

Closed Captions Transcripts 10.6.2026 Meeting

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Okay good morning and welcome to the October 6, 2026 Volusia County Council meeting. It's good to see everybody here. All of the cameras. If you have a cell phone please silence it. We will go on with the meeting. I will give you a couple of directions first. I will tell you we have by your popular demand we have a new sound and audio system today is the first day you are using it. Have a grace for us if there is a glitch anywhere. We will start the meeting with an invocation and Pledge of Allegiance if you are member of the faith group who would like to participate in an invocation for our meeting please just send an email to kgreen@volusia.gov that is cursor over here she'll get you all set up where you can apply all faith groups are welcome this morning we are fortunate to have Pastor Mose Hawkins, No Limit Praise Tabernacle of DeLand. Pastor if you would like to come.

>> PASTOR MOSE HAWKINS: Let us pray. But the God in the name of Jesus God we thank you God for this opportunity God God's Council has this County has invited me into this session God into their meeting God that you might guide that you might provide wisdom God you might provide grace God now that God guide every decision father God influence God every direction father for the betterment of this community Lord God we will give you the name and promise and honor and glory in Jesus holy name we pray. Amen "I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Karissa, Can you please call the roll?

>> MATT REINHART,VICE CHAIR:?

>> DANNY ROBINS,DISTRICT 3: Here.

>> DAVID SANTIAGO,DISTRICT 5: Here.

>> DON DEMPSEY,DISTRICT 1: Here.

>> JAKE JOHANSSON,AT-LARGE: Here.

>> TROY KENT,DISTRICT 4: Here.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Here is your microphone working. Let the record reflect there is a quorum physically present here at the meeting Vice Chair Matt Rienhart is in the meeting virtually not physically present. I need a motion from the members of the commission to recognize Vice Chair Matt Rienhart is participating and voting virtually due to an extraordinary circumstance involving an illness, serious medical condition and physical disability. I will add that he is fine.

>> TROY KENT,DISTRICT 4: Chairman move approval it doesn't sound like my microphone is working.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: I think I'm the only one with a working microphone. This will be fun.

>> MATT REINHART,VICE CHAIR: I make a motion to approve.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: To allow Matt Rienhart to participate.

>> TROY KENT,DISTRICT 4: I make a motion to approve.

>> DON DEMPSEY,DISTRICT 1: I second the motion.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR:

All in favor signify by saying,aye?

>> Board Voting: Aye.

Anyone opposed say nay? That passes unanimously.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER, CHAIR: Met wherever you are I hope you're listening you can participate any participation forms. While she is bringing that I will let everybody know when I call your name. If you come to the podium to appear at the opening public participation you can talk about anything that pertains to the county, something that the Council might vote on in subsequent meetings. Please use a microphone at the podium to make sure they are near your mouth. The monitor will have a clock so it won't have any videos that will be above my head. If you're using those. First this morning if you would please tell us where you are from you don't have to give it your whole address for safety reasons but let us know what part of the county you're in so your representatives know who you are. First up today is.[Listing Names].

>> PUBLIC PARTICIPATION: Good Morning it is.[Listing Names]. I think this one might be working. Chair where I am from Daytona Beach Shores Florida Matt Rienhart is our representative. My name is.[Listing Names] I'm at the Florida attorney I've been secretary of trustees I served for approximately 25 years. I'm asking you this morning to place full restoration of the Volusia County law libraries 2026 2027 funding on the October 20 agenda so the Council can consider the Budget amendment necessary to restore funding. Our system of government depends on three separate branches and the judicial branch must be accessible to ordinary citizens. Access to the courts cannot be meaningful only for people who can afford a lawyer a computer or reliable Internet service. These ordinary citizens are people who walk into the courthouse frightened and confused and often unable to afford an attorney. A judge or clerk may direct someone to the law library for formal legal information; it may be a mother dealing with custody, or a tenant facing eviction. A person seeking protection from mystic violence. Or someone trying to understand probate or small claims. The law library's staff does not practice law and does not give legal advice. What they do is give citizens access to the legal system, helping them locate court approved forms, to use legal research tools and find materials that judges themselves sometimes direct litigants to obtain. Please do not assume that everyone can simply go home and do this on a computer. Many people who use the law library do not own one. Some have nothing more than a prepaid cell phone telling them that a form or statute online is not the same thing as giving them meaningful access to the courts. If this

resource disappears, where are those people supposed to go? Their legal problems do not disappear. They will go back to the clerk's office or judicial staff. They will search the Internet and hope what they find is accurate and applicable in Florida. And some will simply give up. I served this institution for 25 years. I know what it means in his community and I know that the people who've kept it running. I'm asking you again to please place full restoration of the Volusia County law libraries 2026/ 2027 funding on the October 20 agenda and give this Council the opportunity to consider the Budget amendment needed to keep this 75 year old public gateway to the courts OPEN please do not allow that doorway to close without first having had a full discussion of what the library does, who depends on it and what will happen if it is gone. Thank you.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Thank you Council we have one more person who would like to speak on this issue. With your permission I'd like to make a suggestion to the County manager and I discussed yesterday with his staff. I think there is one more speaker. If you would see George tell me if this works for you if she can see the assistant County Manager? The County Manager would like to set up a meeting to speak with your group. And come to her resolution. Okay. Next we have.[Listing Names].

>> PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Testing.

>> PUBLIC PARTICIPATION: Good morning thank you I will keep it short I appreciate you all since Chair Brower members of the Council I practice law in DeLand Board of Trustees for the Volusia County law library we had a resolution asking to reconsider seems like that is on the table I want offer a way to talking by changing the tax rate. An vital information about what the law library does essentially what the law library explanation is a low cost high-impact service closing after 75 years of operation the impact of the library has a people is very hot between 30 and 40,000 people use the system each year across locations that's more than the entire publishing of DeLand every year. Low library they cannot afford an attorney because the keeping the law library very low less than 1/10 of 1% small drop in the bucket of \$1 billion Budget .04% of overall spending cuts to local library that is not low-cost from government spending standpoint I don't know what is for comparison the County appropriated 16 times the amount requested on Mosquito Control. From a fiscal policy

making standpoint, cutting high-end impact low-cost services is nonexempt if you could do something to the low-impact high cost of service, not the other way around. While removing the service is very it does not remove the needed moves those people the good news the solution is easy use reserve temporary grace the gap until next year you've done this with the other departments when you adopted rollback rate for the Sheriff's funding reassuring the county's funding law library is the same decision don't raise taxes that doesn't touch the Sheriff's funding does not do the Roll-back what I'm asking you to please direct the manager placed the Budget amendment on the next agenda for restore and can assure for the fiscal year 2026/2007 use the reserve make it one time lowest reasonable opportunity to sit down at the table and be heard next year.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Thank you Linda assistant County Manager would you raise your hand a second. Do you all see him back there if you would speak to him he will set up a meeting for you to just discuss your issues.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: [Listing Names]. Assistant County Manager would raise your hand.

>> PUBLIC PARTICIPATION: Good morning Council Volusia County charter amendment number five is a wolf in sheep's clothing. It is cloaked as a production amendment for land conservation using terms like super majority vote to sell or convey land placed on the conservation registry. This amendment was crafted by and for developers to gain access to developing our conservation land amendment five is a literal developer's dream. This spokesman who represented this moment to you at Councilman July was also the chair of the Charter Review Commission he represents developers for a living he is also the managing partner of the largest land use firm for development in Volusia County. Not knocking his profession just stating a fact. This is a big red flag and should be concern for everyone in July the threshold is too high for the registry because already votes on whether to approve conservation land for purchase if we purchase it for conservation why do we need any further vote by the council to add to a registry it should be automatically placed on the registry in addition another red flag is the problematic language contained in subsection 3 of the ordinance which is not contained in the actual ballot language subsection 3 contains a significant carveout or a County public purpose that negates a vote of the County Council public notice requirements for transferring land to another use. The County can remove land from conservation under the extremely loose and broad

definition of a County public purpose. No Council vote no public notice the loophole in subsection 3 so large you can drive a bulldozer through it and there is no doubt that Councilman Robins and Councilman Dempsey both well in addition there is no police protection for conservation land a County Parks and reversion spaces are not included there is no advisory vote of the people three counties and five cities actually have a voter referendum requirement to sell or change land it to another use several counties and cities also have these protections this is a procedural safeguard its allowed under the Florida Constitution. It should be noted that the four CRC members voted against placing charter member number five on the ballot however if they were outvoted by 10 other CRC members that you placed on the commission. This Council had the opportunity and the authority to place a stronger amendment on the ballot to protect our conservation land; one that did not contain the sneaky carveout for County public purposes did not require Council vote to be placed on the registry. Required a full majority Council vote to sell or change the use. However only Councilman Kent and it Chair Brower supported a stronger amendment the rest of you only claimed to support the program but your actions and inaction don't match your words constitutional law attorney in her September 18 and presentation and Port Orange recommended no vote on County amendment number five due to the carveout and subsection number three. Thank you.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Thank you for your comments.[Listing Names].

>> PUBLIC PARTICIPATION: Good morning.[Listing Names] president of Volusia County fire and local 3574. Not sure if you are aware of a little media attention of one of our first Nations and Lake Helen, the past couple weeks. Just around the story short it's got a toxic mold in it. Sometimes the media captures everything I like to say. Sometimes it doesn't. I'm sure you guys have been privy to that. I want to thank the Chief director Hinckley for making sure this is an issue. Any problem once it comes to their attention here, take care of it. It impacts a little bit of service delivery. Shout out to the City of Lake Helen for letting us stay in that building. To improve that response time. But this problem was known for three years. I've got the documentation that my guys are sick. Health and safety is paramount. Secondary to that the committee is suffering because of the response times. Thirdly, if we want to just not depend on this over the last three years, now we are one quarter million \$350,000 to the taxpayer. These guys were reporting for three years. I got the documentation that I'm trying to air dirty laundry but I also don't like being told I'm a liar or anything like that. I just want to say I appreciate you doing that. I appreciate you guys making sure it gets fixed. I hope that we can do some resilience testing on our other

facilities. I'd be happy to take you for a tour. I would love to plan a bonding of fire stations. What we're doing at 15 it's great to land at 47. It is great! I think you guys are moving in the right direction. I really just want to start thinking about the future. I will be commenting on Item G. I have a solution for that. I think we can use those funds which are not even outlined in Item G and maybe help out the law library. Thank you.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Thank you for your comments John Nicholson.

>> PUBLIC PARTICIPATION: Please don't bend it. John Nicholson Daytona Beach side last week I'm pushing I like the idea of having people that are coming or running for office for the County Council appear before the County Council so that we the public as a total get to see who and what they are. There have been I think three or four that are running that have come up for us. You see Wendy all the time. We know Wendy, we know what she stands for and what she's going to do. There is a gentleman running against Danny I've seen three times. I've just got more information from him this past weekend. Otherwise I know absolutely nothing about him. The reason why I am saying that is because you have makeup . I mentioned it before you have a city manager, you have a person that has been in the statehouse, you have somebody who is working for the county. A lawyer, all of these things bring a great deal of information and knowledge to your discussions. More than once David or Troy has mentioned the other has brought something up they never thought of. These kinds of things matter when you bring somebody in the best no background in public office or in public life, it is going to affect your Council. It will affect how you deal with things. I was hit with why in God's name. What you mentioned Danny, he hates you. That has nothing to do with it. The idea is he brings something to the table; he's a rabid Republican everybody knows. But you know where he is coming from and he has consistency. Commercial entities bring a great deal of money. Our city would not exist and our county would not exist if we did not have a commercial industry for employers. We need that aspect, we need the law. The public has to know who is coming before us. We are voting and need to look at that balance. We need to know what you bring because Wendy is a great candidate. When you look at what she can bring, and what Don can bring, you end up saying I think Don's background in the law brings more to the Council then Wendy's background on environmental issues. Does that make sense? We have to know who is coming not only for our area but the whole County as a whole. Kat's amendment five. I'm going to vote against that. I'm going to vote against all of them when I have a problem with all of them. I see no reason why it's not automatically on A-List. And secondly we are not guaranteed you guys are going to be up here the Council has changed. Coming

I've been coming for 40 years none of you have been here for 40 years. In another 40 years you guys know you are not going to be here. Okay, have a good day.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER, CHAIR: Suzanne Scheiber.

>> PUBLIC PARTICIPATION: Good morning Susan Scheiber cream green Volusia in 2000 and again in 2020 Volusia County residents voted to tax themselves to Mills for the purchase of conservation land; this tax can be found on your property tax bill. In layman's terms Volusia County charter amendment number five is currently on the ballot for the presence of Volusia County to weigh in on creating a registry. This requires a vote of 5/7 council members to add or remove properties and to sell our conservation land. This is referred to as a heightened vote. The amendment also contains verbiage for up sections for public purpose use; it is worded with more than one item being voted on; our County Council can currently sell our conservation lands by simple majority vote if they choose to do so. State statute 125.35 allows this the amendment increases the threshold to super majority requiring 5/7 council members for approval of a sale. But here is where the verbiage justifies voting no on Volusia County charter amendment number five. All 25 years of Volusia Forever land conservation properties should be placed on the registry. The land purchase for 25 years has already been voted on and should not require another vote to qualify for heightened protection. Amendment five falls short in section number three public purpose negating everything above it for developing for this section shall not apply when being used by the county. This section is the policy that is not seen on the ballot. There is no super majority vote, no notice required for the county to develop the Volusia County lands for public purposes, note the word exception in the ballot language. Public purpose is defined by case law and some examples are erosion, wastewater treatment plan, water treatment plant etc. Lastly, if developed for public purposes, the county can choose to sell the land in the future should the amendment be passed. The amendment set a precedent by our vote telling the Council that it is okay to develop our conservation plans for public purposes. There is no clarity for the registry of our 25 years of conservation lands and protection by using the words " " may be added" for which we voted to tax ourselves \$60 million in 2020 and \$40 million in 2000 not to mention the commitment to our partners for these purchases. The state voted for it because it's better than what we have now. Simply makes it a vote disrespecting our \$100 million in taxpayer investment while allowing the county to develop our conservation land. We support no on amendment number five. Thank you.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Thank you for your comments. [Listing Names]

>> PUBLIC PARTICIPATION: Good morning Council Good Morning Mr. Chair Mr. Nicholson I appreciate your words you inferred the Council brings new councilman Council people to the Council don't the people bring new members to the County Council. It is the people who decide not the County Council members. My talking points for this morning, affordability is in everyone's mind it's getting impossible to pay your bills. One thing the County Council can do today is to suspend the local option fuel tax. The fuel tax add-on to the oppressive fuel costs that bring goods to businesses that allow us to do our jobs and get around the county to thousands of people who buy tanks of gas daily would like to have it suspended for at least 90 days. I think that would be a good thing for the Council to do for the people. Today. To make that happen. The second thing is, back in February your members brought up an amendment or an ordinance about deep well injection toilets to tap whatever you want to call the running wastewater process into the aquifer or near the aquifer. I'm against it because a lot of the citizens are against it. But four of you voted against allowing that to come to the people today again you can do the right thing. Bring that back up one of the four of you that voted against it. You are the winning side and can bring that up nobody else can . I'm imploring you to bring that backup for the people's vote at some point in the future. Order today write an ordinance to a moratorium. A deep well injection told Wastewater back into the aquifer it is something that you can do to preserve our finite water source. Our aquifer is as dirty as it needs to be protected for future generations because without water we have nothing. Reverse osmosis is very expensive and Ormond Beach doesn't. I don't know another city that is thinking about doing it. That's the only thing that will clearly clean our water. We need to keep it as clean as we can prior to anything else happening. To remind you one month from today is election day. Elections have consequences. Those of you that are up for running for higher office or reelection if this dais needs to understand the people to remember they have long memories they want our aquifer protected they want to have cost reduced they want to be able to afford to stay and live in Volusia County. Again I did not say I said my name.[Listing Names] I'm representing Tomoka Farms village.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Thank you for your comments Diane Fletcher.

>> PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: If I can get a motion to approve the agenda with that understanding nine, 10, 11 have been continued.

>> TROY KENT,DISTRICT 4: Motion to approve the agenda absent Items nine, 10, 11 until the following meeting he talked about in October.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: We have a motion to approve Troy Kent.

>> DAVID SANTIAGO,DISTRICT 5: I second the motion.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Any questions from the Council.

All in favor signify by saying,aye?

>> Board Voting: Aye.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Anyone opposed say nay? The motion carries: do you know if Matt voted? We will say 6/0 until we hear from him.

>> TROY KENT,DISTRICT 4: May I make a brief statement. For those of you in the room you might be able to hear me if you're online. I don't think you can. I will publicly apologize about this system. I don't know how this happens. I don't know how you have a \$1.8 billion machine that doesn't test this out before this meeting. This is unacceptable. I apologize to you that you cannot hear what is going on. Just so you know mine is lit up green it is supposed to be working. Chairman I don't know what we adults do if you pass your microphone and round so we can all talk into it. This should have been tested and retested with staff members appearing. I just want to say I'm sorry that you all cannot hear us unless we yell please know I'm not angry I just want you to hear my voice. Thank you Chairman.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Let's test the microphones and see who's working . We start with you Don let's.

>> DON DEMPSEY,DISTRICT 1: Mind is hot.

>> DAVID SANTIAGO,DISTRICT 5: I'm not sure if you can hear me?

>> DANNY ROBINS,DISTRICT 3: Mind should be good.

>> JAKE JOHANSSON,AT-LARGE: Test 12.

>> TROY KENT,DISTRICT 4: Chairman Don and I will share.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: I will share with Councilmember Santiago.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: A member of the public said the podium is not working as well. They are on that. Okay. Item number two is the Consent Agenda. We do have members of the public that want to speak on it. Does any number have an Item they would like to pull for comment after the vote?

>> JAKE JOHANSSON,AT-LARGE: I'd like to pull I for discussion only a comment.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Item I for discussion after the vote any other class member heavy Items they would like to pull for its own vote?

>> TROY KENT,DISTRICT 4: Motion to approve the consent agenda as presented.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Motion by councilmember Troy Kent is there a second.

>> JAKE JOHANSSON,AT-LARGE: I second the motion.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR:

All in favor signify by saying,aye?

>> Board Voting: Aye.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Anyone opposed say nay? We do. Ignore that vote Connie Colby would like to speak then Jeremy you'll follow her.

>> PUBLIC PARTICIPATION: Good morning. Connie Colby Ormond Beach. I'm not speaking for or against, I'm just speaking about the issue you have on there about public notices going online as I am reading admit it is going to be online rather than in the newspapers. I guess at this point that is probably not a bad idea, however, I would like to know if there is some way that people would be informed there is a new notice on the Internet. Can we sign up for something to be informed that there is something coming up in place of just guessing or going on every day or hoping there might or might not be something and very visible because people my age are not necessarily the most knowledgeable about doing things online. Just a thought because I know the newspaper is very expensive for people to buy these days even online. They keep raising the price of that as well. Thank you.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Thank you Connie I think that will come up in our discussion Jeremy.[Listing Names]

>> PUBLIC PARTICIPATION: Good morning Council.[Listing Names] present of Volusia County firefighters local 3574 Item G I've been the president for six years second two years I've negotiated several contracts I've had grievances the station issues my job is to protect the health and safety of my guys. My job is to advocate for them. I'm proud that over those eight years the manager Suzanne Konchan the Chief in this Council we were able to get

stuff done without the use of attorneys. I'm proud of that. I got a two-year degree. I've been a 22 year firefighter. I go against 10 attorneys for legal assistance and the HR director . We are able to communicate that and work out our differences. I'm super proud of it and am thankful for you guys. Item G sends a message to unions that our 10 attorneys are for legal assistance. The directors and the managers let's sum up the sellers at \$3.5 million. Item G says will spend more money to fight a guy that has barely a two-year degree. I don't know the circumstances of the other unions. I want to work for stuff without the taxpayer having to pay this money. It is costing us money and also nothing against the law firm. I think they are great. I just think that we got 10 attorneys, for legal assistance, a lot of smart people and money to be spent on now for the first year if you look in this there is no CAP on it it is not safe 30,000 or 50,000 it just says we are doing the same hourly rate as we are doing last year which is \$35,000, then \$50,000. You can look over it please ask who, what, why. That's all I'm asking for again. Maybe we can branch some of these funds to the law library. That's all I have.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Thank you for your comments. [Listing Names]

>> PUBLIC PARTICIPATION: I'm going to touch on Item C which Connie was speaking to. I think the public should have a variety of notices. It should include the newspaper, it should include online and even social media. It reaches every person who wants to show up at a meeting and to either contest or speak in favor of an item. It should not be limited to online. Some people don't have that access and they never will. As far as what Jeremy was saying when I worked for the City of Daytona Beach they spent a lot of money on legal fees just to contest what the unions were asking for. I agree with him that if we sat down at the table and spent instead of spending a big amount of money for legal fees then we can get contracts settled faster. Daytona would have an outside law firm from Orlando fight its employees that was.[Listing Names] used to be utilized back then. What I'm saying is maybe spend a little less on legal fees CAP the fees and work something out to where all the employees can benefit without the expense. Thank you.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Thank you for your comments. Any council member has a question for the staff? George I would.

>> DON DEMPSEY,DISTRICT 1: If we can have ECHO for discussion as well. I'd appreciate it if it is too late for me to request an E for discussion.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Just for discussion. If that is what you want to discuss we will discuss Item E. I will let him do that first but the County Manager I will ask you if you would like to or you would like Ryan to discuss at all the posting of notifications so there is a better understanding.

>> GEORGE RECKTENWALD,COUNTY MANAGER: Of course we are getting ready to do that item.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: You can wait until then if you care to.

>> Really quick I talked with Miss Colby about the requirement of the statute if you go.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Hold on one second can you get him back there.

>> PAOLO SORIA: Paolo Soria Senior Assistant County Attorney one of the requirements of the statute for public notice if you do the online provision you can register your email address or even your physical address every single notice because on our website will email you or mail to you that notice your choice that is a requirement of using a County website in lieu of the newspaper. You can directly receive those notices if you choose to register.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Okay thank you. Thank you County Manager.

>> DON DEMPSEY,DISTRICT 1: If we are at that point I would like public participation to be over?

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Guess.

>> DON DEMPSEY,DISTRICT 1: For Item E, this is the Jones and admin study employed to transform 386 four that Taylor Road flood mitigation design I want to highlight on page 49 of the report.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: While she is doing that let me ask you this is just for discussion.

>> DON DEMPSEY,DISTRICT 1: No vote I'm in favor of this. [Unclear Audio]. I just wanted to remind everybody that I've historically been in favor of Volusia Forever. I've had concerns about conservation easements as opposed to outright purchases. I'd like to remind everybody that what this is is a flood mitigation plan directed by engineering as a product of our 386 funding. This plan involves the pumping of water into Lake Moore. Which was purchased not as a conservation easement but purchased entirely with Volusia Forever money, which I think is great. I would like to point out that if this was acquired through conservation easements you would not be able to use this plan for flood mitigation because under those contracts you cannot do anything that affects hydrology. Dumping water into Lake Moore affects hydrology but because we own it outright through Volusia Forever I think we paid too much. That is why I voted against it because the price was too high but the principal is awesome. Volusia Forever did what it was supposed to do. It outright purchased the land now we can use the land to mitigate all of this flooding on Taylor road so hats off to the community, 386, defunding engineering firm everything I hope this plan works. At least it is a lake we can use for runoff and it's accessible thank you guys.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Thank you for any other comments from Council before a call for a vote? The motion is to prove the entire consent agenda
all in favor signify by saying,aye?

>> Board Voting: Aye.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Anyone opposed say nay? The motion carries: unanimously.

>> KARISSA GREEN,CLERK: Don't know Matt's boat on the consent agenda but on the approval of the agenda he did vote yes.

>> JAKE JOHANSSON,AT-LARGE: Chairman I have Item I as a comment.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: You would like to comment on Item I of the Consent Agenda.

>> JAKE JOHANSSON,AT-LARGE: Are we ready?

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Just please.

>> JAKE JOHANSSON,AT-LARGE: Item I from those of you that are aware is the cost share for the Army Corps of Engineers feasibility study to basically to engineer our just short of 30 miles of beach. It's a slamdunk. Our cost share is zero. I'm not concerned about that at all. What I want to share with the public is the monumental amount of work that staff did to get this done. We contacted US Congress members from Texas, Florida, our senators, and multiple people from Atlanta on down to the Army Corps. I would like to follow-up you so Jusco walk-up. Pretty much the one that spearheaded this project. I want her to briefly explain what we are getting and what the result will most likely be Jusco. What do you think in three or four years? That will scope out to about 10-12 years as I mentioned last time we talked about this no matter where I am I'm going to be your partner in the end. I really want to see this. Please Jusco let us know what's going on.

>> STAFF: Jennifer Fentrest which County coastal Director this is an effort of not only the County Council and the elected officials to cycle from prior cycles as well included elected officials from all of our coastal Miss Florida inland navigation District presented state representatives state staff this is been an advocacy that has been fairly much the entire

community has held advocate for beaches. Our beaches carry a \$4.3 billion economic impact on our entire county. It's the largest employment sector of our entire county at 31,000 jobs. What we got from weekend announcement in August that the water resources development act of 2024 allowed for access funding in the 2019 disaster recovery act to be used for additional projects which County got named in the 2019 disaster recovery act to be advocacy on behalf of our federal representatives represented Mills representative fine as well as Senator Moody and Senator Scott. The really good thing about the 2019 disaster recovery act is there's language in that legislation that it shall be paid completely by the federal government. We were prepared as a county you guys have approved letters of support that we have had the chairman re-sign a recorder to send to Washington where we prepared to pay 50% of a \$3 million bill. Our representative status legislation has a zero dollar cost share. What that means is 1.5 millions we would've spent on this now goes back to our beaches so we can do more improvements. I put this on the agenda today and note that as we work our way through the end of the calendar year everybody's schedules get hectic. I am anticipating the assistant secretary of the Army over civil works was also the acting secretary of the Army to sign off on what is called a federal interest determination any day now. When they give us the green light that they are ready to enter into the agreement I want to be able to move as quickly as possible to get all of our representatives from the county, the state, local and federal level together so we can celebrate the zero cost share. What this means is Volusia County will have a 50 year resiliency plan where we partner with the federal government. I cannot tell you how many of your oceanfront residents called me following the 22 storms following the 2016, 2017, 20 and teeth every single hurricane you had when the Army Corps came to town to fix our beach? We didn't have a plan in place. We did not have an agreement that the very first step would take us six years to get there. This is the very first step in us having those agreements in place so the Army Corps can come to town. The better thing is that if the FEMA event destroys your beaches you have a better local cost share as FEMA exists today than you would if you did not have an agreement. We are running our state management plan simultaneously and will bring that to our 2027 Council for consideration but long-term this is the best cost share deal we can get. It is zero dollars that is the best we can ask for right now. I'm available for any questions.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Also members can't.

>> TROY KENT,DISTRICT 4: I don't have a question. I have a comment for her and didn't have another comment related to this great news! Thank you for sharing this publicly. I will

just remind the public that is what Washington DC is supposed to do. They are supposed to help their constituents in little Volusia County that is why we sent them to Washington DC. To represent us and say hey, invest some of this pie and take care of us back here at home. It also is helpful with the personal relationship in this dais as well as our staff have with those elected representatives in Volusia County to help make it happen sometimes it happens seamlessly and the public does not even know what happened I appreciate that you share that Chairman unpolluted I see now we have Mr. Rienhart's picture up there hoping we have that fixed I was going to give a recommendation if they need to weigh in on it, we voted as an elected body to allow Mr. Rienhart who's out for medical reason to participate in this meeting today it is hugely important that he does, we voted to allow that to happen I was going to say if that bug is not fixed out here is a recommendation may be a staff member can call him and have him on the cell phone ready to go think you put the cell phone up to a microphone he can talk that way. I'm just trying to help solve problems! Can you update us?

>> KARISSA GREEN,CLERK: I know they are on the phone with Mr. Rienhart in the back trying to work out the bug he did notify me he voted yes on the Consent Agenda as well. We will explore that option once they are off the phone with him in the back.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Okay thank you. We will move to Item number three. Everything is a go. On a happier note, we have a retirement Item 03

Retirement of Chandra Gordon after almost 30 years of dedicated service.

did she spend all 30 in human resources? Did she hire the County manager? When he was on the road crew? [Laughter]

>> GEORGE RECKTENWALD,COUNTY MANAGER: We actually started at the same time we are within a few months of each other. We've grown up together here. I want to talk about the old..

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: [Laughter].

>> STAFF:

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER, CHAIR: You don't look like you're old enough to have worked 30 years.

>> STAFF: Dana Paige human resources reader to recognize nearly 30 years Ms. Gordon has been with human resources and she has decided to retire at this time I will turn it over to Mr. Recktenwald will make some comments.

>> GEORGE RECKTENWALD, COUNTY MANAGER: Thank you Dana and thank you Mr. Chair and the Council it's a bittersweet day when you have someone like this who was given so many great years of dedicated service. It's a privilege today to recognize Chandra Gordon as she prepares to retire after 30 years of dedicated service here at Volusia County. She joined our human resources team in 1997 and throughout nearly 3 decades she developed an incredible depth of knowledge across human resources including recruitment hiring and training classification and compensation family medical leave administration ADA compliance, and all important employee relations. She served as activity object manager before being promoted to Operations Manager. Where she is overseeing payroll records management and she has represented the county as a member of several bargaining teams. When you consider everything this organization and our community have experienced since she arrived in 1997 the scope of her service becomes even more remarkable. Her career spans the 1998 wildfires and the integration of EVAC in the county operations. 2004 hurricane season 2008 economic downturn. The Covid 19 pandemic the organizational changes with amendment 10 these are all events that really affected our workforce. Throughout those changes and challenges she has been steady and knowledgeable and a resource for our employees and supervisors throughout the organization and now she has counseled me on many things through the years. She's been super valuable to me. That kind of institutional knowledge is difficult to replace. And speaks volumes about the value she is brought to this county. Human resources is one of those areas that touches nearly every part of the county government over the course of nearly 30 years. Chandra worked to support County employees through them the services we provide to our residents. Chandra understands your retirement will include spending more time with your family and volunteering and traveling. I think she has a planned trip to Japan coming up. To visit her daughter after nearly 3 decades of service I hope you will enjoy every minute of that. On behalf of Volusia County thank you for your professionalism,

your leadership, your tremendous commitment to the organization and we congratulate you on an outstanding career and wish you and your family all the best for this next chapter. [Applause].

>> STAFF: Thank you.

>> CHANDRA GORDON: Thank you.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Had before you come up? Let's give Chandra a chance when your exit date is.

>> CHANDRA GORDON: October 3.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Okay.

>> CHANDRA GORDON: Just want to say a couple of things.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Did you press the button on your microphone? Is it red or green?

>> CHANDRA GORDON: They are both green. Most of it has been said since I've been here in Volusia County. First of all I want to give honor to God Good Morning to the Council and everybody on the panel today. I just want to thank you for allowing me to stand here and simply to say thank you. Thank you for allowing me to work here. Thank you for allowing me to provide for my family and I think a lot of times we forget that as employees and even as citizens. Being here in Lee County. I've been a public servant for over 35 years with the state of Florida ST John River Water Management District +29 3/4. In Volusia County. One of my favorite very short phrases in the Bible is peace while still working in nature. Peace needs to be still sometimes. We the county have been through a lot, you're right George 1998. I moved my daughter from Volusia County to Hillsborough County so she could go to

school with my mother who was teaching at the time because the air was too thick and the condition she had. Again we worked at the CSC. I won't miss that. That is a very very good service that we provide to the county. I worked in many elections. I think just about all of them since I've been here. I've been part of the historic election with the election of President Barack Obama. I've been here since the 2008 economic downturn. I will say that Volusia County I cannot be more proud of because with the Council at the time they made employees feel safe. They told us that employees would not lose their jobs. They found jobs for employees. That is something to be proud of. Again I have to tell Volusia County. Thank you. Covid 19 was something. It was a challenge. As some people would say we did it with grace. We allowed people to help people we showed compassion. To wrap this up I just want to say again thank you to the Council thank you two Volusia County you provided for me and my family. I stayed here. George, you've paved a path rather than Volusia County. We appreciate that. One of the things you paved and you laid the groundwork for your work for Volusia County you helped with the bridges and the roads, the Civic Center, the public protection and now you're here. That is a road well paved. Susanna just to say thank you for all of your hard work and coming on board. It meant a lot to me that one day you stopped by my office to apologize for something she didn't have to do. That meant a lot of recent conversations we had were very respectful. Thank you. I appreciate that. To my HR family, some of you that are here, all of you, it's been a joy. I've been 29 years and three quarters here in HR you all have made it possible even for the ones that are not here have to mention.[Listing Names] they were just as helpful as my crew I see sitting back there with Debbie.[Listing Names] all the rest of my HR crew. I thank you all. To Dana and my HR family, thank you from ride or die.[Listing Names] she kept me calm a lot of times and I cannot stay calm. When she was not here I would have.[Listing Names] was here she would tell me shut up you can do this. I appreciate you all. For always being there. Again I think most of all I've thanked my family. I think my daughter Crystal she's listening and she said I must be getting old because I find this very interesting. I would like to thank my sister Wanda. My sister Wanda Rose Tina and my grandnephew little J thank you all for coming. I want to thank my fiancé Ray for always supporting me with that again Volusia County thank you for the 29 3/4 years.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Thank you. [Applause]. [Applause] [Unclear Audio]. [Applause].

>> KARISSA GREEN,CLERK: Mr. Rienhart. Mr. Rienhart?

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Are you testing? Okay. I would appreciate a motion to approve her retirement so she knows whether or not she can delete leave. We have a motion to approve the retirement.

>> DAVID SANTIAGO,DISTRICT 5: I make a motion to approve.

>> TROY KENT,DISTRICT 4: I second the motion.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR:

All in favor signify by saying,aye?

>> Board Voting: Aye.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Anyone opposed say nay? You are officially retired on October 30. [Applause]. Did Matt vote on that one?

>> MATT REINHART,VICE CHAIR: Can you hear me Mr. Brower.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: I can can you hear me.

>> MATT REINHART,VICE CHAIR: Yes.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Thank you.

>> MATT REINHART,VICE CHAIR: Okay very good I can hear you all now.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: That is a NAY for you. [Laughter] That brings us to Item number four Council direction concerning law enforcement license plate readers in County right of ways.

>> MICHAEL G. DYER,COUNTY ATTORNEY: Yes Mr. Chair. On August 31 and now you are aware Florida Department of Transportation issued a memo notifying all Florida local law enforcement agencies there permits to allow LPR systems automated license plate recommendation cameras were to be removed within a period of time they had a statute in place to give them authority to do that. This has really been an Item I've worked on with Dan Bartlett. You have an attachment of a listing of use permits, which is what we call them here where these LPR cameras have been allowed on County friend of way and sometimes we will go into a city sometimes that is in the incorporated area. You are authorized to take action on these use permits if you so direct. In your ordinance for reasons of public safety. We are happy to answer any questions you may have on it. It is something that you can do within your discretion.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Okay. Were you able to hear all of that? The county attorney.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Okay. We do have the sheriff and a member of the public would like to speak on this. If the Council would like to hear from them first we will discuss it. We will start with Sheriff Mike Chitwood.

>> STAFF: Good morning.

>> DAVID SANTIAGO,DISTRICT 5: As you know the governor issued an order on August 31 the tag readers were taken down from state property on November 1 I shut the system down we notified Lockwood videos were canceling the contract what was it just is not a ban but a moritorium my feeling is that the state legislature from talking to our delegation is going to take this up in the next session after the new governor is elected hopefully Jake gets elected and we are good to go and will take that up or will operate the system as you operate David was how we operate our system meaning you have to log on with the case number 30 days everything was purge was constant supervision and follow-up to make

sure nobody was abusing the system it's a powerful tool it's a great tool I do understand the concerns because some police departments have gone rogue on it so my suggestion would be just to let's put a moratorium in place let's see what Tallahassee is going to do Tallahassee can just turn around say you know what this is our bailiwick you cannot ban this how we will operate we don't know how it will play out a moratorium will work to solve the needs the cameras are off the camera will be off once they finish taking off the cameras on the stateright of way that will then move to take him down the camera on the county right-of-way.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Thank you John Nicholson.

>> DAVID SANTIAGO,DISTRICT 5: Thank you Sheriff Chitwood for coming up. I move that we take the Sheriff's recommendation and Institute have staff ring back a document or moratorium for a twelve-month ban and flock cameras on all the county properties.

>> DAVID SANTIAGO,DISTRICT 5: I want to edit it if legal thing some okay by doing it this way want to make sure that before the 12 month it expires it is put on the agenda for the Council to decide whether to continue it or not or take other action.

>> MICHAEL G. DYER,COUNTY ATTORNEY: I think my suggestion is rather than single out the flock cameras we can have no new use permits be issued for LPR cameras along county right-of-way I do not think you need an ordinance for that you can get that direction today your follow-up would be for that time lapses to bring an Item back to you for discussion about.

>> DAVID SANTIAGO,DISTRICT 5: So I will amend my motion to direct that the License Plate Readers twelve-month moratorium preventing them on county right-of-way is county owned properties and to direct staff to put it on the agenda on or before it expires.

>> BENJAMIN BARTLETT : I want to clarify a couple of things, one, it does not apply to the LPR cameras that we utilize for the park Volusia program which is county property as well.

>> DAVID SANTIAGO,DISTRICT 5: Good point you're talking about for parking. I will add an additional amendment that a good catch at our beach access or park access camera system is exempt from this motion. One further question: Mr. Legal if I could. Would it be inappropriate based on the notice of this Item for me to include speed cameras in my motion. The reason I ask that question is that we have some municipalities installing speed cameras. I'm talking about County right-of-way.

>> MICHAEL G. DYER,COUNTY ATTORNEY: That one maybe we need to talk a little bit more about outside of this Item I think that's a separate set of what the state did was specific to LPR they had us statute for the LPN.

>> DAVID SANTIAGO,DISTRICT 5: I will bring that up in my comment to give staff directions on my motion stands.

>> BENJAMIN BARTLETT : As part of this we are asking anybody who installed cameras to remove them from the right-of-way.

>> DAVID SANTIAGO,DISTRICT 5: Absolutely that is my assumption but if you need it in the motion.

>> DAVID SANTIAGO,DISTRICT 5: Yes, are we directing anybody that has these on County right-of-way to take them down within a certain timeframe?

>> MICHAEL G. DYER,COUNTY ATTORNEY: Just to make sure I understand I'm just a lawyer you are asking for a moratorium.

>> GEORGE RECKTENWALD,COUNTY MANAGER: I think you are crossing two different things. I think the idea of having a moratorium being that they were off is to leave what is there off.

>> KARISSA GREEN,CLERK: If.

>> MICHAEL G. DYER,COUNTY ATTORNEY: If you want cameras removed as a ban.

>> DAVID SANTIAGO,DISTRICT 5: Okay so we won't issue anymore right-of-way permits but those actual physical ones that are there we have to decide whether we want them to remove them or leave them.

>> MICHAEL G. DYER,COUNTY ATTORNEY: If you approve a moratorium you are telling the staff not to accept new applications that does not affect the cameras that may be there. If you want those removed we need to cancel the existing use permits.

>> DAVID SANTIAGO,DISTRICT 5: It sounds like I need to amend my motion again.

>> GEORGE RECKTENWALD,COUNTY MANAGER: I cannot speak for the sheriff. I'm not so short. That is what you started with trying to go with his recommendation.

>> DAVID SANTIAGO,DISTRICT 5: I think the sheriff said they are starting to bring them down anyway. Can we bring the sheriff back up.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Yes.

>> PUBLIC PARTICIPATION: As per our contract they will be taking them down once they finish with the governor's directive they will now come and take on cameras. It is their equipment they will remove as they get around to doing it the system has been off since September 1.

>> DAVID SANTIAGO,DISTRICT 5: It's going to happen anyway.

>> PUBLIC PARTICIPATION: The cameras are coming down. It's a matter of one to get there to take him down.

>> DAVID SANTIAGO,DISTRICT 5: It sounds like the motion can stand the way it is.

>> MICHAEL G. DYER,COUNTY ATTORNEY: A moratorium we accept no new use applications for it as you specified Ben would rescind the use permits issued for the ones that are existing.

>> DAVID SANTIAGO,DISTRICT 5: And exempt the public parks for the public access system.

>> MICHAEL G. DYER,COUNTY ATTORNEY: We will return near the end of the 12 months the agenda item to the Council.

>> DAVID SANTIAGO,DISTRICT 5: That way it forces us to take action at that time.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: The motion as it stands as stated the license plate readers have a twelve-month moratorium on county owned property that will come back on the agenda for that 12 months runs out the beach park and cameras are excluded from this. They are not taken down, they stay in place.

>> DAVID SANTIAGO,DISTRICT 5: No additional we rescind the existing agreements for everyone I think the sheriff directed permission they are taking them down as they come along.

>> GEORGE RECKTENWALD,COUNTY MANAGER: Now we will resend the permit so we don't have to take them down just like the state.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Okay they stay on until that time.

>> DAVID SANTIAGO,DISTRICT 5: According to the sheriff they are off as of September 1.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Okay that is the motion everybody understands.

>> JAKE JOHANSSON,AT-LARGE: I have one request for clarification. I just want to make sure that the goal here is the cameras are not recording and they are not collecting information not just the sheriff is not getting the information but they are not collecting the information. We've heard from the sheriff they are not collecting information, not even the company. We've heard from the sheriff that the public will be assured they are not collecting information because they will be taking down the cameras and not probably the solar panels as well. That is proof that that will eventually happen. Is that what the intent is here?

>> DAVID SANTIAGO,DISTRICT 5: That's how I understand it.

>> JAKE JOHANSSON,AT-LARGE: Then I'm good thank you.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: My question would be how do we know if there is a date certain for the cameras to be taken down? Or do we just have to go through this period just assuming.[Unclear Audio].

>> BENJAMIN BARTLETT :

>> MICHAEL G. DYER,COUNTY ATTORNEY: And no we don't cancel use permits often. What's a reasonable time that you would recommend 60 days?

>> BENJAMIN BARTLETT : The state gave 30. We can do 60 minutes whatever the Council decides. We sent a letter to the permittees letting them know their permit had been rescinded and we would request the request to remove their equipment within a certain timeframe. That's at councils discretion whatever you direct staff to do after that we would remove it herself.

>> MICHAEL G. DYER,COUNTY ATTORNEY: To be consistent with the state I would not go less than 30 days I think 30 is if that is what the state has done.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: That is part of the motion you have to add.

>> DAVID SANTIAGO,DISTRICT 5: Will amend my motion to add the removal of the LPR within 30 days of today. Danny, are you good with that?

>> DANNY ROBINS,DISTRICT 3: I second the motion.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Perhaps with the last amendment the cameras will be removed. The LPR cameras will be removed within 30 days of today. Correct questions from the staff; several of you looked perplexed.

>> KARISSA GREEN,CLERK: Mr. Santiago and Mr. Johansson have requested to speak.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: And the other councilmember has a question okay no questions for the Council no questions for the staff. 12 month moratorium on all LPR on county owned properties. It will come back on the agenda before this 12 months is up. For the final decision, beach parks and cameras are excluded. The cameras will be taken down within 30 days. The existing cameras. If there are no questions on the motion Karissa, Can you please call the roll?

>> DANNY ROBINS,DISTRICT 3: Yes.

>> DAVID SANTIAGO,DISTRICT 5: Yes.

>> DON DEMPSEY,DISTRICT 1: Yes.

>> JAKE JOHANSSON,AT-LARGE: Yes.

>> TROY KENT,DISTRICT 4: Yes.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Yes.

>> MATT REINHART,VICE CHAIR:

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Come on Matt. Don't let us down it is 6/0 I will follow-up with you and see what.

>> KARISSA GREEN,CLERK: He got on with Darrell and he voted yes.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: The moratorium is passed unanimously. Okay. Item number five. First reading of Ordinance 2026-22, ban on large-scale data centers Large-scale was defined as 50 MW.

>> MICHAEL G. DYER,COUNTY ATTORNEY: This is probably one of the largest agenda Item we prepared it is a proposed ordinance at your direction on August 17 to return with an ordinance that would ban large-scale data centers you directed us to bring back that draft ordinance one think I've given a quick overview the bulk of the work on this was done by Chris Ryan and Ray Tyner and his staff, I want to thank them for all the time they put into this to make this happen. In a compressed timeframe they did just a really stellar job. A ban is probably one of the harshest things you can do from a land use perspective so the

legal standards are a little higher to accomplish it. Basically you have to act in a reasonable way and justify explaining what you're doing. And kind of simple terms. That is why this ordinance has so many Whereas, clauses. So many attachments and studies. To explain your rationale really many of them are touch and pump things that you've raised before. The concern about electricity and water usage. I'm drawing a blank. Sinkholes. I cannot think of sinkholes. That is referenced in their why did we do that? If this were ever challenged we do not have an application for a data center currently that I'm aware of. If we did get one somebody was unhappy with it and what to challenge it when it goes to the court the court will look at whatever ordinance you adopt to see if it is legally sufficient. Chris and Ray I thank you for your help in putting that together. They are here to answer any questions you may have about the process, just a couple of things I want to touch upon that have been rules we have navigated. We would recommend it to you. We are bringing this forward to you in two Council meetings. Why are we doing that? State law requires only change the actual list of permitted uses of land to bring it back to you as a zoning ordinance the zoning ordinance we have to bring to you in two hearings if the tickets of the PLDRC we have all that scheduled for this month if you approve this this morning we will be back for final adoption for you at the end of this month unless you direct otherwise. Why not do this as an emergency ordinance? I don't believe that is permitted by state law because that says no emergency ordinance shall be enacted that changes the actual uses of the land. My advice to you if we do it for two readings we have not lost anything by doing that because if we were getting an application this afternoon we went utilize something we talked about before the pending ordinance doctrine to say our Council is in the process of changing the rules on this issue we cannot assess that application at this time. Our argument is that there would be a protection. Why do this as an ordinance rather than a charter amendment? I don't leave you to do or accomplish this specific task involving whether a development would move forward or not. I charter amendments because of state law as well. I'm talking about state law preemptions all the time. Growth management is one of those areas we are heavily preempted. I don't believe we can do that here as an ordinance it would be your decision. Lastly, why focus on large-scale data centers which this agenda item does. Where does that come from that comes from Senate Bill 484. What we are doing we have a simple way in effect until October 2027. Unless that is changed by the legislature this fall. We can adopt something like this ordinarily more burdensome or restrictive. Then the legislature passed Senate will 484, this past session, which is said by the way local governments do have land-use authority over large-scale data centers. We are really in a strange way. We are operating under the statutory affordability if we think there's a good faith argument there that we can really do this. There's really been a division of counties about how they've gone about it. Some are just waiting to see what comes out of the legislative session. I'm short , there is going to be

something that does. We will return back to you if that impacts us in some way. A few have receded with a ban others are doing and moratorium I think orange county just enacted a moratorium for their staff to bring something back. In Senate Bill 484 there's a definition of large-scale data center. It is a Florida legislative term that does not have national significance. In Florida it does. It is basically where that 50 MW or more figure comes from. I believe that regulating something other than a large-scale data center, something smaller, we will run into a problem with Senate Bill 180. That is where we stand, that is what we would advise on it. Again I want to thank the work that was put into this. We're happy to answer any questions you may have. If you approve it today, your PLDRC will be back in front of you at the end of this month.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: That they would be October 20. At 4 PM. Do you happen to know when the PLDRC meeting is scheduled.

>> BENJAMIN BARTLETT : October 15.

>> JAKE JOHANSSON,AT-LARGE: No questions.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Do have a question or comment.

>> TROY KENT,DISTRICT 4: Just comments.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: We will go into discussing this.

>> JAKE JOHANSSON,AT-LARGE: They used to agree to discuss the ban because I saw the way the boat was going to number one. I'd like to have a philosophical discussion as we go through this. There are not too many places in Volusia County where we can have a large data center. I don't know if that matters much. There is a lot of information out there, there's a lot of misinformation out there. I've done a lot of digging. I spent some time with other informed people. I think the misinformation that you are getting sometimes in the media a lot of times in social media, is generated by people that want us to fear them. It is

a fact that data centers use a lot of electricity. Some designs use a lot of water. We can create noise. They require infrastructure. If we have a poorly located data center, it will stink. I got it. We should not dismiss any of that. And we won't! But acknowledging those concerns does not mean that the answer is to ban data centers. I'm a proponent of regulating feedback, protecting taxpayers and judging each project on its merits. If you think about the things that the fear is, electricity, covert SB 484 right now. And verified personally by me with FP&L and Duke energy. That state will hold any datacenter totally accountable for any power. Evaporative cooling is the one that costs the most money and the most water. They don't do that anymore. That much in areas that are restricted to water. They either have closed loop or air cooling now. Which brings up noise issues which we can handle with setbacks and putting them out in the north 40 somewhere if Volusia County had a north 40 left to do it. But I believe it is smarter and less of a knee-jerk reaction, to regulate them. Councilman Dempsey rings up the sinkholes. That is an issue. That is something I didn't get into much. I think there are engineers that can probably decide if we don't use aquifer water, and we don't use reclaimed water, or we use it from somewhere different such as Mr. Nicholson points out there are some cities that pump reclaimed water into the river every day, then no harm no foul. And our ground stays the same as it is. Folks, the thing we need to realize if we work to get one here which is a shot in the dark it can bring in \$159 million worth of tax revenue and it will employ 100 people. 100 additional people on our road will not hurt too much. It will hurt but not too much. It will offset a lot of our property tax look at DeBerry. DeBerry has to take revenue generators with power plants. They had the Lotus millage there all over there, smiling as they are building a new downtown. Because they have those revenue generators. Wouldn't it be nice for somebody else to be able to do that? That is where I sit with this. If we put heavy regulation on them it will meet all of our concerns and be able to maybe get some revenue. Mr. Kent says I would anybody want one? To help lower my taxes and diversify my tax base. That would be the biggest reason if we can control the rest. That's all I have, chairman . Thank you.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Thank you.

>> TROY KENT,DISTRICT 4: Thank you chairman thank you Councilman Johansson I think my exact quote was why in hell would anybody want one? With that being said I want to thank our residents for speaking up about issues that are important to them because it's one of the reasons I appreciate the representative form of government that we have, we represent you and listen to you, and the staff our legal department especially take you for

your responsiveness with ordinance number 2026-22 there are actually 98 Whereas, in this ordinance I don't know if you counted them Mr. Dyer but they are 98 of them. I want to point to two of them that are my favorite. Whereas, HEPA scale data centers trying 50 MW or more place extreme baseline demand on the energy grid, exposing local residents to elevated risk of grid instability rate inflation and service curtailment and the next one I will talk about is Whereas, large-scale data centers: operations could extract millions of gallons of water per day threatening local drinking water supply and aquifer levels during seasonal droughts even when standard conservation plans are submitted under section. That is 2/98 Whereas, those were important enough for you to hear in our agenda packet that we have. I for one am pleased with what we have in front of us, unless somebody can change my mind I will be voting in favor of it.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Thank you. Jake, I think it's an unfortunate statement to say this is a knee-jerk reaction that implies the rest of the Council did not do their research. I'm pretty sure that they did. I'm in favor of the ban because all of the things that you said could be worked out, how it is called, electricity, they are not in place yet. This is an ordinance not a charter amendment which is hard to change. This is an ordinance that follows that science comes into play and it is perfectly safe, we can change it. I don't see that yet. At least for our county. If we vote for this ban it is not a statement that any of us up here are against data centers. We use them every day. It just means not here. That does not mean NIMBY is not in my backyard, it means Don has alerted us to a serious situation not only the data centers could affect or would affect the aquifer levels but the actual structure of the aquifer it caves in. The sinkholes. I would love to have the money but not at the risk of the water which is already in question for the citizens of Volusia County and the safety of the very structure of our aquifer. I will support a ban. I hope everybody that all of us will.

>> MATT REINHART,VICE CHAIR: Can you hear me.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: I can.

>> MATT REINHART,VICE CHAIR: That is good news technology when it works. A couple of things on this. Mr. Kent, thank you very much for pointing that out closer the words I picked up on a number one was extreme when it replaced the power usage. And the reason the

original motion before this ban was for those two things and plus what Councilman Dempsey pointed out as well. Back before. I guess my dear was how this can impact on Inc. I'm a horrible guy, the cities need to make that choice so be it I guess I'm looking at it from the perspective of unincorporated we'll have one area it's heavy industrial where this would fit in. My understanding is too small anyways. When this is up I'm in favor of this still in favor of this as I was last time. I totally respect the opinion of Mr. Johansson especially in light of upcoming events and how this could help us. Like you said, share to what extent of the people nobody has reached out not a soul. I have to go with the way this reads. Thank you.

>> DON DEMPSEY,DISTRICT 1: Can I ask a legal question ? We already have several. I know there is no vacant land to speak of that would necessitate or hold a hyper scale data center. We do have a lot of warehouses already built within the county. We have assembled warehouses that are well over 1,000,000 ft.² which is large enough to actually hold a data center if the warehouse the present owners decided to change the use to a data center or they went out of business and a data center came in and bought the existing structure. Would this ban as written prohibit the change of use from a warehouse to a data center or not. We 13 would guess.

>> DON DEMPSEY,DISTRICT 1: I think we have a 2 million square-foot facility here. We have another 1.4 million square-foot facility if they decide to change the use and make that a data center.

>> CHRIS RYAN: They would not be able to under this no.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Okay I think the board is working. That is the last council member I see with a comment we have a number of people from the public who would like to speak. John Nicholson you are first.

>> PUBLIC PARTICIPATION: John Nicholson Daytona Beach side a couple of things I missed your meeting and missed 3.5 hours of why you are thinking about banning the data centers. Personally I don't know whether it is for politics because some people are doing it because it's an election year. Number two, is it NIMBY we don't want it in our backyard? Is that why

people don't want it? Or is it a toilet tap issue? Is it one of those things? Nobody is jumping on board because it will be so bad. Third, is it Soros and the Chinese who want us to slow down so they can get ahead of us. I have no idea which of those it might be but I see no problem with that logic interpreting data centers as permitted. As long as they are under 50 MW. If you are allowing data centers but we don't want the big ones because of these seven issues. And the seven issues don't really exist. You don't have any place to put them except maybe sort of kind of if perhaps somebody goes out of business and you can put it into other locations. Why are we pushing to ban a data center that like toilets to tap is not an issue? They say it will not come here anyway. Why are we rushing to ban it? Secondly, the electricity? People were shocked when I said the Plaza had their own electrical plant. This guy in Miami had his own logical plants. These are private homes that have their own electrical plants. If they can have their own electrical plant, you darn well know, a datacenter could have their own electrical plant. The water is not an issue although we have to ban the use of aquifer water. Period they have to go to the Tomoka Farms and the Tomoka River to Halifax River St. Johns River reuse water. There are other sources of order they can use there also now for using the water. We forget how much water is used in agriculture. How much is used in grass. Watering our lawn is using water then a huge datacenter. Our golf courses are using more water than a datacenter. The water issue is just a smokescreen. Electricity is a smokescreen. There is no reason to ban something that can prevent dozens of homes. You will get \$165 million. How many homes would have to be built to give us \$165 million a year? We had apples to oranges, there are these many homes that produce electricity however, this is not a home. It is a commercial: what commercial properties produce electricity and how much? What commercial properties produce or use water. And to what extent.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Thank you for your comments. [Listing Names]

>> PUBLIC PARTICIPATION: Gentlemen, last month seven of you voted for the ban. It was effective according to the attorney at that moment. We need to stick to our guns and vote on this ordinance to ban hyper scale data centers. We don't have the water, we don't have future technology that will make it safer. You don't have the energy grid. We don't want the development of these put on our backs. It will be on the beach side with a bold one. It will be up in the Tomoka farms village where I live. You will be in the rural areas of Volusia County even if we use vacant warehouse space. They still need the power, they still need the water. Who pays for that? Who benefits from that? We bring business and industry to Volusia County every year but our taxes go up every year if they are not paying their way.

This is a pipe dream that the datacenter is going to reduce our taxes. I have not seen businesses reduce our taxes in Volusia County. We need to do the right thing. One month ago at least 30 people spoke against hyper-scale data centers. You all voted in accordance with the will of the people. For whatever reason sinkholes, power, water congestion. They don't bring jobs, they are not going to bring growth. They will import deliberately to build them, will import the tools to make the buildings and will have a few people to run the automation. They don't really support the community. We've seen the detrimental impacts of hyper scale data centers in Georgia and Virginia, you can read it in that research you can visit and talk with those people like I have. They are not good. Data travels at the speed of light. That datacenter can be in Arizona the data will get here in milliseconds and back. They don't need to be in Volusia County. I'm not against them everywhere, I'm against them in Volusia County. So other people Volusia County so do the right thing vote in favor of this ordinance, don't kick it down the road you change your mind, and yes, the election is in 30 days elections have consequences vote yes for this ban on hyper scale data centers then let's work on the smaller ones thank you very much.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Suzanne Scheiber.

>> PUBLIC PARTICIPATION: Suzanne Scheiber we support large-scale data centers in Volusia County. In addition , it is time to address the Comprehensive Plan Land Development Code. Even Team Volusia came in without data centers in their economic presentation for Volusia County. They knew the issues. The difference between a 49 MW datacenter and a 50 MW datacenter is negligible. Do we think the sinkhole will not form with a 49 MW datacenter? But only with the 50 MW or higher come on gentlemen that was good information about sinkholes. The Council about water usage staff previously stated that existing County regulations divide a framework for reviewing commercial and industrial development but were not specifically written with data centers in mind. When staff tell you upfront that many existing zoning and development standards remain applicable, but additional standards are appropriate to address the unique characteristic, surely you're not going to dismiss the staff. Please address the categories of the characteristics through changing codes and by ordinances for a proper ban. What is the maximum daily water usage currently in an unincorporated Volusia County? Why would we even consider going higher than that? What type of operation is currently using the maximum daily usage? What is our current policy on industrial waste? Do we have anything that compares to larger amounts of electronic chemical and water byproducts and heat and air pollutants in existence? What policy do we have addressing a single

building or numerous buildings on one parcel? As far as water usage and noise, what policy do we have in place for multiple parcels utilized for numerous buildings for water usage and noise? What protections if any are in place to prevent the passing on of the electric grid cost for datacenter to residents? Yes, unfamiliar with SB 484 but there is an expansion of the grid the courses into the community in many cases and cost residents in their power bills. The bottom line is data centers have proven to create many issues in the community. That is not to deny it. If we don't take action while we can, the state can preempt us further so it's called good planning just use that. Address the comp plan and the LDC thank you.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: [Listing Names].

>> PUBLIC PARTICIPATION: Good Morning Council hopefully we are moving forward with a 50 MW datacenter however stopping 50 MW leaves a dangerous loophole 49 MW facility or series of smaller ones can still impose many of the same burdens in our community these facilities on 24 seven they demand constant calling of generators and massive electrical loads even a midsize datacenter intent-49 MW range can use electricity equivalent to thousands of homes and draw significant volumes of water for cooling in the county is on Volusia Florida and its salt source for every additional heavy truck raises the risk of depleted wells higher cost for residents and greater susceptibility to sinkholes noise another concern continuous low-frequency sound from cooling systems and generators does not respect an arbitrary 50 MW a line travels disrupts sleep and reduces quality of life for nearby residents exactly the impacts of your own staff many of us in the public have already highlighted. Developers note the threshold if Jor stops at 50 MW projects will simply be sized just under it. Multiple smaller facilities will be proposed on adjacent sites. The cumulative effect on our infrastructure or aquifer and neighborhoods can be just as damaging some of our neighboring jurisdictions understand this Ormond Beach is pursuing a ban and all data centers Edgewater has adopted a broad prohibition a partial ban in the county creates a gap that undermines protection we expect from her County government counseled the public health safety and welfare concerns cited do not disappear under 50 MW a scale intensity of use is closed the loop all direct the staff to include 49 MW facilities and small commercial data centers in the ban at minimum established clear protective standards that protect the same harms under a different label Buddha moratorium in place for this process are added to the ban were currently going for a not done because some of the comments I will read some stuff for my previous. Four counties.[Listing Names] made a conscious choice to protect their residents environmental resources with an outright ban

ordinance. We are also continuing to trend in their comp plan now to see across only categories this was done in May. We are behind the eight ball on this. Many of these were already moved forward and put into place and they are already working on their LDC by going through ordinance. We're not the only state of California they acted very quickly in Monterey California about that at the last time on June 2, 2006 Montgomery held a special election in which 86.3% of voters approved a measure making it the first city in the nation to enact a permanent order approved citywide ban on data centers we cannot replace health impacts that these data centers will cause from industrial waste there is no way to mitigate that I'm asking you to do a ban and regulate smaller scale as well thank you.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Thank you for your comments Dick McCormick.

>> PUBLIC PARTICIPATION: Dick McCormick DeLeon Springs. Thank you gentlemen for your time and effort here. I'm totally in support of the ban on these hyper scale data centers. I really think the data center problem is not going to go away. Our sinkholes are not going to go away. Our issues with the electrical grid with the growth we are having in this area and all Central Florida is not going to go away. I think let's go with a ban on the 50 MW centers. I really really echo the concern I have with the smaller centers. If we get somebody that comes in and decides they want to build a 10 megawatt center after realizing 1 MW center will provide enough juice for 750,000 homes for one year. It's a 1 MW center. They are pulling 1 million- five million gallons of water a day out of where we fear getting it. As Mr. Dempsey pointed out, the concern I have is about these sinkholes. Those of us who lived here during the freeze back in the early 80s, you know Pierson Seville Central Florida we had a Porsche dealership that went under a road and in Winterhaven I believe it was. During the heavy pumping that we had at that time I don't want to drag this out I really think we will start with the hyper scale data centers we really really need to keep track of the fact once we get them done with then we have to deal with people who want to come in through the loopholes and the loopholes are the less than 50 MW centers.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Thank you for your comment that concludes the public comments on this item.

>> DAVID SANTIAGO,DISTRICT 5: Thank you Mr. Chairman. First I would like to applaud my colleague Jake Johansson for your comments and sharing them to solve. It took courage to

do that given the political environment that is out there regarding this. If you recall the last meeting we had I talked I was a I voted for the ban to come back to us but I was a strong advocate for a moratorium 12 month moratorium until we found out and learn more about healthy industries is evolving and put safeguards in place around that. I think the gentleman you said is correct that they are not going away. Data centers are not going to disappear. A lot of the comments made from this podium will be here, from a data center. You can see that all the time. They are not going away. I just did a little research and I taped in a data center AI. How are things evolving? As it pertains to data centers in America? A lot of things are shifting. I will just read a few there shifting to bring your own power. Create your own power. Somebody said that from there also. It's evolving based on fair public criticism. Another evolving technology on these is eliminating water consumption via a closed loop system. We've had testimony here where Mr. Nichols has been saying how much water we dump into the river or Daytona Beach dumps, I forget the number, 10 million gallons a day? 10 million gallons a day? Can an assistant include that I don't know. Another change is happening in the industry at their engineering out the noise. I don't know how they will do that but it is technology evolving. One of the other things you don't fear finding centers to make neighbors happy I will lead with this last one they are mandating waste heat recycling whatever that means. It sounds interesting. A lot of things that we see scares us. Back to the previous meeting I felt we should be solution finders technology involved and the ban I think I will probably vote for. The moratorium in my opinion was the right way to do it so we learn what's happening and we adapt to it and make the rules based on the things we want to make sure we want to protect. I get the fear, the mentality makes sense. It happens. As leaders I think our job is to really see the fear then see the facts and make tough decisions. That in my opinion is truly leadership. A lot of things are complex. It takes leadership sometimes to make unpopular decisions. But if you do them with the right intent not just bowing in fear I think history has taught us that in various scenarios. But the ban and going back to the ban why it will vote for the ban. The reality is we only have one parcel that may be applied to this. It is not where somebody described over here in the communities. That was fake news. That is campaign news is what that is. As far as changing existing properties, even if that happens they would have to come to the Council for approval because they would be changing the use. I will vote for it. I'm just saying there are protections in place. Let's vote for the ban. I caution us in the future whichever at this body is we don't buy into a lot of the fear tactics out there. Americans need to continue to evolve and we must evolve what history tells you you're always their street guy. I apologize if I'm escorting this saying Americo will fall from within right there are forces working to play us from within we need to be smarter leaders holistically. Thank you Mr. Chair.

>> JAKE JOHANSSON,AT-LARGE: Thank you David I appreciate the comments. My opening comment after presenting the information. If you want more information they call themselves Florida tax watch has a great PDF file on data centers as well. Because we only have one place and because it probably does not fit and because it is really inconsequential, I'm with the ban as well. I just wanted the public to understand, especially not municipalities because there are probably none of them there. There are opportunities here and be sure that you get to the ground truth data before you make your decision. If you're making your decision based on what you hear in the media, what you hear on social media with any subject but especially this one. I've been providing opportunities to say some things that our adversaries are putting on social media that are guiding us. Some people say it is a conspiracy theory but it is true. There are people manipulating social media to try to get you to believe something that may not be true. Instead of just believing it, find the root data and make your own decision. I spent a lot of time looking at this. That is the end. But again we only have one area. It is inconsequential. It is not going to kill me to vote for the ban. Thank you Chairman.

>> DON DEMPSEY,DISTRICT 1: I respectfully disagree with you guys saying there is only one area. I recently discovered I'd like to take credit for this. I'm not. It's from another friend of mine. I pointed this out to someone who is very alarming! We have numerous multi million square-foot warehouses in our community in the county. One of these illnesses is also one of the biggest owners of hyper scale data centers. This company owns the million square-foot warehouses as well as owns data centers in other areas. It is not such a stretch to think they might try and convert the warehouse into a data center that is what concerns me. The sinkholes concern me but now I am becoming aware of this. I think it is not something out of thin air, this is not just the sky falling. Politics. I think it's a real concern that I want this permanent. Don't want them to have a change of use and all of a sudden convert these multibillion-dollar square-foot warehouse facilities into a data center. They are already built. As my friend called it he called it a Trojan horse. That is what I'm concerned about. His us following for a Trojan horse as well I want the ban I'm not saying they are doing it this was not my thoughts. It was pointed out to me. It made me think how close it might be to reality. I am concerned about it. I'm concerned that if these went into place it would have a major effect on our subsurface sinkholes that's why I strongly believe in this minute ban.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Thank you I will just add. I agree with that. I think it's really important that we take this first step and ban hyper -scale very large data centers. I think

the public rings up a really good point that a 49 MW down to whatever number is good also the dangers for our community. What I would suggest is that we vote for this ban for the megawatts today. If it passes somebody could make a motion that we send it to the county staff so they can bring back another 362 pages of research on what kind of parameters would be put in place as far as water, noise, electricity use, for smaller data centers. We cannot ban memos. We have a data center downstairs. It is just a roomful of servers that conducts the business of the county. I'm not suggesting that we ban every data center. I would like to hear from the staff smaller than the 50 MW that we should have regulations for water use, electrical use and noise, anything else that the Council wants to look at. Let's take care of Item number five first and a ban on the megawatts.

>> DAVID SANTIAGO, DISTRICT 5: Don I want to reply to you because I just don't want to leave the record. The way it might be construed. These suits warehouses cannot just automatically get confirmed; it is not a permitted use. On their property let's go to the videotape vacant request I'm just saying they cannot automatically convert.

>> DON DEMPSEY, DISTRICT 1: What I'm saying is if we have a permanent ban it has to get notice to the public we have two public meetings.

>> DAVID SANTIAGO, DISTRICT 5: Even the request to change would be noticed.

>> DON DEMPSEY, DISTRICT 1: Not to the extent of the request to change the ordinance.

>> RAY F. TYNER: Growth resource management director knowing your large packet part of that package for the supporting documentation what we had is a comprehensive plan analysis. We showed several comp plan policies that help support the ban. We have two things going on for any facilities that are 49 MW or less. We have 180 that prevents us from making more stringent regulations but I will tell you if 49 MW came in here, we would utilize the same comprehensive policies that we are supporting in the ban to try to mitigate those potential impacts. They have to be consistent with those policies. Those policies are existing. We do have it to help us backup if we get any said plan for a little bit under that.

>> DAVID SANTIAGO,DISTRICT 5: Can you clarify our debate that is if an Amazon warehouse or distribution center went out of business or went empty can they just convert into a data center today?

>> RAY F. TYNER: From an infrastructure standpoint I don't know what the answer is. I know they are specially built. I don't know if they can take a warehouse and convert that warehouse without the support infrastructure with the walls. I don't know if that can be done.

>> DAVID SANTIAGO,DISTRICT 5: It probably requires coming to this body.

>> RAY F. TYNER: For the existing warehouses this needs to go in industrial number two for something like that if you have 48 or 49 megawatt want to convert to those we would have to do a rezoning and land use change that would come before the council.

>> DAVID SANTIAGO,DISTRICT 5: What I'm trying to get to to understand 50+. [Unclear Audio]

>> RAY F. TYNER: They have to do a land use change to make it industrial that would require a rezoning.

>> DAVID SANTIAGO,DISTRICT 5: That might be a dead issue. We are going to vote for it. I want to make sure that the public does not leave with the perception that this warehouse can convert into a large-scale data center.

>> DON DEMPSEY,DISTRICT 1: But there is more than one spot in the county where it can happen. That is my point.

>> DAVID SANTIAGO,DISTRICT 5: I love you, we disagree on that. I think I'm ready to vote.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: They can ask but it's a steep hill to climb I really appreciate what you just added because I don't know if that alleviates the concerns of the public that spoke for something smaller than 50 MW but if a 30, 40 megawatts comes in because of the research you've already done here and the standards that you are applying they would have to pass all of those hurdles that you've set up Q does that the staff.

>> RAY F. TYNER: Yes and the planning commission and the Council if the site plan was coming in and the applicant can always appeal but it would be a staff level analysis of our Comprehensive Plan making sure it is consistent with those policies.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: And it comes to the Council.

>> RAY F. TYNER: No if they appeal it eventually would.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: If they appeal. Thank you, I don't see any other comments. Karissa, Can you please call the roll?

>> KARISSA GREEN,CLERK: Can you repeat the motion.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: The motion is a ban on 50 MW or greater data centers in unincorporated Volusia County.

>> KARISSA GREEN,CLERK: Who was who made the motion and the second.

>> TROY KENT,DISTRICT 4: I make a motion to approve.

>> DON DEMPSEY,DISTRICT 1: I second the motion.

>> MATT REINHART,VICE CHAIR: Yes.

>> DANNY ROBINS,DISTRICT 3: Yes.

>> DAVID SANTIAGO,DISTRICT 5: Yes.

>> DON DEMPSEY,DISTRICT 1: Yes.

>> JAKE JOHANSSON,AT-LARGE: Yes.

>> TROY KENT,DISTRICT 4: Yes.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Yes. The ban passes 7/0.

>> DAVID SANTIAGO,DISTRICT 5: We are taking away Don's iPhone by the way he is going back to a land line.

>> PAOLO SORIA,LEGAL: Procedural issue this is the first reading it is not past the second reading will come before you October 20 at 5:01 PM.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: I'm sorry this was just the first reading. The second one is on October 20 at 4 PM and will go to the PLDRC on October 15.

>> MICHAEL G. DYER,COUNTY ATTORNEY: In case anybody was following along we have to bring it back at 5 PM. 5:01 PM.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: 5:01 PM on October 20. Okay. Okay that takes us to 11:10 AM Item 06

2026 ECHO Grant Cycle Award Recommendations.

Total potential grant awards: \$13,144,290.

>> DAVID SANTIAGO,DISTRICT 5: Moved to approve as presented by the staff.

>> JAKE JOHANSSON,AT-LARGE: I second the motion.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: We have a motion to approve the entire list in one vote.

>> DAVID SANTIAGO,DISTRICT 5: If permitted I think legal would allow that.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR:

>> JAKE JOHANSSON,AT-LARGE: I second the motion.

>> BRADLEY BURBAUGH: We need direction on Daytona.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: I didn't hear what you just said.

>> BRADLEY BURBAUGH: We included Daytona as part of the list. It was two points shy of 80. I want to make sure it was included.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Okay. We have a motion to approve the whole list at once. I happen to think that's a horrible idea. We should evaluate each one but we will see if

anybody else has that concern. I will ask if any Council member has a question for the staff. I see Troy Kent's name up. I don't know if you have a question or comment.

>> TROY KENT,DISTRICT 4: I had a question I guess for Mr. Santiago he said as proposed by the staff we are going to include in this list Daytona Beach who did not meet the threshold of the points that we are supposed to get is that your is are you comfortable with that.

>> DAVID SANTIAGO,DISTRICT 5: Yes I did acknowledge that to Brad but I'm open to removing the eternal one and having that is a separate discussion if that is what you prefer.

>> TROY KENT,DISTRICT 4: I do prefer that one councilman Chairman I will also tell you I would also prefer going through them individually I will see how the rest of the Council feels.

>> DAVID SANTIAGO,DISTRICT 5: Since I have a motion in play I want to amend my motion by removing the Daytona one should be removed from the list as a whole and presented without Daytona if my seconder is okay with that.

>> JAKE JOHANSSON,AT-LARGE: The second is okay.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: We are removing the Daytona project from this first vote.

>> DON DEMPSEY,DISTRICT 1: I'd like to go down individually as well, kind of like what Mr. Kent and the Chair are proposing. I think some of these merit some discussion.

>> DAVID SANTIAGO,DISTRICT 5: Can I respond to that. We can have a discussion on every single one right now. There is nothing preventing you from talking about any one of them with this motion in place. If it is number three or four we can talk about it. I just want to make sure you're prohibited from speaking on any of the ones on the list.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: The problem could be that if somebody has an issue with a particular project and wants to vote no on it after voting no on everything.

>> DAVID SANTIAGO,DISTRICT 5: Not the surly Mr. Chair as Troy consist or expressed concerns with Daytona we adjusted it and was removed Daytona.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: You'll amend it every time.

>> DAVID SANTIAGO,DISTRICT 5: If we have to we will hear the comments.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Okay. Staff. Can I ask a couple of questions to whoever wants to answer. I think the last time we talked about this I asked Dr Burbaugh about the scoring system I'm hearing from members of the ECHO committee that it starts at points you had ensured me it did not. Although reading the minutes from the last meeting, I understand from one of our attorneys that no we don't start from the committee and do not start from zero - 100 points, they were told Florida State Law requires that we give any ECHO participant a starting number of 60 points. I'm just wondering how Florida State law controls a local program?

>> PAOLO SORIA,LEGAL: The response was that you have to score. There was an individual member that did not want to give a zero as a protest to say I'm not going to score you have to if you are present. There is a baseline of points. It is 60 points that each applicant gets of the past eligibility that means they have all the required documents they got the match in place to document. There is a baseline of 60 that you start from which is met eligibility. Of all of these applications, all of them received a unanimous vote by the committee. That is 60 points then what the committee does is both on the quality of the application we don't vote on the quality we advise the committee if it met eligibility. It's a two-part score.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Okay. What concerns me is that the committee as you just said they cannot vote zero even if they don't think it qualifies on an individual project. I think the lowest score they can give them is 60.

>> BRADLEY BURBAUGH: 60. That is because they met eligibility.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: By the County staff.

>> BRADLEY BURBAUGH: By the vote of the committee.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: I forget who it was that brought up this last meeting that we postpone this until we look at all of the rules. Now I understand why. Here we are we are going to vote on them. My other question for you is the award CAP. On February 3 the Council voted to approve five million-dollar CAP on awards but now on the rulebook that says \$10 million I'm wondering I don't remember the Council voting on that.

>> BRADLEY BURBAUGH: From the timeline you gave given the short amount of time that we had we estimate changes to the guidebook and give it out so the individual grantees would have that information. There is a standard line in the guidebook that has been there since the early 2000's when the program was adopted it says that above that \$5 million if there is a significant addition like another building we talked about this before it's adding another experience to that campus that Council can provide up to another \$5 million for that it does not mention any dollars it says up to the CAP. This is long-standing and he gives the Council the authority essentially if they think it's another structure that will offer a significantly different experience to do so under their authority. They cannot apply and the applicant cannot apply until there's been a vote by the Council allowing them to apply for the second CAP. It is basically giving this Council the authority to do that.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Again a reason to vote on each individual project. So the CAP is not \$5 million it is \$10 million if we wanted to be. I'm sorry that just concerns me. In an environment when the public is really concerned about taxing and property taxes our job is to be good stewards of their money. I see the scoring, the CAP, is taking a lot of that out of our hands. I guess we can vote for no one that occurs. The last question is really not for you, it is for the County Attorney. It's uncomfortable but it has to be said that because at least I'm getting emails and phone calls on this that the public is wondering if three of our council members need to recuse themselves from this vote on the ground because they received \$10,000 in donations before this vote. Is there a conflict of interest? I don't know

how much help Jake got. I think it is public record within the county that Danny and David and each received \$10,000 from the Brown is that a conflict.

>> MICHAEL G. DYER,COUNTY ATTORNEY: Who were the donations from?

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: If you look at the county website it says I don't know if it says Hyatt Brown. You can only give 1000 it had to be him or his company and its subsidiaries.

>> MICHAEL G. DYER,COUNTY ATTORNEY: Campaign contributions in and of itself a Commission on Ethics is ruled do not create a conflict of interest for voting purposes there has to be more. I looked at Dr Burbaugh. If I'm speaking from looking at the list of applications here they are all 501(c)(3). Or governmental entities not individuals 501(c)(3)'s don't give campaign contributions that is why I ask that specific question all of you have voting conflict statute that you follow sometimes you've had those discussions we've had issues the final arbitrator that is the Commission on Ethics if anybody feels they wanted us to pursue a complaint they are free to do that your abstention from a vote is triggered when it produces special private gain or loss and economic benefit or harm to you relative to business Association business associate or principal who is typically a principal like somebody who hires you. I don't see campaign contributions by a private individual as something that would rise to that level.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Even a private individual that is part of the 501(c)(3)?

>> MICHAEL G. DYER,COUNTY ATTORNEY: That is correct.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Regardless that is the law I accept that. The perception is still I think it is still it worries the public when we are dealing with this much money. And voting on it. Okay. That is the end of questions for me.

>> DAVID SANTIAGO,DISTRICT 5: I'd like Mr. Chair to yield first to Mr. Troy Kent then I will go after him.

>> TROY KENT,DISTRICT 4: Mr. Johansson you were in front of me as well is that okay.

>> JAKE JOHANSSON,AT-LARGE: Yes Sir.

>> TROY KENT,DISTRICT 4: Chairman I'm not on the ballot I will be in two years but I'm not on the ballot. I just have to say publicly, since you mentioned these people, Mr. Brown who is here today, he is a resident just like I am. Just like you are. He can or I can or anybody here can donate to anybody's campaign and it to me, you talk about the perception. This is just me personally. I feel like what you said crossed a line. I feel like you are putting not only the individuals that are running currently but also Mr. Brown's integrity into question. I think it's wildly inappropriate. I don't think it is called for. I feel like the political season is ugly enough. I feel like as a body we are better than that. Each of us goes through a training every single year on ethics. Per the state statute where you served as a legislature Mr. Santiago. Chairman I am just you and I agree on a lot of things unfortunately chair, this is one we are not going to agree on if you didn't mean for it to be that way, you are a grown man you do you and I will do me. It came off as ugly and like they are doing something wrong or that they could be so they might have to recuse himself when the lawyer that we may great amount of money to no offense, to represent this county and take care of these residents and also this dais, said there was no conflict and it felt like a dog with a bone there was more you are going to go after. I don't feel like Mr. Brown deserves that. I don't feel like any resident of Derek deserves it. I don't feel everybody on this dais deserves it until somebody deserves it. I just did not feel like they did thank you for allowing for time.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: I will respond real quick it's unfortunate it was Mr. Brown or or everybody but the facts are there was a \$10,000 donation and a couple weeks later there is a vote on awarding or anybody's 501(c)(3) with \$2.5 million. It is ugly that the public didn't trust us then they look at this and say what is happening here? You are supposed to be stewards of our money. I said at the beginning it is uncomfortable to bring it up but I think we have to talk about it. The public needed to hear from the attorney. Now they need to hear from us. I think it just looks ugly to the public who depend on us to handle their money properly. It makes them wonder. I do appreciate what you said.

>> TROY KENT,DISTRICT 4: If I may follow up on that I will tell this dais very briefly about 20 four years ago my first election of beautiful little city of Ormond Beach I was elected as a city commissioner I had a dear old lady who worked in the library of the public school that I attended she was the supporter of mine and wrote me a check for \$100. She contacted me and wanted to verbally or light me on fire. She accepted money from somebody she deemed a developer that she thought was inappropriate and what they would be asking me for. I simply asked her if you wrote me a check for \$100. Are you going to ask me for something? I've never ever had anybody that's ever supported me contact me and say I want you to vote a certain way because I would tell them that is inappropriate. I don't appreciate that. I put it out there it can be someone that donates more or someone that donates less or even volunteers on a campaign. I appreciate you sharing your thoughts on it. Like I said you and I have more in common I think then we have not in common but this is just one where we are going to disagree.

>> DAVID SANTIAGO,DISTRICT 5: Thank you Mr. Chair Troy I'm glad I yielded to my blood pressure trying to come down slowly. My character has been called into question. Thank you for your words of honor and integrity which you know the process and we know the process. Determine exactly what he was doing when he did that. He knew exactly what he was doing. It was a political theater that he was doing. He had the answers to that legal question already. Because the legal team already looked at it days ago and told him they told us. This is the mockery that he makes of this Council since he's been here six years ago that's why a smile and finally going to say it you made a mockery of this Chairman seat since you've been here I've been respectful to you for years but you now called my integrity into question I don't want to get pissed I am pissed off. What the guy will do is judge the project on its merits the museum that is a gem in this county let's talk about the merits of the project tell us why you do or do not like this museum and whether or not ECHO should fund it that should be the compensation not that this guy got \$1000 he must be corrupt Scott got \$10,000 he must be corrupt. If you don't have any data to support your accusations don't do it the respectful and honorable position that you hold. It happens over and over again. Let me finish. I will let you speak afterwards. You said your garbage. I do not interrupt you.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Go ahead.

>> DAVID SANTIAGO,DISTRICT 5: No, the position you're in requires honor and integrity. If you have no proof you should never bring it up. He speaks in platitudes like the public should know or something might be happening. That is garbage folks. Let's talk about the merits of the museum. Tell me why DeBerry should not get any money. Tell me why Ormond Beach? Any money wire project is good or not stop this garbage election is here and you are ban of gangsters out there that subscribe to the same garbage you do the public will soon decide if they will be up here with you and get help this county consult if that band of merry men that aligns himself with him you'll get to see what this Council is going to do in the future. I apologize to the public but this guy has called my character into question I'm not want to stand down might be 5'4" I will fight a 10 foot giant that's why my name is David thank you.[Laughter]

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: The public has called the character of this entire Council because of this problem. They needed to hear an answer to this. I had an answer: I knew what the County Attorney was going to save the public did not. They deserve to hear it, they deserve to know how their money is being taken care of.

>> JAKE JOHANSSON,AT-LARGE: I have two questions. The 60% I just want to be clear. Everybody starts at zero and you look at their package and they turn it in on time. I'm just making 20 points. They give you the help they will spend the money, that's 20 points. They give you their financials, that is 20 points there up to 60 points. If they don't turn any of that they are not up to 60 and they don't move on.

>> BRADLEY BURBAUGH: That is correct.

>> JAKE JOHANSSON,AT-LARGE: You have 10 good projects that start out at 60 it is not that they start we just woke up and said we are giving everybody 60 and moving on there are bunch of people that did not get to 60 and they are not even on this list obviously. I'm glad I'm straight on that a comment was made that 5 million was the CAP but really 10 million was the CAP we all have some say in that. I think you said we do have a say in that not only do we have say in it it's not a no vote it is we need to initiate that additional \$5 million. If we don't say squat, nobody gets squat beyond the \$5 million.

>> BRADLEY BURBAUGH: That is correct.

>> JAKE JOHANSSON,AT-LARGE: Okay my third question is anybody on this list worthy of that additional \$5 million?

>> BRADLEY BURBAUGH: For this.

>> JAKE JOHANSSON,AT-LARGE: The \$10 million CAP is there anybody that we are looking at that we may want to do that for.

>> BRADLEY BURBAUGH: Certainly if there are any of these projects that are new providing a new experience or new amenity to the community it's a five million dollar and seven per project not per campus.

>> JAKE JOHANSSON,AT-LARGE: Right got it.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Troy Kent your name is up is that left over.

>> TROY KENT,DISTRICT 4: Sorry technical difficulties. You can laugh at that. My only other comment was that my favorite ECHO projects are of course the county of Volusia ECHO projects. That is something I would commend to staff that we continue to diligently look at where ECHO dollars can be used for our County residents with County projects. That is my only comment. Thanks.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR:

>> DON DEMPSEY,DISTRICT 1: I guess if I can put this at the that's why I don't take donations from anybody I didn't last time I'm not going to do at this time. I was not put into that group because I take note of donations from either side of the line thank

you.[Laughter] It's for that very reason why I don't take it so it cannot be accused of siding with donors. I would like to go down the list if we could and just discuss there is a couple I have questions about Mr. Robins Barbara an issue last time I believe it was about Item eight on conservation Florida.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: We have three members of the public that want to speak that might help form your questions.

>> DON DEMPSEY,DISTRICT 1: I'm sorry.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: That's all right you did know we have three members of the public you have three minutes to talk about this Item Connie Kobe is first. You will be followed by John Nicholson who was followed by.[Listing Names]

>> PUBLIC PARTICIPATION: I'm Connie Kolby Ormond Beach. I did not know which way you're going to go with this. I spent last night going through all of the notes from this meeting. As far as eligibility goes from these to me there were a lot of issues with different things that were on there. Start with the brown one they said they were asking for \$2.5 million which puts them over the CAP because the CAP is \$10 million. They only had \$5 million to start with that is a little bit over the amount they are entitled to. Different things like the Marine Discovery Center, it still needs permits from F DEP and the Army. The Army Corps of Engineers. Edgewater said they needed additional permitting. D Ranch had no feasibility study. Other issues with that one. Ormond Beach will leave them alone; they are good ones. Holly Hill says they need some permitting as well. Anyway some of these issues came to the advisory board that were really not ready for being approved at this point. They had some issues with them that needed to be further investigated. Harvey Avenue was pending a CRA approval. Not ready to bring to the board on that one. Some of these things I think need to be looked at before you vote for the whole package because each one of them had something different. Not all of them but a couple of them definitely need to be looked at. Thank you.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Thank you John Nicholson.

>> PUBLIC PARTICIPATION: John Nicholson Daytona Beach side a couple of issues through issues actually . one, with regard to the \$400,000 for the Daytona Beach weather it has reached the amount total. You have to realize it is the core area and it is expanding the beachside boardwalk to include several other things. It would be needed for the second pier; it is a foundation for other things. I'm asking you to include that in your thoughts about whether it should be included in this particular round or not. Secondly with regard to Hyatt Brown, you guys have no idea how a city our size when somebody gives you almost half \$1 billion it's approaching 1/2 \$1 billion on numerous projects this one is super. It's like \$250 million. He always goes overboard. Remember the \$15 million for the park downtown he is at \$37 million. This is exactly what ECHO is for. It is a major game changer for that museum. For me, it is not even a question. When somebody hands you this kind of money, you don't say well you only \$0.13. That is what it seems like you were saying. Again publicly, and I know he gets enough and he doesn't need it but thank you Hyatt for everything you do for us. Lastly with regard to the amount of money it is \$13 million and seven projects have gotten \$12.5 million of it. I don't know why we are encouraging it or what you have for projects at \$2.5 million. We were a maximum of \$1 million just two years ago or so. Are all of our projects at the point where if you don't have megabucks we encourage them to end and spend. Are we kicking out little ones the \$100,000 here, \$125,000 there? That's what I used to remember is to get seven /8 under \$100,000 now I don't see any. They're all going superhigh. I just wanted to bring that up, thank you.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: [Listing Names]

>> PUBLIC PARTICIPATION: Good morning.[Listing Names] Tomoka Farms village I'm not here to speak against or for any of the projects. All ECHO Grants to make the cut are worthwhile because we need those types of objects in Volusia County. I'm here to talk about the project as a whole. On November 3, 2020 the voters voted overwhelmingly 72.4% to continue the ECHO program for another 20 years in fact there were hundred thousand more votes yes, then no. The project or the program was approved by the voters based on the guidelines the way they were written at the time. On February 3 of this year 2026 the Council decided to raise the threshold of the amount of wards up to \$2.5 million. Let's equate that back to what happened with the arts. The arts program was changed to you guys change the parameters of the folks that were vying for those dollars? Amended their asks through the new program requirements and your word that money only to pull it back at the last minute public spoke out you came back and re-awarded that money with a few exceptions. I think the same thing bears talking about here when the voters vote on a

project or a program like ECHO which is very important then the Council changes the parameters of that project or program midstream in six years into the approval process, I think the public will have questions. Why is it being changed? It was different from what we approved. What I'm talking about is the survival of echo. When it comes up for a vote again in 2040. The voters will look back and say they changed this on us six years into the previous vote. Now the amount awarding applicants has improved or appreciably gone from 600,000 up to \$2.5 billion. They are going to see that they ought to want to know why that is being done. I'm not saying why it has been done on not casting any dispersions but I'm saying if you change the parameters of the program after the voters approved it overwhelmingly. When you do things people have questions that's why you're getting emails that's why you're getting emails from the constituents to say why are we doing that in their questioning of individual programs. Maybe not really so but they are seeing a change that dramatically decreases the amount of money available for other applicants . some may be excluded is not that dollar amount available anymore. What I'm asking you to do is look before you change programs that the electorate approved overwhelmingly for long periods of time. Because you change this program and the dynamics look at what happened with the arts. The public and back overwhelmingly electorate rewarded that money because you changed the program midstream. That's why I'm saying ECHO is a viable project. These projects are good projects that don't change big projects after they've been approved by the electorate based on what it says the time vote. If you do that people have questions. They may not be as generous in the next election.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Thank you for your comments.

>> BRADLEY BURBAUGH: If I may clarify two points. I think one is that Lebron received \$4.1 million from 2000 -2020 the program is assigned to the CAP when we reauthorize the program in 2020 the CAP presents that is something that has been interpreted as legal. The CRA individuals when it comes to the support for their match at the eligibility meeting they may not have the bank statement or the grant signed with the CRA resolution pending, we give them some grace up until the score sheet they have the day of scoring. If they are not submitted by the day of scoring the meeting with our committee they would be booted out of the process. But for the CRA the City of Daytona by the time the scoring did have that. I think the ballot language is not its umbrella terms it is not specific guidance that this Council adopts that is your prerogative as this Council.

>> MICHAEL G. DYER,COUNTY ATTORNEY: I think to jump on as I could is this Council approves the rules of the program he goes through the advisory board you can change them but you have rules that are far more specific because what was order approved anticipated that you would establish the rules which you have done historically as a body.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Okay. Argument done.

>> GEORGE RECKTENWALD,COUNTY MANAGER: There was never a dollar amount to make it more plain English there was never a dollar amount in the ballot language.

>> BRADLEY BURBAUGH: That is correct I think there is been very little changes the one change we talk about in terms of dollar amount as a suggestion from the auditor looked at the price of projects from 2000 until today it says one dollar today if you kept the \$400,000 original CAP delivered the same amount of services and project it would cost \$1.5 million today. That was the auditor recommendation that this Council adopted.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Okay thank you back to the Council members

>> DANNY ROBINS,DISTRICT 3: Thank you Brad it helps us get some clarity kind of combating the political the caulking we've been seeing here lately and on social media we learned that there was no dollar amount on the amendment and the language gives us the leeway to make those changes I can pretty much flow with that. I also want to make a point of clarification. The arts funding mentioned earlier was from the general fund not ECHO and we had the legislative powers to make those adjustments because they were not separate or separate from the ECHO program. I think the Council we've done a pretty good job paying attention to the numbers of support from the public with the ECHO program. When it comes to the cultural, environmental , historical and outdoor recreation , we've had no issues. I'm not subscribing to this doom and gloom stuff that we've been hearing is strictly political to burn bridges and to create chaos. It's unfortunate because we have a lot of great people in this community and no he doesn't need it but Mr. Brown does dedicate his life to Volusia County and brought business here and has done so much for this community in all aspects. I apologize about the sum of the unprofessionalism that we've

heard so far. It's despicable and I'm not going to air any of that dirty laundry. I will take care of that privately. Thank you. I will support this list as presented.

>> DON DEMPSEY, DISTRICT 1: I had two questions. First of all I would like to point out to Mr. Brown that I've taken no money from him. I have all the respect in the world for him for what he does for the community. I know a lot of times these guys get demonized as developers. He gives back to the community. He does not just make money from the community and pockets it. He gives back. John said it's almost 1/2 billion dollars he is given back. That's a lot. The community benefits from people like him. I really appreciate what he does for all of us. Going to this list. I have two questions. One, I heard from some people the concerns about the Bush Flagler allotment of \$100,000 only because it's not open to the public. I didn't know if we had anybody from the staff who could enlighten us. I understand it's for an ADA accessible playground which is obviously worth it. I just want to make sure we are making all efforts to ensure that the whole public has access to this, not just members.

>> BRADLEY BURBAUGH: The YMCA has three ways to access it if you remember you can certainly access it if you're not a member if you check in at the counter you can go in they will offer scholarship if you don't have the funds. Or a day passes. Scholarships for free with met people in a day pass they get by or become a member this is the ninth project team that was awarded to the YMCA there is precedent and public access has been determined through those methods in the past.

>> DON DEMPSEY, DISTRICT 1: Okay Ms. Colby brought something out. I heard some concerns about Item eight conservation Florida D Ranch preserve that there was not a feasibility study done. Can you expand on that and what's happened.

>> BRADLEY BURBAUGH: All projects have a feasibility study or they would not pass eligibility. There was a feasibility study, rocketing plan and business plan as part of the grant requirements. There may be some disagreement between the committee members or the public on was it the most robust or was it that they would've liked to see. That is a matter of opinion but the staff's judgment based on ours is looking through all of these applications every year and having a section with a feasibility study determining the need.

>> DON DEMPSEY,DISTRICT 1: Be eventually submitted a request for \$600,000 is that right.

>> BRADLEY BURBAUGH: Guesser.

>> DON DEMPSEY,DISTRICT 1: Can you explain why they withdrew the \$600,000.

>> BRADLEY BURBAUGH: They had a barn it was that they were going to retrofit when they thought it was acceptable they could do then when it came back I think there was a misunderstanding it was going to be a public access facility or not in terms of whether they could do what they wanted to do. I think the bar is a little higher when it comes to public access facilities. They realized they cannot have hundreds of people in a retrofitted barn if they needed to fit 100 people in a facility that needed to be different.

>> DAVID SANTIAGO,DISTRICT 5: Just two things. Briefly to the public. I took no pleasure in my high blood pressure a few minutes ago. It's not my normal way of doing things if you followed me over the years of Ortman time serving. I'm sorry that had to happen. To Mr. Brown, Volusia County is lucky to have you as a resident here want you to know that and I apologize to you for it might've been promote your name was trying to be disparaged in some way I felt that way thank you for being a Volusia County resident we appreciate you and Volusia County no you don't look for the limelight but we should County residents have very little knowledge of what you do in this community. Q I'm done.

>> DANNY ROBINS,DISTRICT 3: Thank you chairman Don just want to extinguish some of the mutual concerns we did have or had at one point I looked over the paperwork and everything and what conservation Florida was saying was correct about the building the cost for retrofit would be astronomical. Nobody likes seeing good buildings or good material being taken down but we cannot make it work. They didn't want to expand the footprint and I get that. Number two had to do with funding or long-term security. That concern was also addressed with a very healthy rainy day fund I think just short of \$20 million to cover any other issues that may come in the future. And cover all costs when it comes to operation. My concerns were taken care of and hopefully we can get your support on that. It's a great project that will have in that area it borders David's district but it will act as a regional education facility really for Central Florida. There is WMA. There is

the river right by the boardwalk. A lot of great things are happening in that area but I think this would be positive to our community so I will support it.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: So far nobody has pulled D Ranch off the list. I'm just trying to make sure that Don or anybody else did not think nobody is asked for that yet. I happen to think it should be taken off the list. Yes, it has a feasibility study. It looks pretty weak. Applicants are also supposed to turn in minutes and they turned in some as I read through the minutes the D Ranch is never discussed except for a Consent Agenda when it also was not discussed. To prevent it I don't know how they came to the conclusion I'm not sure they did come to a conclusion of how to do this they came to us for \$650,000 and afterwards discovered that the building they wanted to use was not sufficient. Now they're coming back for \$2.5 million. It makes me really nervous to trust them with \$2.5 million of public money when they were not aware of the condition of the barn before one had not adequately discussed it, at least as reflected in their minutes. In a feasibility study that I don't think merits consideration. I would like to see it approved but I don't think it should be approved at this time. I think they should go back and strengthen their approach to it. Before I can vote to give them \$2.5 million. If we are voting as a group everybody on that list all at once that will be an issue with me. There is a glut of projects that are very good. And they need to be approved. I hope they will be approved. Then to Mr. Brown I will add this, I've been to your headquarters at your invitation, twice. You gave me a tour. I have all the respect in the world for what you have accomplished and what your family continues to accomplish. This may sound strange I don't know. I don't work for the rest of the Council I work for the public and when I hear that many complaints I'm not disparaging to name but I'm getting emails that are. Yours and affairs because of the simple appearance of making donations and then two weeks later voting for this. I'm sorry if that happens but it happens. It is happening right now. It needed to be clear in the public air. That is what I am tempted to do. Am I the only one that would like to pull D Ranch from the list?

>> DON DEMPSEY,DISTRICT 1: I would like to pull it as well. For discussion I would like to vote on the others and talk about D Ranch separately.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Okay. That is 2/7 I don't know if that is the motion.

>> DANNY ROBINS,DISTRICT 3: I was listening to some of the commentary that you made wanting to pull it and that is fine you didn't mention any clear direction or what you would be expecting conservation Florida or training to change or strengthen their approach. I think you have to be specific with that in order to garnish some support. I'm interested to hear that.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Would like to see them come back at the next cycle with a robust report on health will make this work a feasibility study that needs to be called a marketing study. How is it going to affect the entire county I'd like to see? I think every member of I don't think any member of their board is in Volusia County. They're all in Seminole County. Maybe that is fine. The way they are set up works they can have three people that make decisions for how this money works. Five people are required, three people would be the majority. I would just like to see from them really intense discussions that are reflected in their minutes. This is why we are asking for this. This is what we are going to do. I don't see it. I see it in an application. I see what they say which I just think is weak. I would like to see it strengthened with a good feasibility study with a robust discussion by their board that is reflected in their minutes.

>> DANNY ROBINS,DISTRICT 3: That sounds great chairman. I think they already did that if you look at the ECHO meeting where D Ranch was discussed you would see or hear that discussion was made by our board as well invented by our board. We cannot just keep doing this generality when we save robustly. There is no definition. It sounds sexy but there's nothing there. Council, we are just dancing with this thing. It's been vetted by us, it's been vetted by the ECHO committee D Ranch has been around for decades. They have a feasibility study to meet all the requirements. They have a robust rainy day fund to cover any things. There you have it.

>> TROY KENT,DISTRICT 4: Thank you chairman this comment is really just for the staff reviewing what you staff as presented here. It goes back to Item number 10 on the list Daytona Beach. I will just say the ECHO board has a threshold at 80. This is just for me. I feel like in the future staff even though you say they did not meet that threshold, we could see how we can improve or approve this. For me going forward I think maybe the staff needs to follow the ECHO recommendation if it does not meet the bare minimum. I don't like that it didn't meet their bare minimum. Maybe you all can approve this because it

meets our bare minimum. That does not feel good. I'm not crazy about it, just give you that for future ECHO projects. For me personally.

>> BRADLEY BURBAUGH: We would like the past precedent to bring projects with a score between 70-80 for Council consideration. If your colleagues agree with you, we would like nothing more.

>> TROY KENT,DISTRICT 4: I'd like to hear that maybe my colleagues will agree if it does not meet the minimum threshold of 80 especially if they jump through the basic hoops they get 60 I don't think is too much to ask to get to the threshold of what ECHO once. Council?

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Thank you.

>> DAVID SANTIAGO,DISTRICT 5: Troy if you can bring that up in the end we can discuss it with what I call the question.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Before I call the question my understanding was a motion we removed Daytona you will get to discuss it again. We are voting on the other eight projects all at once. The nine projects. I will just say before I vote I feel strongly about D Ranch but since this is how I have to vote I can be the only person to vote against the list but I think the other projects are strong I would vote for your project Mr. Brown. I'm ashamed that the ones don't meet those standards in my opinion. It's apparently only my opinion we should pull it for now. Karissa, Can you please call the roll? We are voting on all nine projects excluding Daytona.

>> MATT REINHART,VICE CHAIR: Yes.

>> DANNY ROBINS,DISTRICT 3: Yes.

>> DAVID SANTIAGO,DISTRICT 5: Yes.

>> DON DEMPSEY,DISTRICT 1: No.

>> JAKE JOHANSSON,AT-LARGE: Yes.

>> TROY KENT,DISTRICT 4: Yes.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Yes. The motion carries: 6/1. Let's discuss Daytona real quick. It was called as somebody wanted to put that back up for discussion? If you don't then we will take a break.

>> BRADLEY BURBAUGH: I think a point of clarification there was extreme discussion not extreme. There was a good amount of discussion about a procedural issue before the vote that may have influenced the two points that were related to the CRA preapproval. This board is Council has approved a guidebook that has been long-standing and plays the CRA using CRA funds is a match requires preapproval the weight that that is been interpreted in the past when we bring a project to you that uses CRA utility it uses CRA if you approve the project it also constitutes the preapproval there was a lot of discussion about Council role in that process I think some of the board members did not feel comfortable holding a project eligible without hearing whether you approve the CRA or not. The city remedied that by saying they would give us another resolution thinking they would use \$400,000 of funds not CRA. Just that point of clarification I want to make just for the purpose of this meeting.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Okay thank you I believe that Vice Chair Rienhart would like to weigh in.

>> MATT REINHART,VICE CHAIR: Yes sir thank you chair can you hear me okay.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Yes.

>> MATT REINHART, VICE CHAIR: Thank you Brad for pointing that out that's exactly what this verse cannot we get to study this was this procedural issue it has to do with the CRA was the only reason it scored the weighted that being said I would make a motion to approve number 10 this is a great thing for that area.

>> DAVID SANTIAGO, DISTRICT 5: I second the motion.

>> MATT REINHART, VICE CHAIR: This is a great thing for the issues on the boardwalk you want to move forward and make that area better this is one use of that resource.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER, CHAIR: There is a motion by Vice Chair Rienhart to approve Daytona Beach.

>> DAVID SANTIAGO, DISTRICT 5: I second the motion.

>> JAKE JOHANSSON, AT-LARGE: Discussion this is somewhat bothersome it has fallen below the list for me. There's been discussions at Daytona about the use of the CRA funds and their possible improper use of CRA funds. Not to say this is an improper use but given their questionable financial use of monies it kind of gathers me. I know it's important to the community. I would like a lot more information and I was not planning on voting for this anyhow. This is one of those where I would definitely wait one cycle and get more information.

>> TROY KENT, DISTRICT 4: Mr. Johansson I don't believe I can say it any better than you just did. I'm not even going to try. I completely agree with you. I think if anything we can talk about it next cycle. There are too many unanswered financial questions CRA etc. etc. I'm a no on this.

>> MATT REINHART, VICE CHAIR: Good points by both you gentlemen however I think this is a good use for that what they've done in the past I don't want to throw the baby out with the

bathwater and let this one project suffer as a result of maybe what they've done or not done in the past. I'm still yes on this.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Okay. Karissa, Can you please call the roll?

>> MATT REINHART,VICE CHAIR: Yes.

>> DANNY ROBINS,DISTRICT 3: No.

>> DAVID SANTIAGO,DISTRICT 5: Yes.

>> DON DEMPSEY,DISTRICT 1: Yes.

>> JAKE JOHANSSON,AT-LARGE: No.

>> TROY KENT,DISTRICT 4: No.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Yes. The motion carries: the project is approved. With that it is 12:09 PM we will take a break and be back at 12:45 PM..

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Let's start with Item number seven which is a quasi-judicial hearing Proposed plat vacation of a portion of the plat of Part Two New Glencoe, Map Book 9 Page 117 and a portion of the plat of New Glencoe Gersen & Ferreira, Map Book 9 Page 85.

Council District #3.

>> JAKE JOHANSSON,AT-LARGE: I make a motion to approve.

>> DANNY ROBINS,DISTRICT 3: I second the motion.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Anybody have any ex parte disclosure they need to declare.

no you can take me down.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: No questions, have you opened your mouth yet.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR:

All in favor signify by saying,aye?

>> Board Voting: Aye.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Anyone opposed say nay? You will let me know how Matt voted on that. I guess he doesn't hear us anymore.

>> KARISSA GREEN,CLERK: I got notification he approved Item number seven.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Okay 7/0. Item number eight you are having the same album we are we can barely see over the monitors.

>> PAOLO SORIA,LEGAL: I thought that was a comment on my left back.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Ordinance 2026-18 Legal Notices on County Website
Connie Colby is still here.

>> TROY KENT,DISTRICT 4: I make a motion to approve.

>> DANNY ROBINS,DISTRICT 3: I second the motion.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Since we had a question, will one of you tell us how it's going to work.

>> PAOLO SORIA,LEGAL:

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: So the public knows.

>> PAOLO SORIA,LEGAL: If you approve this in lieu of publishing the newspaper we can publish on the website part of the consent agenda Items was setting the fee schedule and for approval of the contractor the service vendor. In order for the local government to use the county's website the cost to publish on the website must be less than the cost to publish in the newspaper. The fee schedule you approved is \$2.50 per line one dollar cheaper than the News-Journal but its CAP at \$200 is automatically cheaper. Eric usually ads for publishing in the newspaper went anywhere from \$300- up to multiple thousands depending on the type of notice and words. The public statute requires us if we want to use a newspaper we need to publish once per year in the newspaper or journal circulation that we are publishing on the website and any person who wants to receive notice can register with the local government entity to receive notice by email or by first-class mail. In addition to easy accessibility on the county's website, anyone who wants to be in the forum registers with the county or registers with the city every single time that local government posts something they receive an email notice.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Okay I think that answered her question how could she besides the computer get notification. She would have to register in her city of residents as well?

>> PAOLO SORIA,LEGAL: It depends on who you want to receive notice from its dependent on each local government if you live in the city if you want to receive notifications from the city register from the city to receive notices they published on our website if you want both you register with both the County and the city most likely will have a central repository that you can input your address and what notices you want to receive from which city.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: That will be on the website.

>> PAOLO SORIA,LEGAL: Yes, it's only one website or county.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: That should make it simple thank you very much.

>> JAKE JOHANSSON,AT-LARGE: I remember bringing this up when I first got here. The reason I did that was because as the city manager I remember writing those checks or seeing them and going all my God that is outrageous. I like that it is going to be cheaper for us. I like that we have a fee schedule for municipalities that join in. I'm hoping that we do. What will be our plan for notifying the public or the public service announcement that says look, we are doing this, because the Daytona Beach News-Journal their print is about 26,000, we are much bigger than that here in Volusia County. The intent is to get out to more people what are we going to do to get above 26,000 people signed up or at least knowledgeable that this is where they are going.

>> PAOLO SORIA,LEGAL: The minimum requirement we have to publish every single year in a newspaper circulation is that not only us, every single local government that wants to use our website has to do the same thing. Once per year every local government that wants to use our website needs to publish in the newspaper that if you want notices it is on the county's website and if you want to receive notice by email register or if you want to receive notice by first-class mail, you register. The link to the website needs to be on our front page. It needs to be on the front pages of every single local government, which is also a statutory requirement. You cannot hide it. Legal notices must be available the moment he lands on the homepage of the local government website. Then we can get with Michael Ryan and to also do some further outreach to inform the public once we get everything underway if you want to receive notices at least for the County you can go to the County

website there is the registration option we are going to talk with the other municipalities on their participation and walking them through the statutory process. It is not automatic like you do need to do some pre-notice to the public that you are actually doing this.

>> JAKE JOHANSSON,AT-LARGE: I think it's important as with all of our projects is to get Michael Ryan in the public affairs people really engaged in this and maybe the radio show. You all know no matter how many places you advertise something somebody is going to come up to us and say nobody told me about it. We've got to keep pressing. I think it's important but I love what we're doing here so thank you.

>> PAOLO SORIA,LEGAL: I would like to add this does not affect standard mail out notices or posting. Growth management whenever they advertise land-use matters they still have to do the adjacent property owner notice they still have to post those orange signs on the frontage of each property.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Good thank you we have a motion and a second to prove all in favor signify by saying,aye?

>> Board Voting: Aye.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Anyone opposed say nay? The motion carries: let me know how that weighs in on that.

>> KARISSA GREEN,CLERK: Mr. Brower he approved it as well.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Okay it is approved unanimously. 7/0. That takes us to closing comments. We will start with the County Manager.

>> GEORGE RECKTENWALD,COUNTY MANAGER: Yes sir. I just want to apologize for the beginning of the meeting. I liken it to football practice. You are in any kind of sports

practice. We did practice. I know the team did work late last night or through the weekend we squeezed a lot in. We had an option of possibly going to another building and setting up but we chose to plow through this way. The practice went pretty well but obviously we cannot make the screen fast this morning like we wanted. We do have the contractor in the booth with us. We will have it all worked out for the next one. We do apologize but thank you to everyone for bearing with it. We did a check and we made sure it's out on the Internet and on YouTube. That part was working. We will get the rest of the kinks worked out other than that I have nothing else.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Before we go on we have a member of the public you would like to speak to. John Nicholson.

>> PUBLIC PARTICIPATION: Because you all attend a university in the City of Daytona Beach Boulevard that was just renovated. I've gotten two complaints so far. Apparently the FDO team has Daytona Beach in the crosshairs and they are sticking cement obstructions everywhere. No matter where you go you are about to hit something. You saw it in Granada. It is worse in Daytona Beach. What they are doing is they want you to slow down. What they do is they take an obstruction from the side and put a little planter so in the middle of the road they now have to curb to get around it. They just finished redoing University. As you come out and approach the light there is a planter of some sort that comes out from the building. They come out halfway into the lane, as you are driving off the beach you approach the light and you have to curb around this little obstruction and people have been hitting it. Dave did this in Halifax where the.[Listing Names] church. You see markings of people hitting it all the time. They've done it all over the place. I don't see the benefit. You are slowing people down but you are destroying their cars in order to do so. It does not make sense to me there's got to be some other way. The signage on the letter AIA cannot emphasize enough that we cannot keep losing tourists. It is not an object that we should try to get our tourist industry down or to stop it in any way. That renovation of A 1A it's the pits we are going to feel in the future again. I want to bring it to your attention that FDOT is a target if it targets Daytona Beach it targets the tourist industry it targets the bottom line of the whole county thank you.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Thank you for concluding the public input for the end of the meeting. County Attorney.

>> MICHAEL G. DYER,COUNTY ATTORNEY: Nothing thank you.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: That moves us to the County Council.

>> KARISSA GREEN,CLERK: Mr. Rienhart are you able to unmute? If you want to move on to Mr. Robins.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Councilman Robins I can barely hear anything. [Unclear Audio] okay. Why don't we want to go? We will see if we can get Vice Chair Rienhart straightened out.

>> DANNY ROBINS,DISTRICT 3: I don't do this often. I want to shout outs to my colleagues today David and Troy. For being leaders today. There's a difference between leaders and politicians. You guys are leaders. I just wanted to say thank you.

>> DAVID SANTIAGO,DISTRICT 5: Thank you Mr. Chair just one thing last week we had passing of a good man who is very active in West Volusia County very active in my county of Deltona Eli chaperone some of you guys might've known him with some of the nature stuff he did was a big bird enthusiast and a Rotarian he was a very dedicated Rotarian to the DeBary area he lost his battle I want to recognize him here publicly but in addition I wanted to called him the bird man because that's what he did he did pictures of birds all the time. He would share it. I would rely on him often when I traveled with my wife and I. If we were in a different country and I saw a bird I had never seen before, I would take a picture to send it to Eli. I say Eli what is this? Have you seen this and he would tell me within minutes that is this. He was very passionate about what he did. Again he was a good guy I don't want any commencement I want to save the consult was okay with finding a way to direct staff to see with the improvements were getting ready to do battle Ionia preserved we have a ECHO project there there's investments happening there it's a bird sanctuary if we can find a way to honor him within the bird sanctuary of Leon a preserve with some of the enhancements were doing. Nothing specific if I can get support to tell staff to bring something back first to consider.

>> TROY KENT,DISTRICT 4: District 4 gives you that support. I second the motion.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR:

All in favor signify by saying,aye?

>> Board Voting: Aye.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Anyone opposed say nay?

>> DAVID SANTIAGO,DISTRICT 5: Thank you.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Go-ahead we had to skip over you take your time.

>> MATT REINHART,VICE CHAIR: Thank you very much gentlemen, thank you for your patience. Sorry, trust me, I want to be there today. It is the kind of thing I have never suffered before. This is bad. Anyway thank you first thing I would say my understanding at the beginning of the meeting about the lost liberty issue I was going to bring up. I guess the staff is talking with that group to see if they have a solution. Am I correct in hearing that?

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Yes.

>> MATT REINHART,VICE CHAIR: Good I will leave that alone. Two things, real quickly. Coming up this Saturday October 10 there is a young lady we became friends with that battled a long long battle with cancer. Her whole goal through this and her fight was to bring awareness to this and to help out others in the community with cancer. Not so much yourself. She has even written a couple books about it. There will be a village called mojo, mojo by the way is her derby dog. It takes a village that is exactly what she's building. It's a community event that is going to be at the city center in Port Orange on Saturday from 9:30 AM to 2 PM. I'm sorry 9 AM to 2 PM. It will be cancer patients, survivors caregivers and families for active connection, education , encouragement and help whether their newly

diagnosed or years of survivorship as yourself caring for someone with this community needs. Just wanted to put that out and also another PSA. We will have another meeting before everybody knows they are very active member of the domestic abuse Council. Thank you again for the support on that database. My understanding it may still be another couple weeks where we are supposed to go live on September 30 will have to converse with George. I think it will be at least another two weeks so they can work those issues out. My understanding is that before we are doing a conference at the Ocean Center on October 22 there are a lot of great speakers about domestic violence and how we can help tackle this. I know we are going to be doing a couple of different breakout sessions and speakers from across the country about this. It's a really great event. It is the first inaugural one. It's an all day event they can register on the domestic abuse Council website. That's all, thank you.

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: Thank you.

>> DAVID SANTIAGO,DISTRICT 5: I spoke already and good.

>> DON DEMPSEY,DISTRICT 1: Met must be really sick he didn't mention the jail once in that speech. That's all I have to say.[Laughter] Nothing else.

>> JAKE JOHANSSON,AT-LARGE: Thank you sir. I want to clarify something for the public if anybody is listening anymore. Derek was mentioned yet again today about pumping sewage water into our aquifer. There is no such thing that will ever happen. The St. Johns River water management District will not ever allow us to pump sewage into our aquifer. Obviously there is a regulatory framework to allow us to pump treated sewage water, which is well treated back into an area in our aquifer. We are not doing that either. Hate when people say you don't want a sewage water pump in your aquifer. It is just not going to happen. We are not to let it happen here. Just clarification. I just hate when people say that and people start shaking their heads up and down. It is more that fear may be not generated from the Chinese in this place but generated by all local folks. Let's not lose sight of the fact that that is never going to happen. Other than that, that's all I have as chairman.

>> TROY KENT,DISTRICT 4: Thank you chair Council would anybody agree that we would like to have a discussion Item? To make sure that our staff are on the same page as the ECHO advisory board, if it's not a minimum of 80 I don't want staff approving it. Is there anybody billing that has come back so we can have that discussion?

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER,CHAIR: If that was a motion that a second from Councilmember Robins

all in favor signify by saying,aye?

>> Board Voting: Aye.

>> TROY KENT,DISTRICT 4: Thank you thank you for the apology with the sound system I believe everything you tell us about practicing and working out. He mentioned to me earlier in Murphy's Law it happens. Our residents have expectations of us up here. My expectations of you and Michael Dyer are here. The residents for me I think their expectations are here. There was some frustration with me earlier today. I believe you will have it fixed by the next meeting. Thank you. Last but not least we have a group of support services that help this elected body stay on track and help staff as well led by the incredible Terri.[Listing Names]. But Miriam it is her last meeting with us. I just wanted to give a public shout out to Miriam because through the direction of Terri these individuals are kind and professional and efficient and effective at their job. That is Miriam as well. There she is.[Applause]. I will just say Miriam, wherever you are Miriam, we absolutely wish you and your family the best. Our loss is whoever's gain who ends up fortunate enough to hire you. We wish you nothing but the best with my comments.

>> DAVID SANTIAGO,DISTRICT 5: I want to add Mr. Chair George when they fixed the system. I kind of like the old school microphone 20 exit with the old school microphone.

>> TROY KENT,DISTRICT 4: You people have no idea how radical I am. On a karaoke microphone it has been a real restraint for me not to bust out with some 80s take care. If my wife was here we would be singing a duet right now. Don't you want me baby. You know what I'm talking about. I want you all to know I've had real restraint. David I can go with everybody's new microphone as long as I get to keep that second that. [Laughter].

>> JEFFREY S. BROWER, CHAIR: Okay. I will wrap it up Troy. I'm glad you said what you said about the sound. I know all of us receive frustrating emails. I cannot hear it garbled whatsoever. We tried to fix it. You are not. You are always at school, you're not here much. I'm in and out. I've seen Darrell and his team feverishly working to test this over and over before our meeting. The problem is the chambers are used a lot not just by us but other people. I want Darrell to know and all the people that are in the ICE cold box with you right now we do appreciate his hard work. He pushed for this new equipment and I believe the County Manager made a great decision to try and put it through now and get rid of the complaints. That's why I said at the beginning of the meeting that this is a trial and there will be some glitches. Darrell, we appreciate you and respect you and keep working on it. Let's get it straight. I think we got most of the bugs worked out today didn't we? Except for Troy's microphone. And the other thing Jake since you brought up the toilet to the aquifer, it is true hopefully I believe it is true our St. John's Water Management District would never approve pumping raw sewage into the aquifer. But they have already approved pumping cleaned up Deltona water whose water is already there drinking water standards are already dangerous levels with PFA. The same is not coming, it is a project that is approved and funded. That is why it's important to me. I don't want that to happen to any part of our aquifer. With that this meeting is adjourned at 1:18 PM.