

2022 Form 6 - Full and Public Disclosure of Financial Interests

Filed with COE: 06/19/2023

General Information

Name: Sean Parks

Address: 12135 Topaz St, Clermont, FL 34711

PID 236419

County: Lake

AGENCY INFORMATION

Organization	Suborganization	Title
Central Florida Expressway Authority (CFX)	Authority Members	Lake County Board of Commissioners
East Central Florida Regional Planning Council Lake County	ECFRPC Council Board Elected Constitutional Officer	Commissioner County Commissioner, District 2

Net Worth

My Net Worth as of December 31, 2022 was \$ 891,491.00.

Assets

Household goods and personal effects may be reported in a lump sum if their aggregate value exceeds \$1,000. This category includes any of the following, if not held for investment purposes: jewelry; collections of stamps, guns, and numismatic items; art objects; household equipment and furnishings; clothing; other household items; and vehicles for personal use, whether owned or leased.

The aggregate value of my household goods and personal effect is \$ 126,500.00.

ASSETS INDIVIDUALLY VALUED AT OVER \$1,000:

Description of Asset	Value of Asset
See Attached	

Liabilities

LIABILITIES IN EXCESS OF \$1,000:

Name of Creditor	Address of Creditor	Amount of Liability
Regions Bank	PO Box 2153, Birmingham, AL 35287	\$ 136,000.00

JOINT AND SEVERAL LIABILITIES NOT REPORTED ABOVE:

Name of Creditor	Address of Creditor	Amount of Liability
N/A		

2022 Form 6 - Full and Public Disclosure of Financial Interests

Filed with COE: 06/19/2023

Income

Identify each separate source and amount of income which exceeded \$1,000 during the year, including secondary sources of income.

☐ I elect to file a copy of my 2022 federal income tax return and all W2s, schedules, and attachments.

PRIMARY SOURCES OF INCOME:

Name of Source of Income Exceeding \$1,000	Address of Source of Income	Amount
Lake County BCC - County Commissioner	315 West Main Street, Tavares, Florida 32778	\$ 86,000.00
Parks Consulting Services	12135 Topaz Street, Clermont, Florida	\$ 55,000.00
United Southern Bank Board	Eustis, Florida	\$ 18,750.00
Preffered Governmental Insurance Trust Board	Lake Mary, Florida	\$ 8,000.00
See Attached		

SECONDARY SOURCES OF INCOME (Major customers, clients, etc. of businesses owned by reporting person):

Business Entity	Major Sources of Business Income	Address	Principal Business Activity of Source
Parks Consulting Services	Town of Montverde	PO Box 560008, Montverde, Florida 34756	Consulting - Town Planner
See Attached			

Interests in Specified Businesses**Business Entity # 1**

Name of Business Entity	United Southern Bank
Address of Business Entity	Eustis, Florida
Principal Business Activity	Banking
Postion Held with Entity	Board of Director
I own more than a 5% Interest in the Business	No
Nature of my Ownership Interest	30 shares of stock
See Attached.	

Training

- ☒ I certify that I have completed the required training under Section 112.3142, F.S.
- ☐ Required training under Section 112.3142, F.S., not applicable to filer for this form year.

Signature of Reporting Official or Candidate

Under the penalties of perjury, I declare that I have read the foregoing Form 6 and that the facts stated in it are true.

Sean Parks

Digitally signed: **06/19/2023**

Filed with COE: 06/19/2023

Florida Association of Counties

Certificate of Completion
is hereby granted to

Sean Parks

for successfully completing

2022 Ethics, Public Records, and
Sunshine Laws Workshop
December 28, 2022

offered by the Institute for County Government

(6 Credit Hours)
CCC-Core-Ethics



Eric Poole, Executive Director
Institute for County Government



Attachment A

Sean M. Parks – FORM 6 – 2022

Part B - Value of Assets

- 1.) Property located at 12135 Topaz Street, Clermont, Florida 34711 - \$505,000
- 2.) Various Stocks –includes Delta Airlines, Devon Energy Corporation, Twitter, Nvidia, Concord Acquisition, Trex, Walt Disney, Microsoft, Kroger and Commercial Metals Company, General Electric - \$13,679
- 3.) IRA – American Funds Company - \$174,694
- 4.) SEP – American Funds Company - \$11,326
- 5.) Roth IRA – American Funds - \$3,767
- 6.) Fairwinds Federal Credit Union – Money Market Account (and savings) - \$23,000
- 7.) United Southern Bank Savings Account - \$64,000
- 8.) Owner – Parks Consulting Services, LLC - \$86,967 (Book Value)
- 9.) 30 Shares of Stock - UniSouth, Inc. – December 2022 Value \$1,050
- 10.) SEP - DOD GX - \$6,413
- 11.) SEP – DOD IX - \$7,045
- 12.) SEP – DOD FX - \$4,050
- 13.) 4 vehicles aggregate \$60,000 – no debt
 - 2021 Chevy Traverse
 - 2019 Subaru Forester
 - 2004 Ford Sportrac
 - 2004 Cadillac SRT

Part D – Income

Primary Sources of Income:

- Lake County BCC – 315 West Main Street, Tavares Florida 32778 - \$86,000
- Parks Consulting Services, LLC 12135 Topaz Street, Clermont FL 34711 - \$55,000
- United Southern Bank Board, Eustis Florida \$18,750
- Preferred Governmental Insurance Trust Board - \$8000
- Montverde Academy Board, Montverde Florida - No Income Taken in 2022

See Attached Legal Opinion

Secondary Sources of Income – Major Client(s)

- Parks Consulting Services – Town of Montverde, PO Box 560008, Montverde Florida



MELANIE MARSH
County Attorney
NICOLE M. BLUMENAUER
Assistant County Attorney
DAVID LANGLEY
Assistant County Attorney

MEMORANDUM

Lake County Board of County Commissioners • County Attorney's Office
315 W. Main St., Tavares, FL 32778 • 352-343-9787 • www.lakecountyfl.gov

TO: Commissioner Parks
FROM: Melanie Marsh, County Attorney *mm*
DATE: December 22, 2020
SUBJECT: Opinion Regarding Compensated Service on Private Boards

This memorandum is in response to your inquiry regarding whether any ethical conflicts exist as it pertains to your service on the following private boards: (1) United Southern Bank; (2) Montverde Academy Board of Trustees; and (3) Preferred Governmental Insurance Trust Board of Trustees.

Short Answer

Section 112.313(7), Florida Statutes, prohibits a public officer from having a contractual relationship or being employed by an entity that is subject to the regulation of or doing business with the public entity that the public official serves. A prohibited relationship **cannot** be cured by abstaining from voting. However, based on the information you have provided to me, you do not have a prohibited relationship with any of the three entities that you currently hold a position with as a compensated member of their board of directors.

Background Information:

1. *United Southern Bank – Board of Directors (Compensated Position):* United Southern Bank (USB) was originally chartered in 1937 in Umatilla, Florida. USB currently has 12 locations and offers personal banking and business banking services. Currently, the Lake County Board of County Commissioners does not have any contracts, bonds, loans or accounts with USB Bank.
2. *Preferred Governmental Insurance Trust Board of Trustees (Compensated Position):* Preferred Governmental Insurance Trust (PGIT) is an insurance program dedicated to the public sector that specializes in insurance products for property, casualty, and worker's compensation. However, the County currently does not procure any insurance from PGIT.
3. *Montverde Academy Board of Trustees (Compensated Position):* Montverde Academy (MVA) is a coeducational school that serves grades Pre-K through 12 and includes a boarding program and post-graduate studies. The County currently issued an Industrial Development Authority bond on behalf of MVA for purposes of expanding their campus. MVA has a 501(c)(3) taxation status.

Analysis:

Section 112.313(7), Florida Statutes, prohibits a public officer from having a contractual relationship with, or being employed by, an agency or business that is either subject to regulation by, or doing business with, the officer's public entity. In order to determine whether an ethical conflict exists, the following questions must be asked and analyzed:

1. Is there a contractual relationship between the public official and the agency or business?
2. Is the public official employed by the agency or business?
3. If yes to #1 or #2, is the agency or business subject to the regulation of the public entity?
4. If yes to #1 or #2, is the agency or business doing business with the public entity?

1. Contractual Relationship.

Whether a contractual relationship exists between the public official and the agency or business is governed by the substantive law of contract. Without additional information, it is not clear whether you have any contractual relationships with the three entities listed above. However, because the next prong is answered in the affirmative, it is not necessary to have any additional information regarding contractual relationships.

2. Employment Status.

The term "employment" requires that one be compensated or receive some consideration. See CEO 76-21, CEO 80-29. The term "employment" also includes being an owner, partner, sole proprietor or a compensated director of a non-profit entity. Since the positions you hold with each of the three entities listed above are compensated, you would be considered "employed by" these entities for purposes of the ethics regulations.

3. Are the agencies subject to the regulation of the public entity?

The Commission on Ethics has also opined many times on what constitutes "regulation by" an agency. Please see **Exhibit A** for a summary of the various opinions on this issue. Essentially, the phrase "subject to regulation of" means that business operations or modes of doing business are subject to the control or authority of the public entity. See CEO 74-8. Other examples of regulation include development agreements, contractor licensing, a charter school subject to the sponsoring school district, etc. None of the three entities listed above are regulated by the public entity that you serve.

4. Are the agencies doing business with the public entity?

The Commission on Ethics has also opined many times on what constitutes "doing business with" an agency. Please see **Exhibit A** for a summary of the various opinion on this issue. Ethics opinions have interpreted the phrase "doing business with" as referring to a lease, contract, or other type of arrangement where one party would have a cause of action against the other in the event of a breach or default. See CEO 86-24, CEO 07-11, CEO 11-14, CEO 11-15, CEO 12-15. Lake County currently does not have any

contracts with either USB or PGIT. However, since Lake County was the Issuer of the IDA bonds for MVA, there is a business relationship between the parties. See CEO 86-2 attached as **Exhibit B**.

5. *Exemptions from Section 112.313(7), Florida Statutes.*

Section 112.313(15), Florida Statutes, provides that no elected public officer shall be held in violation of subsection (7) if the officer maintains an employment relationship with an entity which is currently a tax-exempt organization under s. 501 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code and which contracts with or otherwise enters into a business relationship with the officer's agency and:

1. The officer's employment is not directly or indirectly compensated as a result of such contract or business relationship; and
2. The officer has in no way participated in the agency's decision to contract or to enter into the business relationship with his or her employer, whether by participating in discussion at the meeting, by communicating with officers or employees of the agency, or otherwise; and
3. The officer abstains from voting on any matter which may come before the agency involving the officer's employer, publicly states to the assembly the nature of the officer's interest in the matter from which he or she is abstaining, and files a written memorandum as provided for in Section 112.3143, Florida Statutes.

Since MVA is a tax-exempt organization under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code, your position as a compensated member of the board of directors would not be a prohibited relationship so long as you have complied with the above listed requirements. The Clerk of the Board of County Commissioners does have your written memorandum on file, and you did abstain from voting on both the approval of the issuance of the IDA bonds after the TEFRA hearing and on the request for refund of the issuance fees.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, it does not appear that a prohibited conflict of interest exists. However, going forward, if the County seeks to contract with either USB or PGIT, you will need to resign your position with those entities as a prohibited relationship cannot be cured by abstention from voting. If the County seeks to do business with MVA, your relationship with that entity would be exempt from Section 112.313(7), Florida Statutes, only if you are able to comply with the specific parameters set forth in the exemption established under Section 112.313(15), Florida Statutes. If you are unable to comply with the exemption's requirements, you will need to resign your position with that entity as well.

Please let me know if you need any further assistance with this issue.

EXHIBIT A: CEO OPINIONS

6. A business entity is "subject to the regulation of" an agency when the business' operations or modes of doing business are subject to the control or authority of the agency. CEO 74-8. In CEO 09-18, a corporation which had entered into a development agreement with a city was found to be "subject to the regulation of" the city council, due to the many terms and conditions contained in the agreement. Occupational licensing for revenue purposes is not "regulation." CEO 79-82. Incidental or passive governmental influence, such as the enactment of ordinances that affect a broad number of people, does not constitute "regulation." CEO 78-59. County phosphate mining ordinances have been held not to constitute "regulation" by county commissions of mining companies. CEO 00-14. In some situations, a city council or a county commission may not regulate a developer, even though the city's board of adjustment and building department may. CEO 08-1, CEO 08-7. However, in CEO 11-6, the Commission found that activities of a city planning and zoning board did not constitute "regulation"; and see CEO 11-16. The enforcement of laws of general applicability does not constitute "regulation." CEO 91-22, CEO 04-14. However, an agency may be subject to the regulation of another agency, as in CEO 97-03, where the State Board of Community Colleges was found to regulate community colleges. A city building and planning department regulates licensed contractors doing business in the city (CEO 96-15), but a city commission usually does not (CEO 99-7). A city manager's ministerial (nondiscretionary) function to sign a subdivision plat has been found not to constitute regulation of a developer (CEO 76-205, Question 2). Annexation constitutes neither "regulation" nor "doing business." CEO 03-7. A waiver of taxes or granting of a similar economic incentive by a city's economic development commission was found not to constitute regulation or the doing of business, but café permitting or similar functions by its downtown development review board were found to constitute regulation (CEO 10-24). A port authority regulates a shipping company operating at the port (CEO 03-17), the interests of a shipping agent (CEO 08-5), and a company moving cargo through port terminals (CEO 13-11). A county manatee rule review committee (an ad hoc advisory body) does not exercise regulatory authority (CEO 04-14). A city housing authority does not regulate a state university where the two cooperate to carry out tutoring of at-risk children under a federal program (CEO 06-2). CEO 97-7 found that a charter school is subject to the regulation of its sponsoring school district; but, in a particular context, CEO 09-23 used F.S. 112.316 and "the spirit of" F.S. 112.313(15) to negate a conflict of a school board member

employed as an adjunct faculty member at a State college operating a charter school approved by the school board. A franchise has been found to be "regulation," in addition to constituting "doing business" (CEO 12-9). The Florida Virtual School was found not to be subject to the regulation of a local school district. CEO 13-22. In CEO 12-21, a county was not found to regulate a municipality. Note that possible future regulation is not "regulation" under the statute; one's contractual relationship must occur at the same time as the regulatory relationship (CEO 90-65).

7. A business entity is "doing business with" an agency where the parties have entered into a lease, contract, or other type of arrangement where one party would have a cause of action against the other in the event of a breach or default. CEO 86-24, CEO 07-11, CEO 11-14, CEO 11-15, CEO 12-15. In contrast, CEO 15-01 found that a city's donation without obligation of in-kind services to a chamber of commerce did not constitute "doing business"; see also CEO 17-12 (donation/member of Board of Governors of State University System). CEO 17-15 concerned a donation (not a prohibited conflict) of property by a city to a charter school for which a city commissioner served as an attorney, or, in the alternative, a sale (prohibited conflict) of the property. CEO 14-04 found that a business entity seeking a contract would not be "doing business" with an agency until the agency awarded the contract to the company. Note that the public officer or public employee personally does not have to be involved on the private side of the business between his private employer and his public agency in order for the "doing business" element to be present. CEO 10-7. A public officer or employee does not hold employment or a contractual relationship with a company that is doing business with his or her public agency merely because a company of which he or she is an owner or officer subcontracts with the other company (CEO 88-43, CEO 07-2, CEO 11-12, CEO 11-18, CEO 12-8); however, see CEO 14-02, regarding a city commissioner whose personal services for a radio station were sought "through his firm." The company of a school board member was not found to be doing business with the school district when it sold uniforms to parents of school students but not to the district or the district's schools, provided no solicitation or pressuring of school personnel occurred. CEO 10-12. The Commission has found that a direct support organization is doing business with the agency (e.g., college, university) which created it (CEO 89-36, CEO 11-15). A lawsuit between a business entity and an agency does not constitute "doing business" (CEO 77-14); nor does the mere donation of property to an agency (CEO 82-13) or from an agency (CEO 04-5, Question 3, and CEO 04-6). Agreements between governmental entities for the provision of services generally do not constitute "doing business" [CEO 76-2, CEO 81-5, CEO 04-9, Question 3, CEO 06-2, CEO 12-21, (CEO 13-22, agreement between county school district and Florida Virtual School)], CEO 19-02, but the extension of a grant from one agency to another may (CEO 77-65). In CEO 08-6, it was determined that a sheriff's office's contracting with a city to provide municipal law enforcement services did not constitute "doing business," where a city commissioner's employment with the sheriff's office was not connected to the sheriff's provision of services to the city. The existence of a warranty on a sheriff's mobile command post constitutes "doing business" (CEO 06-25), as does the relationship between a charter school and its sponsoring school district (CEO 97-7). A city was found to be "doing business" with a corporation by their entry into a development agreement with one another (CEO 09-18). A franchise has been found to constitute "doing business" (CEO 12-9). Receiving funds from a CRA through its commercial loan subsidy program has been found to constitute "doing business," and thus conflicting for CRA board members. CEO 12-7. Further, in CEO 12-7, the Commission found that the special voting conflict language applicable to CRAs for purposes of F.S. 112.3143 did not operate as an exemption to a conflict

under F.S. 112.313(7). However, see CEO 12-14 regarding redevelopment area board members, as opposed to CRA members.

8. Examples of conflicts under this prohibition include the following: city commissioner prohibited from being employed by brokerage firm if firm is selected as underwriter for one or more city bond issues (CEO 85-29); county commissioner prohibited from employment with national brokerage firm contracting with county for underwriting services for proposed bond issue (CEO 88-80); city commissioner employed by two city franchisees [Gordon v. Commission on Ethics, 609 So. 2d 125 (Fla. 4th DCA 1992)]; and health facilities authority's employee's law firm providing services to authority (CEO 08-15, Question 1).

EXHIBIT B

12/21/2020

CEO 86-2 -- January 9, 1986

CEO 86-2 -- January 9, 1986

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

CITY COUNCIL MEMBER OWNING INTEREST IN OR CONTRACTING WITH PARTNERSHIP SEEKING INDUSTRIAL REVENUE BOND FINANCING FROM CITY

To: *(Name withheld at the person's request.)*

SUMMARY:

A prohibited conflict of interest would be created were a city council member to be a general partner in a partnership which is seeking industrial revenue bond financing from the city to renovate a hotel owned by the partnership. Section 112.313(7), Florida Statutes, prohibits a city council member from having any employment or contractual relationship with a business entity, such as the partnership here, which is doing business with the city. However, this provision would not prohibit the council member from holding a promissory note given by the general partner of the partnership on which the partnership would not be liable. Nor would Section 112.313(7) prohibit the council member's management company from contracting with the partnership to manage the hotel. CEO's [79-1](#), [79-13](#), [81-47](#), and [81-58](#) are referenced in this regard.

QUESTION 1:

Would a prohibited conflict of interest be created were a city council member to be a general partner in a partnership which is seeking industrial revenue bond financing from the city to renovate a hotel owned by the partnership?

This question is answered in the affirmative.

In your letter of inquiry you advise that serves as a member of the St. Petersburg City Council. The Council member is considering becoming a general partner with an ownership interest of between 10 and 15 percent in a partnership which is contemplating applying to the City for industrial revenue bond financing to renovate a hotel owned by the partnership.

In this transaction the City would issue revenue bonds which would be purchased by a financial institution. The City would enter into a memorandum of agreement with the partnership whereby the City would agree to pursue the issuance of the bonds and the partnership would agree to hold the City harmless and to provide such agreements as may be required by the City. The memorandum of agreement would not commit the City to issue the bonds.

If the City did issue the bonds, the City and the partnership would enter into a financing agreement governing the disbursement of bond proceeds and the security for

repayment. The City will have absolutely no liability or obligation under the bonds, as it is merely a conduit in a transaction that is between the partnership and the lending institution.

The Code of Ethics for Public Officers and Employees provides in relevant part:

CONFLICTING EMPLOYMENT OR
CONTRACTUAL RELATIONSHIP. -- No public officer or employee of an agency shall have or hold any employment or contractual relationship with any business entity or any agency which is subject to the regulation of, or is doing business with, an agency of which he is an officer or employee . . . ; nor shall an officer or employee of an agency have or hold any employment or contractual relationship that will create a continuing or frequently recurring conflict between his private interests and the performance of his public duties or that would impede the full and faithful discharge of his public duties. [Section 112.313(7)(a), Florida Statutes (1985).]

This provision prohibits a city council member from having any employment or contractual relationship with a business entity which is doing business with the City. As a general partner, the subject Council member clearly would have an employment or contractual relationship with the partnership. Therefore, the question we must decide is whether the partnership would be "doing business with" the City were the City to agree to issue industrial revenue bonds in behalf of the partnership's project.

The City clearly is authorized by the Florida Industrial Development Financing Act (Chapter 159, Part II, Florida Statutes) to enhance economic opportunities by facilitating the financing of projects such as this through the issuance of revenue bonds. It is our view that in doing so, the City would be doing business with the partnership and the partnership would be doing business with the City.

We generally have advised that a business entity is doing business with an agency where the parties have entered into a lease, contract, or other type of legal arrangement under which one party would have a cause of action against the other in the event of a default or breach. See, for example, CEO [77-36](#), CEO [80-87](#), and CEO [82-50](#).

Here, it appears that under the financing agreement which would be entered into by the City and the partnership, the City would be authorized to enforce the agreement in the event of any default by the partnership. Similarly, although the partnership would agree to hold the City harmless against any claims arising out of the transaction, the "hold harmless" provisions themselves may be subject to enforcement by the City. Under a trust indenture between the City and a trustee bank, the City assigns all its rights and interests to the trustee, but retains certain rights under the financing agreement, including the City's rights to indemnity, reimbursement, and any other rights specifically reserved to the City in the agreement. Therefore, although as a practical matter the trustee stands in the place of the City, the City retains certain continuing contractual rights vis-a-vis the partnership. In summary, that the City and the partnership would be "doing business" with each other would be evidenced by the contractual relationship between them and the potential for a cause of action arising from a breach of that contract.

Accordingly, we find that a prohibited conflict of interest would be created were the subject City Council member to be a general partner in a partnership seeking industrial revenue bond financing from the City.

QUESTION 2:

Would a prohibited conflict of interest be created were a city council member to hold a promissory note given by an individual who is the general partner in a partnership which is seeking industrial revenue bond financing from the city to renovate a hotel owned by the partnership?

This question is answered in the negative.

In a telephone conversation with our staff, the attorney for the partnership advised that when the subject city council member learned that his interest in the partnership might create a prohibited conflict of interest, he divested himself of that interest by selling his interest in the subject property to the other general partner in the partnership. In exchange, the other general partner gave an unsecured promissory note for which he is personally liable, which is not contingent on the issuance of bonds by the City, and which would not be paid from the proceeds of the bonds. This individual will be the only general partner in the partnership which is seeking the issuance of the bonds by the City.

Section 112.313(7), Florida Statutes, is the relevant provision of the Code of Ethics for this question also. The subject Council member has a contractual relationship, as evidenced by the promissory note, with the individual who is the general partner in the partnership which is applying for industrial revenue bonds from the City. Although the partnership will be doing business with the City, as we found in our response to your first question, the Council member no longer will have a contractual relationship with that business entity. Similarly, in CEO 81-45, Question 4, we found that a county commissioner was not prohibited by Section 112.313(7) from being jointly liable on a promissory note with an individual who was the president of a corporation which was doing business with the county.

Accordingly, we find that no prohibited conflict of interest would be created were the subject Council member to hold a promissory note given by an individual who is the general partner in a partnership which is seeking industrial revenue bond financing from the City.

QUESTION 3:

Would a prohibited conflict of interest be created were a management company owned by a city council member to contract for the management of a hotel with a partnership which has renovated the hotel with industrial revenue bond financing from the city?

This question is answered in the negative.

In your letter of inquiry you raise a further question involving the relationship of the subject Council member's management company to the hotel which would be renovated with industrial revenue bond financing from the City. You question whether the Council member's management company may contract with the partnership for the management of the hotel.

In several opinions we have concluded that although Section 112.313(7)(a) prohibits a public officer from having any employment with a business entity which is doing business with his agency, it does not prohibit a public officer from employment with a business entity doing business with a second business entity, which in turn is doing business with his agency.

See CEO [79-1](#), CEO [79-13](#), CEO [81-47](#), and CEO [81-58](#). In CEO [80-25](#) we disregarded the corporate form where a county commissioner was an officer and shareholder of a holding company which held only the stock of a wholly owned subsidiary corporation that was doing business with the county. However, here the management company apparently would not be formed in order to allow the subject Council member to have an ownership interest in the partnership which is renovating the hotel.

Accordingly, we find that no prohibited conflict of interest would be created were the City Council member's management company to contract for the management of a hotel with a partnership which has renovated the hotel with industrial revenue bond financing from the City.