



**CITRUS COUNTY**  
**BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS**  
**MINUTES • FEBRUARY 23, 2021**

**Special Meeting Attorney/Client Session Citrus County Courthouse**

**9:15 AM**

Room 100, 110 N. Apopka Avenue, Inverness, FL 34450

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

February 23, 2021 Citrus County Courthouse

The meeting was called to order at 9:27 AM

- 1. Invocation**
- 2. Pledge of Allegiance**
- 3. Roll Call**

| Attendee Name          | Title                      | Status  | Arrived |
|------------------------|----------------------------|---------|---------|
| Scott Carnahan         | Chair, District 4          | Present |         |
| Ronald E. Kitchen Jr.  | 1st Vice Chair, District 2 | Present |         |
| Ruthie Davis Schlabach | 2nd Vice Chair, District 3 | Present |         |
| Jeff Kinnard D.C.      | Commissioner District 1    | Present |         |
| Holly L. Davis         | Commissioner, District 5   | Present |         |
| Denise A. Dymond Lyn   | County Attorney            | Present |         |
| Beth Antrim            | Assistant County Attorney  | Present |         |
| Charles R. Oliver      | County Administrator       | Present |         |
| Amy Charley            | Deputy Clerk               | Present |         |

**B. OPEN TO THE PUBLIC**

*There were no public comments.*

**C. ANNOUNCE PURPOSE OF MEETING. THOSE PERSONS TO BE IN ATTENDANCE AT THE ATTORNEY/CLIENT SESSION ARE AS FOLLOWS:**

Commissioner Scott Carnahan  
Commissioner Ronald E. Kitchen, Jr.  
Commissioner Ruthie Davis Schlabach  
Commissioner Jeff Kinnard D.C.  
Commissioner Holly L. Davis  
Charles R. Oliver, County Administrator  
Denise A. Dymond Lyn, County Attorney  
Beth E. Antrim, Assistant County Attorney  
Rebecca Foster from Prestige Court Reporting

*County Attorney Denise A. Dymond Lyn announced the purpose of the meeting and introduced those individuals who would be present for the meeting.*

**D. COMMENCE ATTORNEY/CLIENT SESSION IN CASE STYLED WILLIAM OWENS, PLAINTIFF VS. CITRUS COUNTY, FLORIDA, A POLITICAL SUBDIVISION OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA, \*(CASE NO. 2020 AP 0011).****E. CLOSE ATTORNEY/CLIENT SESSION/REOPEN MEETING****F. UPCOMING MEETING- REGULAR MEETING: FEBRUARY 23, 2021 AT 1:00 PM, CITRUS COUNTY COURTHOUSE, ROOM 100, 110 N. APOPKA AVENUE, INVERNESS, FL 34450****G. ADJOURN**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:32 AM

# Proof of Publication

from the  
**CITRUS COUNTY CHRONICLE**  
Crystal River, Citrus County, Florida  
**PUBLISHED DAILY**

STATE OF FLORIDA  
COUNTY OF CITRUS

Before the undersigned authority personally appeared

Theresa Holland and/or Mary Ann Naczi and/or Tonya Knight and/or Jeanne Ethridge

Of the Citrus County Chronicle, a newspaper published daily at Crystal River, in Citrus County, Florida, that the attached copy of advertisement being a public notice in the matter of the Court,

1359-0214 SUCRN PUBLIC NOTICE NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Citrus County Board of County Commissioners will meet for the purpose of conducting an ATTORNEY/CLIENT SESSION on Tuesday, February 23, 2021, at 9:15 AM at the Citrus County Courthouse

was published in said newspaper in the issues of  
February 14th, 2021,

Affiant further says that the Citrus County Chronicle is a Newspaper published at Crystal River in said Citrus County, Florida, and that the said newspaper has heretofore been continuously published in Citrus County, Marion County and Levy County, Florida, each week and has been entered as second class mail matter at the post office in Inverness in said Citrus County, Florida, for a period of one year next preceding the first publication of the attached copy of advertisement; and affiant further says that he/she has neither paid nor promised any person, firm or corporation any discount, rebate, commission or refund for the purpose of securing this advertisement for publication in the said newspaper.

*Jeanne Ethridge*

The forgoing instrument was acknowledged before me.

This 15<sup>th</sup> day of February 2021  
By: Theresa Holland and/or Mary Ann Naczi and/or Tonya Knight and/or Jeanne Ethridge  
who appeared by (X) means of physical presence or ( ) via online notarization.

Notary Public

*Maria A Parks*



1359-0214 SUCRN  
PUBLIC NOTICE

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Citrus County Board of County Commissioners will meet for the purpose of conducting an **ATTORNEY/CLIENT SESSION** on Tuesday, February 23, 2021, at 9:15 AM at the Citrus County Courthouse, Room 100, 110 North Apopka Avenue, Inverness, Florida 34450, for the purpose of commencing an attorney/client session pursuant to Section 286.011(8), Florida Statutes. The purpose of the **ATTORNEY/CLIENT SESSION** will be to discuss pending litigation in the case styled:

William Owens v. Citrus County, Florida (Case No: 2020 AP 0011).

Pursuant to the statute, the Board will meet in open session and subsequently commence the attorney/client session which is estimated to be approximately (15) fifteen minutes in duration. At the conclusion of the **ATTORNEY/CLIENT SESSION** the meeting shall be reopened.

Those persons to be in attendance at this **ATTORNEY/CLIENT SESSION** are as follows:

Commissioner Scott Carnahan  
Commissioner Ronald E. Kitchen, Jr.  
Commissioner Ruthie Davis Schlabach  
Commissioner Jeff Kinnard, D.C.  
Commissioner Holly L. Davis  
Charles R. Oliver, County Administrator  
Denise A. Dymond Lyn, County Attorney  
Beth Antrim, Assistant County Attorney  
Rebecca Foster or Jennifer Ouellette from Prestige Court Reporting

Scott Carnahan, Chairman  
Board of County Commissioners of Citrus County, Florida

Published February 14, 2021

Communication: Proof of Publication (Adjourn)

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS  
OF CITRUS COUNTY, FLORIDA

Citrus County Courthouse, Room 100  
110 N. Apopka Avenue, Inverness, FL 34450

**ATTORNEY/CLIENT SESSION  
AGENDA**

February 23, 2021 at 9:00 AM

REPORTER: Rebecca D. Foster  
Stenographic Court Reporter  
Notary Public, State of Florida

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

APPEARANCES:

SCOTT CARNAHAN, CHAIRMAN DISTRICT 4  
RONALD E. KITCHEN, JR., 1ST VICE CHAIRMAN DISTRICT 2  
RUTHIE DAVIS SCHLABACH, 2ND VICE CHAIRMAN DISTRICT 3  
JEFF KINNARD D.C., COMMISSIONER DISTRICT 1  
HOLLY L. DAVIS, COMMISSIONER DISTRICT 5  
CHARLES R. OLIVER, COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR  
DENISE A. DYMOND LYN, COUNTY ATTORNEY  
BETH ANTRIM, ASSISTANT COUNTY ATTORNEY

I N D E X

|                             | Page |
|-----------------------------|------|
| Proceedings.....            | 3    |
| Reporter's Certificate..... | 20   |

## P R O C E E D I N G S

ATTORNEY DYMOND LYN: Thank you very much.

And at this time, if the court reporter would please note that we are beginning the attorney/client session and the case styled: Scott Adams, Plaintiff, versus Citrus County, Florida, Political Subdivision in the State of Florida. It's case number 2020-AP-0012.

Commissioners, thank you for convening this morning. If you'll recall, we asked you at your last meeting for an opportunity to meet with you to discuss this case and to explore whether there are any settlement possibilities that you would like to discuss with the appellant in this case.

A little bit of history; back in April of 2020, it was discovered that there were two billboards that had been erected at the property and I'll give you the addresses of those; it's 9850 East Bushnell Road and 9556 East Bushnell Road.

It was determined that the owner of the property was Mr. Scott Adams; he became the respondent. And a code-compliance case was opened and investigated by your code-compliance officer, George Pearson (phonetic).

Mister -- the respondent was given an

1 opportunity to cure the fact that there had been  
2 two billboards erected without having the proper  
3 permitting for those billboards. When there was no  
4 corrective action taken, the matter was scheduled  
5 to be heard by the special master.

6 Indeed the special master heard the case on  
7 October 26th of 2020 -- excuse me. Yes.  
8 October 26th of 2020 the special master entered two  
9 orders finding that the respondent was in violation  
10 and that the billboards needed to be removed. The  
11 respondent was given 45 days to remove both of the  
12 billboards. If he failed to remove the billboards  
13 after 45 days, there was going to be a \$50 fine  
14 imposed each day.

15 Following that order, the appellant -- well,  
16 the respondent became the appellant and filed an  
17 appeal of that case and that's why we're here today  
18 to discuss case number 2020-AP-002.

19 In our receipt of the appellant's -- the  
20 appellant brief reviewing that, reviewing the  
21 arguments that were contained within there, Miss  
22 Antrim and I discussed the matter and determined  
23 that there may be some room for a possible  
24 settlement of that appeal. Now that it is pending,  
25 we wanted to have an opportunity to discuss with

1       you.

2               Given the statutory language that exists  
3       currently, we believe that perhaps one of the signs  
4       most likely would qualify as a farm sign even  
5       though it's they're both billboards, we believe  
6       that because of the -- what is being advertised on  
7       the billboards, it may qualify as a farm sign.  
8       Under the statutes farm buildings, as  
9       non-residential farm buildings, farm fences and  
10      farm signs are exempt from any county regulations,  
11      if you will.

12             The statute used to only require an exemption  
13      from the building codes for non-residential  
14      buildings; now the statute has been brought in to  
15      include farm fences and farm signs. And we believe  
16      that this sign, which I'm sure most of you have  
17      passed, might qualify as a farm sign because it is  
18      advertising products or services that relate solely  
19      to the farm. And it was established that, indeed,  
20      the respondent does operate a farm. And it does  
21      have a classification for the property appraiser  
22      for that.

23             There is a second sign, which we do not  
24      believe would qualify for the exemption. And so we  
25      are here to explore with the board whether or not

1 the board wishes for us to make an offer something  
2 along the lines of perhaps keeping the one sign  
3 that would qualify as a farm sign and removing the  
4 other sign because it does not indicate anything  
5 related solely to the farm.

6 That's pretty much everything in a nutshell.  
7 I think that I've covered everything that we wanted  
8 to cover with you. We are at the stage of a  
9 litigation. The initial brief has been filed. It  
10 is our turn to file a reply brief. At that time,  
11 we believe that we need to make the correct  
12 arguments to the court recognizing the potential  
13 sign, the farm sign, of this one and we wanted to  
14 talk to you before we made those representations to  
15 the court. Of course, after we file our reply  
16 brief, we would wait for -- excuse me -- our answer  
17 brief, we would file a reply brief.

18 So at this time, we thought it was  
19 appropriate to bring it to you to get your feelings  
20 on a potential offer to him.

21 MR. CARNAHAN: Commissioner.

22 MR. OLIVER: Well, my only suggestion would  
23 be -- and I don't know whether the court and the  
24 plaintiff would agree to this, but the tenancy  
25 sometimes is back into another, say, election site

1 or something that the sign goes back to what it was  
2 originally put up for.

3 And I don't know whether they would be  
4 willing to accept it, but you may want to consider  
5 getting the judge to enter an order -- I don't know  
6 if Denise could tell you the legality of this, but  
7 if they ever use it for a farm purpose, other than  
8 that, there's an amount per diem fee that is  
9 automatically assessed or contained as part of this  
10 order.

11 ATTORNEY DIAMOND LYN: Well, I appreciate the  
12 administrator's comments, but unfortunately at this  
13 point, we are trying to get you to resolve it with  
14 a settlement. We're not trying to get to the court  
15 at this point in time and we are in an appellant  
16 proceeding. So in this proceeding, the judge is  
17 solely looking at the record that was created  
18 below, which would be at the special master  
19 hearing. So there's really no opportunity for this  
20 judge, at this point, who's in appellate court --  
21 all they're going to say is whether or not the  
22 special master did something right or wrong. They  
23 will either affirm the decision or reverse the  
24 decision.

25 Now, when we get back to the special master,

1       if that ever happened, we could certainly explore  
2       with the special master whether or not something  
3       like that could be done. But at this point, we're  
4       -- that's a little bit further down the road.  
5       Right now we're trying to resolve it with a  
6       settlement agreement. Y'all have always directed  
7       us to do everything we can to try to work with, you  
8       know, the public, our citizens, to resolve things  
9       rather than litigating things. You always advise  
10      us you want us to keep our costs down as much as  
11      possible and that's why we're bringing this to you  
12      now to try to resolve it.

13               MR. CARNAHAN: Commissioner Kitchen.

14               MR. KITCHEN: Seems reasonable to me. The --  
15      what you've talked about, I mean, if the special --  
16      if I understand this, the special master thought  
17      both signs were not farm signs. And you're saying,  
18      you know, under your review of it, you could lean  
19      towards accepting it as a farm sign, but not the  
20      other. Seems to me that, you know, that's kind of  
21      a give a little bit right there already, right? I  
22      mean, so, obviously, it seems to be the reasonable  
23      settlement on keep the farm sign, take the other  
24      one down; I mean...

25               ATTORNEY DYMOND LYN: I think the sign has

1 changed character since the beginning of these  
2 proceedings. The face of the sign has changed and  
3 now I believe that it meets the definitions under  
4 the statute of a farm sign.

5 I'm not sure that the farm does hay, timber  
6 and top soil, which are the three things being  
7 displayed on the sign. I do want to have the  
8 ability to explore with the respondent that he  
9 ensures that the only things that are advertised  
10 are displayed on the sign I think that are solely  
11 related to the farm. I'm not sure if all three of  
12 those things are done, but that's something that I  
13 want to explore with his attorney in the area of a  
14 settlement.

15 I would like to listen to your discussion a  
16 bit and then maybe give me -- discuss with you some  
17 alternatives so I don't have to come back again,  
18 like, maybe our first offer would be X and then  
19 maybe a secondary offer -- or, you know, perhaps a  
20 third.

21 MR. CARNAHAN: Okay. Commissioner Kinnard.

22 MR. KINNARD: Yeah. You know, we're talking  
23 about two billboards. One of them meets the law;  
24 one of them meets the statute that it deals with  
25 the farm issues. The other one is a

1 Welcome-to-Floral-City sign. I honestly don't know  
2 why we have a problem with either one of them. And  
3 going to look deeper into whether or not the farm  
4 provides each one of the things that they have  
5 listed on there, starts to look like a witch hunt.  
6 So I don't have any problem with either one of the  
7 signs there. My position would be drop it. Let's  
8 move on. We got bigger fish to fry.

9 MR. KITCHEN: Can I?

10 MR. CARNAHAN: Yeah.

11 MR. KITCHEN: I couldn't disagree more. You  
12 do that, Commissioner Kinnard, then let's everybody  
13 put up a billboard about anything they want to put  
14 up. I mean, if you want to throw out the code  
15 book, throw out the code book, but if we're going  
16 to have rules where you can't just go and stick up  
17 a billboard, you can't do that. That's the rules.

18 So, sure, it's expensive to enforce our  
19 rules; we have to do that. But if -- you know,  
20 we're fast reaching the point where we need to be  
21 serious about the rules or get rid of them. And I  
22 don't know how many times we've gone through this  
23 gyration of telling staff we pass rules, enforce  
24 the rules, and then we say, what's the big deal,  
25 make it go away. And that's why I have a problem

1 with this. We know this won't go away. We know  
2 this will keep going, okay? It'll say  
3 Welcome-to-Floral-City now and somewhere down the  
4 road it'll say something different. And that's  
5 what will happen.

6 And to me, this should be no different than  
7 if I went out to my front yard and put up a  
8 billboard and said welcome to Ron's place, okay?  
9 That's -- to me, you can't do that.

10 So, again, and I understand, you know, your  
11 reluctance to get into litigation and do all those  
12 kind of things, but I would absolutely not call  
13 enforcing our ordinances a witch hunt. I just have  
14 to disagree with that.

15 MR. KINNARD: Understood. A quick response.  
16 The only reason that I would -- I should say the  
17 primary reason that I would take this particular  
18 position is that on ag property, the state  
19 purposely gives great latitude essentially allowing  
20 them to do almost anything they want to do. And,  
21 you know, I just can't imagine that we get into the  
22 business of examining billboards around the county  
23 and saying, oh, this particular billboard says, you  
24 know, John Smith's store sells X, Y and Z, but he's  
25 no longer selling Y's so we need to go after him

1           now. That looks like we're trying to go after John  
2           Smith's store. That starts to look like -- it does  
3           -- that starts to look like a witch hunt to me, but  
4           that's just my opinion.

5           MR. CARNAHAN: To me, it's about whether they  
6           were permitted or not, okay? And that's the issue,  
7           you know. If the person would have gotten a permit  
8           and put them up legally, then we'd have an  
9           argument.

10          I agree with Commissioner Kitchen, you know,  
11          and I believe you were on the board when we went  
12          through our sign orders not long ago. We passed a  
13          pretty strict sign ordinance.

14          Again, so I think it's more of are you going  
15          to allow billboards not permitted just to be stuck  
16          around the county or are you going to allow making  
17          them get permits like they should? It'd be no  
18          different than going and build a house without  
19          permits or you're going to get into trouble for it.  
20          Commissioner, anything other?

21          MS. DAVIS: Yes. I would agree with the  
22          gentleman that -- I mean a permit and a rule is a  
23          rule. And, but I didn't hear either of you say  
24          whether you would want to do the olive branch in  
25          allowing the farm sign because it was not permitted

1 or not.

2 MR. KITCHEN: Well, may I?

3 MR. CARNAHAN: Yes, sir.

4 MR. KITCHEN: Yes, I did because a farm sign  
5 does not require to have a permit. That --

6 (Speaking over each other.)

7 MS. DAVIS: Okay. That wasn't a farm sign  
8 that was put up, right? That's kind of the sticky  
9 point there --

10 (Speaking over each other.)

11 MR. KITCHEN: Exactly, but now according to  
12 staff now today, it is a farm sign. So and I guess  
13 that's the wiggle room that we have.

14 So, again, that's my thing. If somebody  
15 wants to put up 15 billboards and they get permits  
16 and it meets the requirements, fine. I mean, you  
17 can put up political signs, but you have to get a  
18 permit for it.

19 Yeah, so --

20 MR. CARNAHAN: I'm good with it, so.

21 MR. KITCHEN: Yeah. I am too.

22 MR. CARNAHAN: Commissioner?

23 MS. SCHLABACH: Can I hear the settlement one  
24 more time, please?

25 ATTORNEY DYMOND LYN: Sure. What I would

1 suggest would be a reasonable first offer is that  
2 the sign that is not -- clearly not a farm sign at  
3 this point in time, which is the historic  
4 Welcome-to-Floral-City sign, be removed and that  
5 the farm sign -- let me read the statute to you; a  
6 farm sign means a statue erected, used or  
7 maintained on a farm by the owner or lessee of the  
8 farm, which relates solely to farm produce,  
9 merchandise or services sold produced, manufactured  
10 or furnished on the farm.

11 So with that narrow exemption to permitting,  
12 a farm sign is allowed to stay. So I believe that  
13 the farm sign should only refer to those things,  
14 which are produce, merchandise or services sold,  
15 produced, manufactured or furnished on the farm.

16 I don't know whether top soil is a farm  
17 product. I don't know whether there's timber  
18 produced and I don't know whether there's hay  
19 produced, but I believe the settlement offer to be  
20 extended is remove the non-farm sign and make sure  
21 that the farm sign conforms to the statute and that  
22 it only relates solely to those things. That would  
23 be my first suggestion -- our first offer to them.

24 I suspect -- I suspect, maybe the  
25 Welcome-to-Floral-City sign may become a farm sign

1           because we know that all that has to be changed is  
2           the message. So I'm not sure whether we're going  
3           to be successful in getting a settlement on this,  
4           but the backup or the secondary offer that I would  
5           suggest might be had is that they both become farm  
6           signs and are able to remain, but that would be the  
7           secondary or the backup suggestion that I make to  
8           them.

9           MR. CARNAHAN: Commissioner.

10          MS. SCHLABACH: So if they both become farm  
11          signs today, what is the assurance that they won't  
12          become a different sign years from now?

13          ATTORNEY DYMOND LYN: I will try to get  
14          language in the settlement agreements that say that  
15          they are and will remain farm signs, but I will  
16          tell you there's nothing that can stop them from  
17          changing in the future. If we have a settlement  
18          agreement, that becomes a contract that then we can  
19          enforce the contract. I don't think that I'm going  
20          to be able to get that agreed to, but I will try to  
21          get it agreed to, that they will always be farm  
22          signs.

23          MS. SCHLABACH: Because if it wasn't a farm  
24          sign, it would require a permit.

25          ATTORNEY DYMOND LYN: Correct. And if in the

1 future, I'm unable to get that type of an agreement  
2 that it won't become a farm sign, or that there  
3 won't be more signs added, we would just have to go  
4 through code enforcement in the future, which is  
5 disappointing, but hopefully it won't happen.  
6 We'll remain positive and hope that they just stay  
7 farm signs and that no more billboards get added.

8 MR. CARNAHAN: Right. Are you done?

9 ATTORNEY DYMOND LYN: Yes. I'm done.

10 MR. CARNAHAN: Commissioner.

11 MS. DAVIS: I have a question for you, Madam  
12 Attorney; so these signs were erected without  
13 permits, which is obviously try to get away with it  
14 or ask forgiveness -- permission kind of typical  
15 sort of move. So would this special -- if these  
16 signs were to flip in the future to something other  
17 than farm -- and this doesn't really change  
18 anything today; it's just for my own knowledge --  
19 would the special magistrate typically look to what  
20 has happened before with those in assessing the  
21 daily fine?

22 ATTORNEY DYMOND LYN: Unfortunately, each  
23 violation stands on its own. It would be up to  
24 staff to make the arguments to the special master  
25 in their -- the staff always requests the damages

1       that the staff believes that the county has  
2       suffered. So I'm sure staff would ask for an  
3       enhanced daily fine if that were to be the case,  
4       but I can't prejudge what might happen in the  
5       future. And Miss Antrim reminds me that billboards  
6       are not permitable in these zoning categories. So  
7       if a request came in for a billboard, in fact, the  
8       special master actually found, the billboards are  
9       not permitted in the latest districts, which I  
10      believe are like CLC --

11           MR. CARNAHAN: So where these billboards are,  
12      they'll be permitted, correct?

13           ATTORNEY DYMOND LYN: Billboards would not be  
14      permitted in the CL district.

15           MR. CARNAHAN: And that's what this is?

16           ATTORNEY DYMOND LYN: Yes.

17           MS. DAVIS: Then how can it be farm signs?

18           ATTORNEY DYMOND LYN: Because the legislature  
19      has made a narrow exemption for farm buildings,  
20      farm fences and farm signs from county permitting.  
21      We are not allowed to enforce any code against farm  
22      buildings, farm signs --

23           MS. DAVIS: I guess I just thought it'd be ag  
24      -- it would have to be zoned ag for that to be  
25      relevant.

1           ATTORNEY DYMOND LYN: It's the legislature's  
2 determination.

3           MS. DAVIS: Because there's all kinds of  
4 things I can't do with my land even being a farm  
5 girl because I don't live on ag anymore.

6           ATTORNEY DYMOND LYN: We have a long history  
7 of supporting agriculture in this state.

8           MS. DAVIS: And we should, but typically on  
9 land that's zoned ag I would think.

10          MR. CARNAHAN: Commissioner Kinnard, anything  
11 else? Anybody?

12          MR. KINNARD: No.

13          MR. CARNAHAN: Okay.

14          ATTORNEY DYMOND LYN: All right. So just to  
15 summarize my direction is to first offer that one  
16 sign remain and made to comply with the statute and  
17 the other sign to be removed and that these two  
18 remaining -- the one remain the only farm sign  
19 allowed in that area. And I will certainly stress  
20 the fact that it's CL and that no billboards are  
21 allowed in CL.

22          Failing that reaching agreement there, then I  
23 will suggest that the second sign become a farm  
24 sign, the first sign remain a farm sign only  
25 relating to -- or solely relating to the items that

1 we've discussed that are in the statute and that no  
2 more signs be added.

3 And if I can't get an agreement on those two  
4 things, then Miss Antrim will proceed with filing  
5 our responsive brief and our view to the court.

6 MR. CARNAHAN: Fine with me.

7 ATTORNEY DYMOND LYN: And just for the court  
8 reporter, it looks like everyone's answering in the  
9 affirmative on that.

10 All right. At this time then I believe we  
11 can close the attorney/client session and reopen  
12 the meeting.

13 (Whereupon, the attorney/client session ended  
14 at 9:23 a.m.)  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

## REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

STATE OF FLORIDA

COUNTY OF CITRUS

I, REBECCA D. FOSTER, Court Reporter, certify that I was authorized to and did stenographically report the foregoing proceedings and that the transcript is a true and complete record of my stenographic notes.

WITNESS my hand and official seal this 10th day of March, 2021.



REBECCA D. FOSTER, Notary Public  
State of Florida at Large

