credits does not seem to serve any useful purpose except maybe the County's accounting system of those projects. Commissioner Curry opined that it disincentivizes people to negotiate with the County for those credits.

General discussion ensued.

Mr. Bouyounes stated the Board has dealt with this issue for years. He opined that if you wanted to keep discipline in the process, the Credit Agreement can go for five years and could be adjusted and extended for another five years based on this Board making that decision. Mr. Bouyounes advised that there are Impact Fee Credits since the 1980s sitting on the books and it is not just a tracking process, but also it is a liability sitting out there and if you have a developer that is not building and developing, it can go on forever.

General discussion resumed.

It was the general consensus of the Board to leave the language relating to the length of term for Credit Agreements the same as stated in the current Ordinance.

In response to Commissioner Zalak, Ms. Encinosa advised that one of the provisions added to this Ordinance as required by State law through Subsection 7 of the Impact Fee Act, which states if the TIF rates are increased after a credit is granted under this Section, the credit holder shall be entitled to the full benefit of the intensity or density prepaid by the credit amount as of the date the credit was established. For example, if a developer has a 1,000 dwelling unit subdivision and has agreed to put in “X” infrastructure then they get certain number of credits. Even if the Impact Fees go up, they still get to build the 1,000 dwelling units for the credit that they have already received. The County cannot charge a developer any extra if your Impact Fees increase after that credit has been granted.

General discussion ensued.

Ms. Encinosa reiterated that Florida Statute (FS) 163.31801 Subsection 7, specifically states “If an Impact Fee is increased, the holder of any Impact Fee Credits, whether such credits are granted under FS 163.3180, FS 380.06, or otherwise, which were in existence before the increase, is entitled to the full benefit of the intensity or density prepaid by the credit balance as of the date it was first established”.

Ms. Kamp stated she has noticed that other jurisdictions lock in the old Impact Fee schedule for those credits until they are used up.

Commissioner Zalak opined that he would rather hold the credits until the road project is built and dedicated.

Ms. Encinosa stated the Credit Agreement could include language that provides for a credit, but put a time limit on when the road project has to be completed, dedicated and accepted by the County.

General discussion ensued.

ACA Straub noted Coordinator Kim Hatcher, Growth Services, is the Impact Fee person that tracks all of the developers’ agreements and the Impact Fees within Marion County.

Ms. Encinosa advised that the proposed Ordinance would adopt the rate schedule at the 100% calculated rate and keep the current Impact Fee rates in effect until October 1, 2025 and then it would bump up to the new rates after the BCC satisfies the 90 day notice requirement. She stated she would like to offer the Benesh study as to both extraordinary circumstances, which is a separate document, and the rate study for the new TIFs. Ms. Encinosa clarified that if the BCC adopts the Ordinance, it approves the rate study, as well as an extraordinary circumstance finding. There is some additional language in the Ordinance to address compliance with State law by allowing for “all credits available under an Impact Fee Credit Agreement shall be transferable within the applicable Road Construction District”. Ms. Encinosa opined that in order to further comply with State law, it needs to include “or to a development with an adjoining Road Construction District if the construction or contributions that generate the credit will provide direct benefit to the assignee development”.

Commissioner Stone opined that the paragraph should read “the duration of the agreement shall be for a period of five years unless the applicant requests a longer period in which the board may approve a period of up to 20 years”.

Chairman Bryant requested to keep the language “In no event shall the duration exceed twenty (20) years, exclusive of any moratoria, from the date of recording in the official records”.

General discussion ensued.

Ms. Straub addressed government properties, noting an example of a government property is Category 411 “public park” and Category 590 “library” and questioned whether the Board felt that an Impact Fee is appropriate. She advised that when the County builds a fire station, it has been paying Impact Fees. Ms. Straub questioned whether it was the Board’s desire to remove those facilities. It was the general consensus to concur.

Ms. Straub clarified that staff would remove any government properties, whether it was Marion County's, City of Ocala, State property, City of Belleview, municipalities, and any government office. She commented on categories 520, 522, and 530, as it relates to schools, noting those are private schools. The County already exempts public schools.
Chairman Bryant stated she did have a conversation with Ms. Encinosa yesterday to go over what State Statute provides when it comes to this matter. She opined that it would be appropriate to treat private schools the way the County treats public and charter schools. It was the general consensus of the Board to concur.
Ms. Encinosa advised that the Board could utilize public purpose findings and amend the language to read "providing incentives for the creation of Private Schools by exempting Private Schools from the County's Impact Fees serves to reduce the burden on public educational facilities, benefit the community as a whole and constitutes a valid public purpose. Further Private Schools may provide fiscal benefits to the County in excess of the cost of the project's impact to the County's Public Facilities that provides additional justification for exempting Private Schools from the County's Impact Fees".
Ms. Straub commented on ITE codes for various restaurant types, whether it is a drive-thru restaurant or a sit down restaurant. She stated staff created a small local restaurant category back in 2015, in order to help small "mom and pop" restaurants and ensure that they do not have the same barriers as other restaurants.
Commissioner Zalak commented on charging restaurants Impact Fees by the square foot (sf), noting a drive-thru restaurant can have a small square footage but can create a lot more traffic than a dine in/sit down restaurant.
General discussion ensued.
Ms. Straub addressed automated car washes, and how to evaluate these types of businesses. She requested the Board direct staff to perform a localized study and bring that information back within six months for consideration. Ms. Straub advised that anybody who was to come in as of the effective date would need to sign paperwork with the County that says they would pay the Impact Fee upon completion of the study.
Chairman Bryant commented on the various types of car washes, noting some are stand alone and are completely different and are going to have different trip generations than the ones that sit right next to a grocery store where people are already making those stops. She requested that when staff perform that study, they are being cognizant of all of those different parameters.
General discussion ensued.
In response to Chairman Bryant, Ms. Encinosa stated adding those adjustments for car washes and restaurants should not affect the Ordinance.

There was a recess at 3:22 p.m.
The meeting resumed at 3:27 p.m. with all members present, except Commissioner Curry.

Ms. Straub presented a 1 page handout entitled, "Impact Fee and Assessment Rates for Consideration". She stated this is an updated handout that shows that a 2,000 sf residential home would pay $5,520.44.
Commissioner Curry returned at 3:28 p.m.
Commissioner Curry advised that if a property owner is building a 2,000 sf house today, the TIF is currently at $1,397.00; Education Impact Fee is $43.07; building permit $600.00; miscellaneous permitting fees are $300.00; to connect to an existing water and

sewer is $6,013.00; and a for ready to hook up septic and sewer permit is $450.00; for a total of approximately $13,000.00 and that does not include the Fire Assessment that the BCC approved today.

PUBLIC COMMENT
Chairman Bryant opened the floor for public comment.
Len Racioppi, SW 85th Street, on behalf of the Marion County Republican Executive Committee, presented a 1 page e-mail dated May 23, 2025. He advised that the electronic mail (email) reflects the organization's support of increasing the current TIFs well above 50% and to the maximum level to avoid essentially 2 things: 1) future funding shortfalls (County debt) and 2) the potential for increased taxes. Mr. Racioppi stated everyone knows the County has grown extensively over the last several years. The growth is reflected in the number of permits, traffic, and the stress on infrastructure needs. He commented on the studies by the consultant that show Marion County is going to need to spend more than a $1,000,000,000.00 on road infrastructure and will have a $500,000,000.00 shortfall. Mr. Racioppi advised that currently developers have a highly discounted 2015 fee, noting his organization supports private industry and free enterprise, but it should not be subsidized by taxpayers.
Bruce Atkinson, NW 150th Avenue, Micanopy, advised that he supports immediately increasing the Impact Fees to the 100% TIF rate to help get the County out of its infrastructure deficit. He advised that Marion County residents are not afraid to pay their fair share, noting they voted to keep the One Cent Sales Tax for another 20 years. Taxpayers also voted to approve additional taxes for public school capital improvements. Mr. Atkinson stated property owners are all paying increased property taxes directly or indirectly and it is time developers paid their share as well. He opined that increasing Impact Fees would be good for the County, noting government needs to stop approving tax bailouts and/or subsidies for developers and businesses.
Mike Wandersleben, SW 129th Terrace Road, advised that he is present on behalf of Bridge Homes and is a member of the Marion County Building Industry Association (MCBIA). He stated he understands the need for roads and fire stations; however, permit fees have risen from $1,500.00 three years ago to $8,000.00. Mr. Wandersleben noted lot fees have risen to about $30,000.00. Subcontractors are trying to raise their prices with the tariffs. He stated builders are getting pinched in every corner and affordable homes are no longer affordable. Mr. Wandersleben requested the BCC to consider not raising the Impact Fees to help keep affordable homes in Marion County, otherwise builders are not motivated to build affordable homes anymore.
David Tillman, SE 16th Avenue, MCBIA President, stated he agreed with Mr. Wondersleben that Impact Fees do affect affordability and what is being proposed is a significant increase. He advised that when this matter was first proposed, developers were informed that if the One Cent Sales Tax passed, then the increase in Impact Fees would not significantly increase ($200.00 to $300.00). Mr. Tillman stated the building industry got onboard to help support the Sales Tax; however, now they are being told that Impact Fees are being increased by thousands of dollars. He opined that the Impact Fees do not need to be implemented at the 100% rate. Mr. Tillman advised that builders are paying sales tax on all the materials they use and now the County is double dipping into the builders' pocket when it comes to the Impact Fees. He opined that raising Impacts Fees so high is going to discourage commercial development near residential, thereby causing longer trips for residents to get to existing commercial businesses.

Don Shlonski, SE 152nd Lane, commented on the work product (email) provided by the Marion County Republican Executive Committee, noting a lot of time, effort, and input went into it. He advised that it is important that Impact Fees are distributed appropriately between the builders and the residents, noting the organization wants the high quality of people to continue to live here in Marion County so that the businesses will choose to be in America.

Brigitte Smith, SW 85th Avenue, expressed concern that if the Impact Fees are adopted at 50%, it would still leave the County with a deficit. She opined that setting the rate at 77% would be more reasonable and equitable.

Tom Fisher, SE 40th Lane, stated the County is in a crisis level in regard to road infrastructure needs. He advised that he is in support of the Impact Fees, noting growth needs to pay for itself.

Pat Driscoll, SE 162nd Street, Weirsdale, advised that she lives on a fixed income and does not want citizens to carry all of the burden for the building industry.

Ken Ausley, SE 36th Avenue, advised that builders do not pay Impact Fees, noting they are passed on to the end users. He stated this will end up being a tax on home buyers.

Denise Alexander, NE 25th Avenue, stated she agrees with Mr. Ausley.

Jimmy Gooding, SE 36th Avenue, advised that he agrees with the Board's decision in regard to the length of duration for Impact Fee Credits. He stated he is confused with what the Board is proposing in regard to carwashes. Mr. Gooding expressed concern with the Board adopting an Ordinance prior to performing a local study relating to the impact of carwashes and drive-thru restaurants. He proposed that the County go to 50% for all commercial users, noting it would be better than performing a new study and being in jeopardy of being legally challenged. Mr. Gooding addressed several technical problems with the Ordinance, noting staff are proposing new language that the liability for The Impact Fees run with the land due to concern about staff being overburdened. He opined staff will be very overburdened when they start receiving calls from title companies wanting to know if their Impact Fees have been properly paid. Mr. Gooding expressed concern with the language proposing a lien to secure the Impact Fees, noting the County could instead hold the Certificate of Occupancy (CO) until the fees are paid. He stated the proposed Ordinance refers to a document (Impact Fee Study Manual), which he is unable to find and questioned whether the Office of the County Engineer (OCE) has that document. Mr. Gooding advised that those are just some technical problems with the Ordinance that need to be addressed before the Board adopts something today.

In response to Chairman Bryant, Ms. Encinosa advised that it is her understanding that there will be an asterisk symbol utilized for automated carwashes that states that the fee is being studied, and it will come back depending on the magnitude of that fee, based upon what a business would pay today under a comparable category. She commented on liens that run with the land and clarified that what it means legally is that if, for whatever reason, there is an Impact Fee due and it is inadvertently not collected, the owner of the land would still be liable for that fee. Ms. Encinosa stated there is already language in the Ordinance that states when a business gets a credit, it runs with the land; therefore, the Impact Fee burden should also run with the land and most Impact Fees in the State of Florida have that exact language in them.

Commissioner Zalak opined that in regard to automated car washes, the Board has two options where it could enact the fee that is currently in the program today and then once the study's done, the County could give a rebate of the difference, if any, or it could put zero in there today, wait for the study to be done and then have them pay upon agreement with the CO.

Ms. Kamp advised that the current self-service car wash rate is $811.00 per lane and if the Board adopted the new fee schedule, the self-service car wash would be $5,691.00 per bay (lane).

General discussion ensued.

In response to Chairman Bryant, Mr. Bouyounes advised that to his knowledge the County does not have an issue with collecting Impact Fees prior to issuing a CO.

Chairman Bryant directed staff to strike the language regarding liability running with the land and placing liens to secure and go back to the language that the Impact Fees are collected prior to issuing a CO.

ACA Straub advised that along with the Impact Fee Study there is a procedures manual (Impact Fee Study Manual), noting staff will ensure that manual is published on the County's website. She advised that staff will be creating a Geographic Information Systems (GIS) layer as it relates to the City of Ocala boundaries and County enclaves.

Tamara Fleischhacker, SE 3rd Street, advised that she is the interim Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the Ocala Metro Chamber and Economic Partnership (CEP), representing the business community and its shared commitment to responsible growth and infrastructure investment. She advised that the business community strongly supported the renewal of the One Cent Infrastructure Sales Tax, a clear signal that it is aligned in prioritizing transportation and first responders. However, the business community is concerned by the proposal to implement Impact Fees at 100% of the allowable rate immediately, especially so soon after passing the 20 year sales tax renewal. Ms. Fleischhacker opined that sudden high Impact Fees make Marion County less attractive to businesses and developers pushing projects and potentially jobs to compete in other communities. She stated the CEP recognizes the County's goal is to slow growth, but this also weakens competitiveness, and the community risks losing out on transformative investments. Ms. Fleischhacker stated full residential fees will drive up the cost of new homes, pricing out middle income families and essential workers, and exacerbating the already serious housing affordability crisis. Small businesses and local entrepreneurs face the steepest challenges in absorbing added costs. Meanwhile, working families bear the brunt when housing prices rise, and local businesses suffer. She advised that tourism is also a vital part of this economy, and high commercial Impact Fees can discourage investments in hotels, restaurants and entertainment venues which already operate on low margins. Ms. Fleischhacker opined that making it more expensive to build and improve facilities like convention centers, event spacing, etc., limits the ability to attract large scale events. She stated businesses absorb these costs and will pass them on to visitors through higher lodging, dining and entertainment pricing, making the County less competitive with neighboring destinations. Ms. Fleischhacker opined that implementing maximum fees without comprehensive local data and phased-in planning could open the door to legal challenges and risk delay in moving forward. She advised that the CEP strongly recommends a deliberate phased-in approach, beginning at 50% of the calculated rate for both commercial and residential, noting this gives time for proper planning, adjustment and continued investment without stalling growth and deepening the housing affordability concerns.

Former Commissioner Glen Fiorello, SE 9th Avenue, advised that he is present to represent taxpayers because that is what this is all really about, noting at the end of the day, it will be taxpayers that pick up the blunt of getting infrastructure in place if the Board does not do anything whatsoever with Impact Fees. He opined that the developer did not create the issue, the builders and everyone that worked on that job site did not create it, noting the ultimate person that creates it is the buyer. They create the impact when they move into Marion County.

Ken Metcalf, Stearns Weaver Miller Weissler Alhadeff & Sitterson, East College Avenue, Tallahassee, referred to Attachment A of the 12 page letter from his firm dated May 22, 2025 objecting to the County's proposed TIF Ordinance. He opined that there are two main variables for calculating demand for an Impact Fee Ordinance: 1) trip length and 2) trip generation. Mr. Metcalf expressed concern with the timeframe of the data utilized in the Benesch study, noting the trip length data goes from 1986 through 2009 and the land use categories data is from the 1990s to the early 2000's. He noted the trip generation data includes information from outside the United States (US). Mr. Metcalf advised that the law requires that the County actually evaluate the impacts on a District by District basis. The City of Ocala's trip links are going to be different than the East Benefit District and the West Benefit District. Those are the minimum requirements of case law, as well as the minimum requirements of the Statute.

In response to Chairman Bryant, Ms. Encinosa advised that what the Statute requires is that the Impact Fee calculation is based on a study using the most recent and localized data available within four years of the current Impact Fee update. She clarified that it does not say that calculations had to be generated within that four year timeframe and it also does not have to be 100% local, but it has to be as local and recent as you can get the information. Ms. Encinosa addressed Road Construction Districts, noting those are expenditure Districts. She clarified that the County has a uniform fee and then it has Districts to expend the money within the area where it was collected, unless it is an arterial road that provides a benefit that crosses multiple Districts. Ms. Encinosa advised that if any developer has an issue and believes that they are creating less of an impact, they can do their own study and show that they are creating less of an impact and the County will decrease their fee in accordance with the procedures in the Ordinance.

Mr. Bouyounes questioned when a new development application comes to the County and the developer does a traffic Impact Analysis to determine the impact on the existing system, what rate do you use, what manual, and what trip generation rate do you use to evaluate that impact. Ms. Kamp advised that the developer would utilize ITE for the traffic analysis.

Jessica Icerman, Stearns Weaver Miller Weissler Alhadeff & Sitterson, East Jackson Street, Tampa, advised that she is representing On Top of the World (OTOW) communities and Colen Built Development. She stated property rights are held sacred in America and applicable State laws codify constitutional interpretations by the Courts. The strict requirements on study methodology are based on ensuring that Impact Fees do not cross the line into unlawful exactions, so for the purposes of today's consideration, an Impact Fee must have a nexus and be roughly proportional to the impact caused by the development. Ms. Icerman opined that the study's data is fundamentally flawed, both technically and legally. She advised that the study must be initiated within the last 12 months, noting this study was initiated in 2023. Ms. Icerman stated another provision of the Ordinance that was bothersome was the provision regarding the Impact Fee Credits running with the land. State law and the proposed Ordinance now recognizes that Impact Fee Credits are actually transferable. She clarified that when the County enters into an Impact Fee Credit Agreement, it is with an entity or company, and it does not run with the land. Ms. Icerman opined that adopting the Impact Fees at 100% of the calculated rate will have negative impacts on the local economy. She advised that in a legal challenge, the burden is on the County to prove each facet of compliance with State law. Moreover, a Court will not, and is actually prohibited from, deferring to the County in this type of legal action. Ms. Icerman stated her clients support an elimination of the five year limitation cap and an Impact Fee of 50% of the calculated rate, noting they are also willing to work with the County to strengthen the Ordinance and to make it more legally defensible.

Mr. Minter addressed one of the items that Ms. Icerman brought up in regard to the requirement for the study to be within 12 months of initiation of the new Impact Fee Study and their letter said the County approved the contract with Benesch on May 21, 2023; however, the County subsequently did authorize a new study, which is what is being presented today, and that new study, although he is unsure of the exact date, was within the 12 month timeframe.

City of Ocala Manager Peter Lee, SE Watula Avenue, referred to the 2 page letter dated May 1, 2025 from him on behalf of the City of Ocala, noting City staff still want to consider a mobility fee as utilized in Sarasota and Pasco Counties and approximately 20 other jurisdictions. He stated the City of Ocala has begun working with County staff to re-do the ILA to align with the updated program and procedures.

In response to Chairman Bryant, Mr. Bouyounes advised that City and County staff are working toward a draft ILA for BCC and City Council consideration; however, he does not have a timeline as to when it will be presented for consideration. He stated the City is aware that the County will be adding a 3rd District that encompasses the City. Mr. Bouyounes noted there is still ongoing discussion as to when to perform a mobility fee study.

Mr. Minter advised that City Attorney William Sexton would be preparing the first draft of the ILA. He clarified that the question is whether the City would agree to the ILA if the Ordinance were adopted as presented today, noting if there is no ILA in place, then the County would need to come up with an alternate collection of fees method.

Mr. Bouyounes stated there is an ILA currently in place and unless that Agreement is terminated then there is an Agreement to collect.

Mr. Lee stated he will address this with the City at their next meeting.

Mr. Minter advised that in regard to the extraordinary circumstances, if the BCC wanted to reduce the Impact Fees, it does not have to go through any kind of special procedure to reduce those fees. Theoretically, if and when the City adopts a mobility fee, they could bring that issue back to the County and the County could make whatever decision it thinks is appropriate at that time.

Chairman Bryant stated it is her assumption that since the County received correspondence from the City that they are aware of the proposed Ordinance and if there had been any concerns from any of the Council members, they would have sent some kind of correspondence other than what has already been identified or they would have reached out to a Commissioner.

Mr. Lee advised that it is not the City's intent to double dip or have anyone pay double taxes by the implementation of a mobility fee. He clarified that the City Council sees the City and specific areas within the City as areas where it would like to promote development. There are areas that are on an urban transect that clearly should be developed and as was alluded to earlier, different places (City, County, etc.) have different trip lengths. Mr. Lee expressed concerns that the proposed Ordinance could have effects on Community Redevelopment Areas (CRAs), as well as affordable housing.

Mr. Bouyounes advised that if the City wanted to look at a small area encompassing part of the City and they wanted to advance that and do a mobility study, it would have to

come back to the BCC to adjust the Ordinance to allow a mobility fee.
Commissioner Curry opined that a mobility fee might be an appropriate thing for the Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) to discuss at that level.
In response to Commissioner Curry, Mr. Bouyounes clarified that if the City implemented a mobility fee, the County would have TIFs in certain areas and the mobility fee in certain areas until a Countywide mobility study is performed and then the Board can decide what to do at that time.
In response to Commissioner Zalak, Ms. Kamp stated Orange County has a multimodal fee, which is the same thing as a mobility fee, within the City of Orlando only because there are not too many roadway projects within the City limits; however, the rest of Orange County has a roadway based TIF because they have a lot of projects that they need to build so they do not want to mix other modes.
Chairman Bryant advised that she has been given the answer to the question in regard to the requirement for the study to be within 12 months of initiation of the new Impact Fee Study, noting staff changed the scope of service with Benesch Consulting on October 15, 2024 and it went in front of the BCC November 5, 2024 for approval of the contract amendment to include the Impact Fee Study.
Mr. Bouyounes commented on Commissioner Curry's suggestion about having a mobility fee discussion at a TPO meeting and opined that it would be a good platform because you have all the members from the different municipalities present to discuss mobility and Impact Fees.
Ms. Straub advised that currently a developer would not pay Impact Fees until it was time for the CO; however, you get locked down on what your Impact Fee rate is based on when you submit your actual completed application. She clarified that if somebody were to submit an application today, they are under today's rate, but they would not pay until they CO, which might not happen until sometime next year.
Chairman Bryant advised that public comment is now closed.

BOARD DISCUSSION:
In response to Commissioner Stone, Ms. Straub stated fast food restaurants would be an ITE category of 934 (fast food with drive-thru) and for a building of 1,000 sf it would have a rate of $49,319.00.
Mr. Minter expressed concern about adding that category into this Ordinance right now, even though the title of the Ordinance is Transportation Impact Fees, he stated he is concerned about adding a brand new fee for $49,000.00 in the middle of a public hearing.
Ms. Encinosa advised that from an Ordinance standpoint, adding the new category would not change the title of the Ordinance, but the Board can always bring this matter back later when it brings back automated car washes if that's something it wants to pursue. It was the general consensus of the Board to concur.
General discussion ensued.
Mr. Minter clarified that the proposed Ordinance originally had automated car washes at $100,000.00, then it was changed to just putting an asterisk until a study could be performed. He stated the Board can leave the $100,000.00, which is what has been included in the table already, staff can still do the study, and the Board can always reduce it in the future. Or alternatively, if somebody wants to do their own individual study, they can do that.
Chairman Bryant concurred that the Board should leave the $100,000.00 in the Ordinance and if someone wants to do their own study, then they can present their findings to the

BCC for consideration.
Mr. Minter addressed the modern automated tunnel car wash, which he opined is totally different than the basic wand car wash, so he does not view the number in there for the tunnel car wash as being the same category as what the Ordinance currently has. He stated he views it as a brand new category.
In response to Commissioner Zalak, Mr. Minter recommended a new study be performed relating to traffic generated by drive-thru restaurants and he does not recommend inserting it into the proposed Ordinance at this time. He advised that the BCC would have to hold another public hearing and amend the Ordinance, noting there is a Legislative justification for breaking them out into a separate category.
General discussion ensued.
It was the general consensus of the Board to direct staff to schedule a separate public hearing to consider amending the Ordinance to include a new category for drive-thru restaurants.
General discussion resumed.
Chairman Bryant requested staff also review gas stations that have a convenience store and food restaurant attached.
General discussion resumed.
Mr. Gooding opined that data for automated carwashes is inflated and expressed concern if the Board adopts the fee based on that data. He recommended the BCC leave the asterisk until the study is performed.
Chairman Bryant stated if a business believes the data is incorrect, they can perform their own study and bring that information back to the Board for consideration.
Mr. Gooding advised that the Statute stipulates that the burden is on the County to adopt a study based on data.
Chairman Bryant clarified that the County is not trying to place undue burden onto developers.
General discussion ensued.
Commissioner Zalak advised that if an asterisk is put in the Ordinance, then the developer or business owner would sign a contract stipulating that once the County performs its study, then the developer would pay that Impact Fee as reflected in the study.
Ms. Kamp stated the ITE numbers are based on three studies per tunnel and one study based on square footage. She clarified that automated car washes have limited data just like many other land uses, but the study contains the best data available.
Chairman Bryant proposed the Board treat automated car washes as a new category just like drive-thru restaurants and bring both of those things back as amendments to the Ordinance once the local studies are completed.
General discussion resumed.
Commissioner McClain expressed concern as to what would happen to the economy if the Board pulled hundreds of millions of dollars out of the economy by implementing high Impact Fees. He noted he agreed that the County needs Impact Fees, but they need to be reasonable. Commissioner McClain stated there is a reason why in the State Statute the Legislature had these things implemented over a period of time and not in one big hit. He stated he could not support an increase higher than 50%.
Chairman Bryant noted the study states that Impact Fees at 72% can get the County to where it can be whole over the course of the next 20 years conservatively.
General discussion resumed.
Ms. Encinosa advised that right now what the Statute allows is that the County can

increase to 50% of its current fee, that is where the cap applies, not 50% of the calculated fee.
Chairman Bryant questioned if the County implemented at 65% of the calculated fee this year, then next year could it increase the rate up to 50% without declaring extraordinary circumstance and implement that rate over the course of the next four years.
Ms. Encinosa clarified that unless the Board adopted those phased-in rates today, the Statute would prevent the County from increasing Impact Fee rates more than once every four years.
General discussion ensued.
Commissioner Zalak advised that the plan that is currently in place today fixes some of the issues, but it does not really give the County a significant long term capacity increase solution after the developments come to fruition.
General discussion resumed.
Commissioner Curry advised that he wants a plan that will set the County up for success going forward and also prevent any legal action that would tie the County up for more than a year and avoid the cost if a challenge happened, which there is a very good chance it would, particularly if the rates are set at 100%.
Commissioner Stone opined that the County needs commercial where it already has so many house tops, noting commercial needs to go out there to fill that gap and keep residents in their neighborhoods without driving all over town and across the County clogging up the road system. She suggested taking commercial development down to the 50% rate and then utilizing a phased-in approach.
Ms. Encinosa advised that it is NGNs recommendation that the County maintain proportionality between rate categories so that if you are collecting at 50% for one, you collect at 50% for another. Unless there is some public purpose that can be identified as to why the County would want this specific category to basically be paid through the General Fund or other legally available funding sources instead of having their Impact Fee paid at the same rates. She commented on the possibility of utilizing economic development incentive programs for certain targeted industries, but as far as buying all commercial down at a different rate than residential, that is not something she would recommend today.
General discussion ensued relating to rate percentages.

There was a recess at 5:25 p.m.
The meeting reconvened at 5:33 p.m.

Chairman Bryant advised that she spoke with the County Administrator and County Legal during the break and was notified that one of the things that the Board can do is set the Impact Fee rate at 70% for the first year, then over the course of the next three years, those increments would be increased by 10% annually, the County could then track the fees and if collecting more revenue than needed, the Board could lower the rates. She clarified that the rates would be a dollar amount that is outlined in the fee schedule.
General discussion ensued.
Mr. Minter clarified that there would be 5 years of schedules in this Ordinance, so people can see what the fee would be 2 years from now, unless in that specific year the Board decides to lower the fee.
General discussion resumed.
Ms. Encinosa verified that the fee schedule that will go into effect on October 1, 2025 will

be at 70% and the fee schedule is to be increased by 10% on October 1, 2026, another 10% on October 1, 2027 and another 10% on October 1, 2028.

It was the general consensus of the Board to concur.

A motion was made by Commissioner Stone, seconded by Commissioner Zalak, to adopt Ordinance 25-18 amending Chapter 10 of the Marion County Code providing general standards and definitions applicable to all Marion County Impact Fees; and specifically updating Transportation Impact Fees, including findings; setting the Impact Fee rate at 70% for the first year, then over the course of the next three years, those increments would be increased by 10% annually; adopting the technical study; administrative procedures; and finding extraordinary circumstances supporting rate increases.

Ms. Encinosa advised that in regard to changes in the language for Developer Agreements, the length of term is going back to the 5 years with the ability to ask for up to 20 years, and will include adding in the transferability of the Developer credit language. She clarified that the proposed language that Developer credits will run with the land is being removed, as well as the language stating that the lien runs with the property will be removed. Ms. Encinosa clarified that rates for the automated car wash and fast food restaurant will both come back at a later date. She advised that language to exempt Government property is being added to the exemption section, as well as adding language to include private schools as an exemption along with public and charter schools.

Commissioner Curry stated the reason he is supporting the motion for setting the TIF rate at 70% is due to the TIF projections for FY 2020 through 2024, noting this is a good place to land.

Commissioner McClain expressed concern that adopting the proposed rate would be a mistake. He opined it will hurt housing affordability for first time homebuyers, and will raise property values, which in turns raises property taxes. Commissioner McClain stated this will hurt local small builders.

The motion was approved by a vote of 4-1, with Commissioner McClain voting nay.

Ordinance 25-18 is entitled:

AN ORDINANCE OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF MARION COUNTY, FLORIDA, REGARDING IMPACT FEES FOR TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES; FINDING EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES EXIST NECESSITATING AN INCREASE IN TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE RATES IN EXCESS OF THOSE PHASE-IN LIMITATIONS SET FORTH IN SECTION 163.31801, FLORIDA STATUTES; REDESIGNATING ARTICLE XI OF CHAPTER 10 OF THE MARION COUNTY CODE OF ORDINANCES AS "IMPACT FEES;" PROVIDING CERTAIN RECITALS; AMENDING ARTICLE XI OF CHAPTER 10 OF THE MARION COUNTY CODE REGARDING IMPACT FEES FOR TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES, INCLUDING SECTION 10-271 SHORT TITLE, AUTHORITY, AND APPLICABILITY, SECTION 10-272 INTENT AND PURPOSE, SECTION 10-273 DEFINITIONS, SECTION 10-275 WHO MUST PAY IMPACT FEES, SECTION 10-277 REBATE OF IMPACT FEES PAID, SECTION 10-278 INDEPENDENT IMPACT ANALYSIS, SECTION 10-279 LOCAL STUDIES; FIVE-YEAR UPDATE, SECTION 10-280 REVIEW HEARINGS BEFORE A HEARING OFFICER, SECTION 10-321 FINDINGS, SECTION 10-322 COMPUTATION OF AMOUNT OF FEES, SECTION 10-323 DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTION

CREDITS, SECTION 10-325 USE OF FUNDS, SECTION 10-327 TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE SCHEDULE; REPEALING SECTION 10-282 OF THE MARION COUNTY CODE ON INDEXING; REPEALING SECTION 10-283 OF THE MARION COUNTY CODE ON ANNUAL INDEXING PROCEDURE; ADOPTING A NEW SECTION 10-282 OF THE MARION COUNTY CODE ON ADOPTION OF IMPACT FEE TECHNICAL STUDIES; ADOPTING A NEW SECTION 10-283 OF THE MARION COUNTY CODE ON ADMINISTRATIVE CHARGES; ADOPTING A NEW SECTION 10-286 OF THE MARION COUNTY CODE ON EXEMPTIONS; ADOPTING A NEW SECTION 10-287 OF THE MARION COUNTY CODE ON PENALTIES AND LIENS; ADOPTING A NEW SECTION 10-324 OF THE MARION COUNTY CODE ON DEFINITIONS APPLICABLE TO TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEES; REPEALING SECTION 10-326 OF THE MARION COUNTY CODE ON MOBILE HOME IMPACT FEES; DIRECTING THE PROVISION OF NOTICE OF IMPACT FEE RATES; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY, CODIFICATION, LIBERAL CONSTRUCTION, AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

CLOSING COMMENTS:

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting thereupon adjourned at 5:41 p.m.

____
Kathy Bryant, Chairman

Attest:

____
Gregory C. Harrell, Clerk