

Summary of Discussion
Broward County Charter Review Commission
Wednesday, February 14, 2007
Broward County Governmental Center
115 South Andrews Avenue, Room 430, Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301
10:00 AM – 1:00 PM

Members Present:

Commissioner Hayward J. Benson, Jr.
Michael L. Buckner, Esq.
Mayor Debby Eisinger
David Esack
Patricia Good
H.K. "Petey" Kaletta
Mark Ketcham
Dr. Mark Lieberman
Joseph Maus, Esq.
Commissioner Ted Mena
Mayor Lori Moseley, Chair
Burnadette Norris-Weeks, Esq.
Robert Penezic, Esq.
Commissioner Hazelle Rogers, Vice Chair
Dr. Irv Rosenbaum
Jodi Jeffreys-Tanner
Wil Trower
Richard J. Weiss, Esq.

Members Absent:

Bruce Rogow, Esq.

Others Attending:

Joe Benavides
Mark Cohen
Pete Corwin
Chedley Etienne, Administrative Assistant, CRC
Ellen Feld
Dan Glickman
Matthue Goldsten
Sam Goren, Esq., General Counsel
Yolanda Grooms, Administrative Specialist, CRC
Maria Gross, Assistant Director, CRC
Bill Hirshman

Gloria Katz
Commissioner Ken Keechl
Phyllis A. King, Transcriber
Kimberly Maroe
Dennis Myers
Sue Olson
Commissioner Stacy Ritter
Commissioner John Rodstrom, Jr.
Susan Smith
Lisa Vondrak
Patricia G. West, Executive Director

(A copy of the sign-in sheets identifying those present is filed with the supplemental papers to the summary of this Charter Review Commission Meeting.)

A meeting of the Broward County Charter Review Commission (“CRC,” “Commission” or “Committee”) was held at 10:00 a.m. on Wednesday, February 14, 2007 at the Broward County Governmental Center – Room 430, Fort Lauderdale, FL.

I Call to Order/Roll Call

Chair Lori Moseley called the meeting to order at 10:03 a.m. She wished everyone a Happy Valentine’s Day and thanked the CRC staff for the wonderful decorations and very thoughtful roses. The Chair then requested the roll call by Phyllis A. King, PKING Consulting, Inc. Upon completion of roll call, Chair Moseley recognized the presence of a quorum.

II Approval of January 10, 2007 Summary of Discussion

The Chair requested a **motion for approval** of the CRC January 10th Summary of Discussion.

A motion was made by Ms. Good; seconded by Mr. Penezic. The Chair called for all in favor, I’s were stated and the motion was approved by the Chair.

III Chair and Executive Director’s Report

The Chair requested a show of hands of who would be able to attend this afternoon’s Public Hearing at 2:00 pm. All present attendees raised their hands.

The Chair asked Ms. West to proceed.

Ms. West addressed the CRC Budget Subcommittee advising them that staff had completed a short report of the first quarter expenditures of the CRC for the Committee's review. She stated that this could be discussed later; however, the CRC staff intends to provide an overview of expenditures to the Budget Subcommittee on a quarterly basis.

Ms. West advised that today's CRC meeting packet contains a copy of:

- **The CRC January 10th Summary of Discussion.**
- **A Summary of Discussion of the January 22nd meeting of the Committee to Establish Subcommittees (CES).**
- **A Summary of the January 25th Public Hearing.**

Ms. West then asked the Chair if the 22nd and 25th Summaries of Discussion (SOD) need to be approved. Mr. Goren replied that the Summaries are just public record data, indicating that the public hearing occurred, who attended, and who spoke. The Chair asked Mr. Goren for further clarification that the subcommittee SODs did not require approval.

Note: Mr. Esack arrived at this time – 10:05 a.m.

Mr. Goren advised that they could be received by motion to the record as a matter of course to the extent that there were Public Hearings conducted and that people did attend in some numbers. The Chair stated that she was referring to the minutes of the Committee to Establish Subcommittees (CES). Ms. West referenced January 22nd. Mr. Goren advised that he would accept them. The Chair stated that there would need to be a motion to accept.

Mr. Weiss asked the Chair what the process would be with respect to the Committee reports. He stated that he believes that there should be some process by which the Board considers what the recommendations are by the various committees, as opposed to just accepting them in a separate report.

Ms. West replied that once the Committee finishes today and has established the subcommittees there would probably be Chairs of those subcommittees and those Chairs would make a report at each meeting to the full group and the Committee could accept them at that time. She stated that, generally, a summary is drafted and then sent to the subcommittee for

review prior to the full Committee meeting. Then, when the Chair of that subcommittee makes the report to the full Committee it could be approved at that time.

Mr. Weiss explained that the CES made some significant prioritizations and based upon that report he thought that the CRC would be establishing subcommittees. The Chair and Ms. West replied that a discussion would first take place on what the Subcommittee did. Mr. Weiss stated that he did not see it on the agenda. Ms. West stated that when the Committee has lunch and Discussion of Issues, that would be that report. The Chair clarified that a full discussion will take place. Ms. West then continued to list items provided in the CRC meeting packet.

- **An Interview Guide for the three people who will be interviewed by the CRC today; Commissioner Ritter, Commissioner Keechl, and Commissioner Rodstrom.**

Ms. West then asked the Committee to think about any other individuals they would like to invite to come before the full Commission at the next CRC meeting.

- **An Interoffice Memorandum from Mr. Goren's office regarding the Broward County Charter Review Commission ("CRC") / Metropolitan Planning Organization Ability to Regulate through a Charter Amendment.**

Ms. West explained that Mr. Goren was directed at a prior meeting to follow-up and provide the full Committee with some information and the MPO memorandum addresses that concern.

- **Background materials from Commissioner Kristin Jacobs in follow-up to her interview from the last full Committee meeting.**
- **Thank you letter from the Children's Diagnostic and Treatment Center, Inc. for Holiday Gifts dropped off by CRC staff.**
- **Matrix of Subcommittees proposed by the Committee to Establish Subcommittees**

Ms. West called this matrix to Mr. Weiss' attention and again expressed that a lengthy discussion regarding those recommendations is planned upon completion of the interviews.

- **Copy of Ordinance No. 2007-02 Code of Ethics / Conduct for Broward County Employees and Officials.**

Ms. West advised that this Ordinance was just passed. It speaks to some of the concerns raised by members of the CRC as it relates to ethics so staff thought the Committee might want to see a copy of the Ordinance that was recently passed by the County Commission.

- **Miami Herald Article dated, February 12, 2007 titled, “Let’s Reform the County Charter.”**

Ms. West advised that this article was in the Editorial Page of the Miami Herald, written by former Miami-Mayor Maurice Ferre. It has been provided for the Commission to review when they have a chance to do so. Ms. West advised that this was it for her report and acknowledged the Chair.

The Chair thanked Ms. West and discussed the status of the CRC Public Hearings. She thanked everyone for attending the public hearings and advised that the timing issue had been clarified. She then asked Mr. Goren to review his MPO Memorandum and if there is time she would also request he go over the new County Ordinance until 10:30 a.m. interviews begin.

Sam Goren, General Counsel, Discussion of Charter Issues

MPO Memorandum

Mr. Goren thanked the Chair and advised that he prepared a memorandum at the request of the CRC to look at the MPO, its duties and responsibilities. He stated that he knows that Commissioner Mena is on the MPO and others have a relationship there as well. He stated that the MPO is an organization which is established by and preempted under State statute. It is not an operative body within the Charter of Broward County; it is not a body which can be otherwise affected by decisions of the Charter. It is an independent entity that serves the public in the context of State law. Mr. Goren added that as independent counsel and staff, although interlocking with the County periodically, it is an organization that is truly independent from the Charter and cannot be regulated in his opinion by the Charter, even through Charter amendment.

The Chair requested Mr. Goren to tell the Commission what the MPO is, just for information purposes. Mr. Goren stated that MPO stands for Metropolitan Planning Organization. It is a group which essentially plans and designs future roadway opportunities, connections, and relationships between Counties, periodically on a good-faith basis. It receives funding and directs the relationships as they exist with planned development for roadways and

transportation needs. Typically, County staff serves in a capacity assisting the MPO. The MPO does have its own professional staff and they've recently engaged separate legal counsel giving them separate assistance.

The Chair clarified that the MPO is working on getting separate legal assistance. Mr. Goren stated that he assumes this should be forthcoming. The Chair stated for the record that there is no current contract. Mr. Goren stated that he is sure that it will be fair and equitable in the context of its approval, but from the standpoint of having that relationship the MPO does have independent counsel much like the CRC.

Mr. Goren stated that the MPO is unique in that it is set up by State law. Because the statute creates it, produces a basis for its existence, and its existence legally, it is not an organization that the Charter can embrace in a legal sense to change. He added that in theory you cannot bring it within the Charter because they are external to the Charter and they are separate and distinct legally from the Charter; so, they are not fair game for the CRC.

Mr. Benson thanked Mr. Goren for his report. He then asked if it is within the purview of the CRC to identify any issues it feels need to be identified, form a position if a position needs to be formed, and articulate those identified positions to the County Commission as an addendum or an obiter dictum in order to have legislative action recommended to the Commission, so that it could then have its legislative arm speak to the State Legislature for any amendments if the CRC feels some of that is appropriate.

Mr. Goren replied that if this CRC chooses not to change the Charter on any particular topic but chooses to articulate a position, a recommendation, or an evaluation of a topic, which too is part of what this Commission's entitlement is as members. He reminded everyone that the last CRC actually had a series of recommendations that were not to change the Charter but to ask the County Commission and/or other governmental agencies to look at future change not within the Commission's complete jurisdiction. He responded that this is fair game and is something which should not be cast asunder just because the Commission is looking at Charter amendments.

Mr. Benson stated that he did not want Mr. Goren's report to cause the Commission not to look at the MPO if in fact the Commission intends to look at any provisions of the MPO. Because

there is a way in which the Commission can cause change to occur if there is consensus that something should happen with regards to it.

Ethics Ordinance

The Chair requested Mr. Goren to review the new Ethics Ordinance. Mr. Goren stated as an adjunct to one of the conversation points at the last meeting regarding ethics, some members of the CRC asked questions regarding the Ethics Code for Broward County and whether or not there had been implementation satisfactory to the current Charter's colleagues on that premise. He stated that the County Commission adopted at the end of January, an Ordinance which essentially intends to provide an ethics compact for the County Commission in how it deals with itself and the public. He advised that with respect to the drafting, it would be the Commission's subjective obligation to look at the ordinance and determine whether or not its contents are sufficient, whether they go far enough or whether or not they are in need of repair or further review. Mr. Goren stated that one of the comments made by CRC members was whether to add a goal post or goal line to the issue if it had not yet been adapted to the CRC's satisfaction. He added that the Ordinance looks like one he handled for one of the other cities which were intended to be a global ordinance. He stated that it expresses the collective views of the County Commission with their ability to be civil to each other, the public, and to those having a need for information. Whether in the CRC's opinion as a board it is sufficient legally to take the Commission to the right level is still fair game. He further stated that whether or not the Ordinance is compliant, he cannot be the judge of this, the CRC can. He added that it certainly creates certain opportunities for collectivization and camaraderie among the Commissioners and whether or not that was responsive to what was the charge in the Charter, specifically and emphatically in the last amendments, is something that the Commission will have to debate and discuss and conclude. However, the Ordinance was adopted in recent days and it is certainly unique.

The Chair requested that all Commission members read and digest the Ordinance before the next meeting and plan to see what the pleasure of the body is after the review.

Mr. Goren added that there was one item which was not in the Ordinance that was actually in an ordinance in a collegial city which was that being a public official needed to be fun. They missed that one; it is in the Coral Springs Ordinance.

The Chair acknowledged Mr. Trower. Mr. Trower asked if the new Ordinance replaces any other ordinance. Mr. Goren stated that it is supplemental to an existing ordinance. Mr. Trower asked if there were other notes about the supplemental contract. Mr. Goren stated that it actually amended a section and he would need to get a copy of Section 26-67 to see whether or not it has any other language that would represent what the Charter is trying to accomplish. Mr. Trower stated that it would be helpful to know what the requirements and other language are in order to view them together. Mr. Goren stated that there is no reference to Chapter 112 per se and that might...., except to say that they embrace it.

The Chair recognized Ms. Norris-Weeks. Ms. Norris-Weeks asked for minutes from the 2002 Charter Review Commission to see what they were trying to get at. On that discussion (ethics), if there is anything like that, either from the Committee, a Subcommittee or from the Commission itself.

Ms. West replied yes.

Mr. Goren advised that there is provision on page 2 of the Ordinance that embraces Chapter 112 which is the Ethics Code by State Statute and the intent of the Ordinance appears to be bringing the County Commission and its minions to a higher standard and this may well be their response. He added whether it is believed or not, it is something that needs to be discussed among the Commission.

The Chair inquired as to whether she has a copy of Chapter 112. Mr. Goren replied maybe not, it is Part 3 in the State Statutes. Ms. West advised that copies of the State Statutes were provided very early on. But if necessary staff can pull out that specific section and provide it again. Mr. Goren advised that it is worth reading on a periodic basis. It is the mantle by which the Commission is judged, by the media, the public, and by other third parties.

Committee to Establish Subcommittees (CES)

The Chair stated that she was going to begin with this topic in order to use time wisely.

Ms. West advised that there is one other document in the CRC member packet that she failed to mention. It is the **Recommendations from the 2006 Management and Efficiency Study Committee (MESOC)**. Ms. West advised that there were a few recommendations forwarded to

the CRC and they have been included along with information from the CES. Staff thought this information from the MESC would be valuable for the Commission to review.

The Chair stated that the CES met on Monday, January 22, 2007 at which time eleven (11) individuals were present. The CES broke down the 35 items from the facilitated session at Mills Pond Park and categorized them into possible subcommittees so that they could bring a recommendation. She stated that the CES decided that maybe some issues would not be brought forward from the CES once it was broken down into all the committees. The Chair stated that the list was initially broken down into eight (8) subcommittees with all of the different topics of the subcommittees to see where they fit logically. She advised that a discussion ensued regarding how the CRC is going to have to begin to do some work and maybe all 35 issues could not take place in this Charter Review session. The CES decided at that time that they would get consensus on the issues that they wanted to bring forward to the Commission. The reason this was done was to begin to fine tune and expedite the process. The intent was not to bring the list to the Commission and say this is all we are going to talk about. The intent was to fine tune and if there was not a consensus of the eleven (11) people sitting in the CES, then it might stand to reason that there might not be 10 members that wanted to bring an issue forward for discussion.

The Chair stated that it has now been brought back to the Commission for the entire Commission to now decide if they agree or disagree; if they want to add something, or not. The Chair stated that she understands that when the CES originally met, they planned to just line up the items. But as the CES meeting progressed it became apparent that if there were only one or two people who wished to discuss an item then maybe that item would not go forward. She advised that it was not to stop dialogue at the CRC level and she believes that part of the CES's job is to expedite the process, bring all the information together and organize that information so that it is easier to digest. She added that the way that process obviously works, if the Commission determines, is that the subcommittees would be bringing it back. The Chair stated that CRC members might not always agree or disagree with a subcommittee but ultimately everything comes back to the entire body and she would like everyone to understand that this is how the process works.

The Chair then opened the floor for a discussion of how the CES meeting originally went. She stated that the items were originally broken down to: Administrative Issues and Governance. She referred everyone to the document entitled ***Subcommittees Proposed by the Committee***

to Establish Subcommittees in their meeting folders. She reviewed the list breakdown as listed on pages 1 and 2 of the referenced document. Those items presented to bring forward were as follows (bulleted items were brought forward, *italic items were stricken for non-consensus*):

Administrative Issues/Governance

- Structure – form of government
- Mayor: duties; strong vs. weak
- Election of Commissioners
- Census/re-districting
- Ethics
- Budget/finance

CRC/MESC

The Chair advised that there was no consensus for:

Constitutional Officers

Coordination between city and county Courts

Review of Constitutional Officers, including SOE

Environmental

The Chair advised that environmental issues water and land were specifically not brought forward.

Health / Social Services

- Housing – conversation about affordable housing and the affordable housing problem in Broward County.
- Children's Services

Hospital Districts was removed

Land Use

- MPO
- Planning Council
- Permitting/development review process (see platting)
- Building and Construction
- County Authority
- Platting process/administrative approval (MESC)
- Shifting land use authority to municipality

Impact fees - was removed because it did not actually fit.

Unincorporated areas (annexation)

RLUPA (Religious Land Use Protection Act) was removed because it is a Federal Statute

Public Safety

- Emergency Management/coordination
- Fire/rescue coordination
- Provide accountability for existing Charter Amendment for Firefighters

Traffic Engineering

Firefighter Minimum Standards

Intergovernmental interaction in emergencies

The Chair explained that many of these issues were redundant, so they were fine-tuned.

Transportation

- Airport/seaport
- Mass transit

Rail

Special Districts

County Authority over Special Districts

Drainage (water)

Dependent and Independent Districts

The Chair pointed out that each issue eliminated by the CES was shown on the document provided with strikethrough. The Chair asked Mr. Goren which of those issues listed were legal and might not have fit because of their being in Federal Statute. Mr. Goren advised that he would have to look back at his notes, but there were some specific topics which the CES looked at which had no bearing on the Charter and they were discounted very quickly. He stated that there was a chart on the board that the CES worked from and from which they made their determinations

The Chair stated that this was the starting point and the CRC has two (2) minutes before the first interview. Ms. West asked the Chair if she wanted to go ahead and begin the conversation on the CES issues.

The Chair opened the floor and recognized Ms. Rogers. Ms. Rogers stated with regard to Special Districts, she knows the CES decided not to deal with that issue, but as a member of the MESC and when looking at the County, the MESC went in depth with a discussion on the subject of Special Districts to see how and why the Districts were established and were they still necessary. Ms. Rogers stated that she would ask, before the CRC decided not to discuss the issue, that the CRC look at the report from the MESC on this specific issue. She advised that it was found to be duplicative, charging the residents twice in different levels of Districts which is non-functional now and may not be necessary. She stated that the MESC conducted a long in-depth study and employed someone to look at the issue. Therefore, she would ask the CRC to take another look at it before discounting it without additional information.

The Chair stated that all MESC recommendations which specifically said "refer to the Charter Review" are on the list. She acknowledged the conversation which took place but stated that there was a reason why it was not referred to the CRC. She advised that she would have Mr. Goren look at it over the break because the conversation did take place and the CRC values what the MESC did.

Ms. West reminded everyone that each issue will be re-visited and the Commission will have a chance to vote whether it stays out or comes back on the table, and whether it stays in the particular subcommittee that the CES recommended. The Chair concurred.

Ms. Kaletta stated that there were three (3) specific recommendations that some things come to Charter Review because MESC did not feel there was anything that the MESC could do about them. But that does not mean that the CRC should eliminate the other things that were recommended by MESC because there were many things like the Special Districts and Housing etc. that recommendations were made that she thinks the CRC can look at and possibly make an impact on. Ms. Kaletta asked that the CRC not eliminate other items from the MESC because there was a lot of effort like Ms. Rogers said.

The Chair stated that she will check, because there were discussions on many things that day and she cannot remember what the actual verbiage was.

Mr. Weiss stated that he is not sure that he understood what Ms. West said and that it is what the Committee agreed to. Ms. West stated that before the end of the meeting the entire CRC will have an opportunity to again review all of the recommendations and then vote on each of the issues to see whether it stays off or on the table. She stated that she thought this was the agreement. That the CRC made the recommendations as a Committee to select subcommittees, but it still had to be approved by the full body. Mr. Weiss stated that he thinks that there is a difference between accepting the Committee Report and going through each individual issue and having the Commission vote on every single issue.

The Chair advised that the major topics will be gone through.

Mr. Weiss stated that he thought that the idea of the CRC is that there is a limited amount of time and if there weren't ten (10) votes to discuss a particular item that it would not be discussed. The idea was to try to limit it down, prepare a recommendation as to what the Committee thought should be discussed. Mr. Weiss stated that if people would like to add, there are 10 votes that say that certain topics should be added to the list then he believes that it should be added to the list.

The Chair stated that she thought the CRC was going to go over the main Committees.

Mr. Esack stated that he is concerned that almost 50% of the total topics were removed. He stated that while he believes in the whole idea of the entire Commission relinquishing to a subcommittee time wise before abolishing 18 of 40 topics all together, he thinks it should be hashed out one last time.

The Chair advised that the intent is not to try to stop dialogue.

Ms. Good stated that she is not necessarily in disagreement with the outcome, but she is in disagreement with how it was done. She stated that her understanding was that the CES was going to take all the items that were on the plate and categorize them and that was the extent of it and had she known that the CES was going to utilize the time to also take items out of contention, she thinks that was different from the assignment that was given to them. She stated that she would have appreciated to know this ahead of time. If this was the intent of the CES then it should have been made apparent to everyone that the CES was going to categorize the items. She added because of the fact that there were so many people in attendance, not sufficient interest was there [to know?] that items were going to be eliminated. She added that she has a problem with the process itself.

Ms. Good stated that she appreciates what Ms. West stated. She believes that the entire CRC, whether you want to lump them into groups and inquire if there is interest, Ms. Good would certainly like to have an opportunity to say something, since she was not part of the CES.

The Chair stated that the objective is to try to begin to fine tune the items. She assured everyone that the intent was not to stop dialogue but to move forward but if ten (10) people have a different opinion, and then it changes.

Mr. Benson stated that he agrees with Ms. West and even though he was on the CES, there were some items deleted that he personally wishes to see back on the list and at the appropriate time he will raise those issues to see if he can have them reinstated for consideration. He stated that he agrees with the Chair that the goal is not to try to limit input, but at least a grouping starting point has been laid out from which the CRC can move forward, but there may very well be some other items that are listed that need to be added that are not there.

The Chair agreed. She then recognized Ms. Kaletta.

Ms. Kaletta stated that she wanted to reinforce what Ms. West and Mr. Benson said. Ms. Kaletta advised that her understanding with what was done was that the CES went through to prioritize and possibly say as a small subcommittee that these are the ones we thought could come back and the major group would make the final decision. She confirmed that it was just to get a head start.

Mr. Ketcham stated that he is very disturbed by the list. He added that he agrees with Ms. Good completely. He heard the intent of the CES and he thought that the CRC decided the intent of the CES and the intent was to categorize things. It was not to cross things off; it was not to discuss the relative merits on whether they should be there but to categorize. Mr. Ketcham stated that he thinks that this sets quite a precedent: to get a Committee, and then put together another Committee and they have a good idea in which direction they want to go. He stated that he might want to reject the whole report and start over, or at least go through the categorizations of them and stop there. But he stated that he thinks what was presented is offensive.

Ms. Jeffreys-Tanner stated that a lot of work was thought out by the CES members and she thinks as things were whittled down from the list of 35, most everything was listed on the chalk board during the meeting. She advised that some things just happened to fall under more than one category. The CES even reviewed if it was something that could or could not be changed by Charter. Therefore, a lot more discussion will show that there are some things that cannot be done, some things will go into another category because at some point it will be realized that the CRC has less than two (2) years to make any recommendations. So in the process of time... Ms. Jeffreys-Tanner assured Mr. Ketcham that it is not to stop discussion or anything like that because anything and everything on this list that was on the original list can be brought back up. Ms. Jeffreys-Tanner added that they were created to start to streamline the list. Mr. Ketcham asked to put things in category.

The Chair stated at this time that discussion will be postponed until after the Interviews.

IV Interviews

The Chair welcomed Commissioner Stacy Ritter. She advised Ms. Ritter that she had 15 minutes to speak.

Commissioner Stacy Ritter – 10:41 a.m. – 10:56 a.m.

Commissioner Ritter thanked the CRC for inviting her and reminded them that she chaired the MESC for two years and some of what she will ask the CRC has probably been asked by some of the former members of the MESC that are on this CRC. Commissioner Ritter advised that there are a couple of issues that she would like to see the CRC take up; some of which she knows the CRC is taking up and some of which the Commission may have considered and thrown out which she thinks should be brought back.

The Chair stated for the record that the CRC has made no conclusions about what the Commission is doing and not doing.

Commissioner Ritter agreed and stated that she does read the Commission's minutes and she sees that some things have been preliminarily crossed off. The Chair reminded her that this is a discussion.

Commissioner. Ritter reminded everyone that she has only been on the County Commission for three (3) months and gave a brief statement of her professional background. Commissioner Ritter stated that she thinks that when you have a fresh pair of eyes looking at things it can help. She added that Commissioner Keechl may feel the same way about some of her views, but she is not sure, they haven't talked about it.

Issue 1 - Article 4 of the Charter - County Auditor:

Commissioner Ritter stated that she was present in 2000 during the process of the County going through the Strong Mayor vs. single-member District debate and she actually supported the single-member District vs. the Strong Mayor side at the time. As a result they came up with the County Auditor Article which was in reaction to the Strong Mayor Proposal which the Legislature literally "shoved down our throat." Commissioner Ritter reminded everyone that she was a member of the Legislature at that time and that when looking at the County Auditor Article, she thinks that in Section A which indicates the Committee who chooses the Auditor; there is something that she does not understand. Commissioner Ritter questioned why would the President of the Broward County Bar Association be on the committee which chooses the County Auditor? She also questioned with no disrespect to our Educational Community, why the President of Broward Community College as opposed to others? Commissioner Ritter

explained that she believes that there are people within the Auditing and Accounting Industry who are far more qualified than she or some of the people listed.

Recommendation: *Commissioner Ritter stated that she thinks that the CRC might consider revising the committee which is chosen to hire the County Auditor as it made no sense to her when she read it. She advised that if the CRC looks at itself and the MESC it will see that the members came from a broad range of places, each was appointed by County Commissioners or other Agencies or Boards that have interest in what the members do and none of them came from those places listed in Article 4.*

Commissioner Ritter stated that she was also not sure of what the philosophy was with giving the Auditor a five (5) year period of service before either choosing to terminate him/her or having to re-new his/her term. Five (5) years seems like a really long time and she does not believe this is done in any aspect of County government..

Issue 2 - Mid-Decennial Census – MESC Proposal:

Commissioner Ritter stated that she knows that not every Commissioner is supportive of a Mid-decennial Census based on discussions from the dais and reading the CRC minutes. She stated that this is something that the MESC looked at very closely. She advised that Broward County population has exploded since the 2000 Census and the lines drawn at that time. She stated that she believes it is unfair to both the constituent and the elected official, when one elected official represents twice as many as another. If the Commissioner from District 1 represents 200,000 people and the Commissioner from District 2 represents 100,000 people someone is being short changed and the people who are being short changed is not only the District Commissioner but the constituents who may need just as much time but will only get half as much time because of that many more people that you have to service.

Recommendation: *Commissioner Ritter added that she thinks this is something that this CRC should look at because it is essential to continue the service for the constituents of Broward County that every District Commissioner represents the same number as every other.*

Issue 3 - Firefighter Minimum Staffing:

Commissioner Ritter stated that she knows that this issue was crossed off the CES preliminary list of things to review. She advised that the MESC spent a lot of time discussing this issue.

The MESC met with the Fire Chiefs Association and other interested parties regarding what is thought to be a public safety issue and that is minimum staffing for firefighters. She cautioned against the unavailability of firefighters in one area when they were needed and mentioned that the inter-local agreements between cities may not always provide adequate coverage in emergencies. Commissioner Ritter said that the MESC could not do anything except recommend that the CRC look at it because it requires a Charter change... She added that she realizes that it is a money issue and she knows that everyone is experiencing budget problems in the coming year, but in her mind and for the people that she represents they would be very unhappy to know that if there is a fire, they may have an understaffed firehouse.

Recommendation: *Commissioner Ritter stated that it has been her understanding that people are willing to pay for police and firefighters. That when they complain about taxes it is usually not because of the firefighters or police that they are paying for, it is for other reasons. Therefore, she advised the CRC that she thinks this is something that the Commission should seriously look at.*

Issue 4 - Growth Management – MESC Proposal:

Commissioner Ritter stated that another MESC recommendation was in the Growth Management area. Shelley Eichner who Chaired the Subcommittee on Growth Management came up with a couple of interesting recommendations with respect to recertification of Land Use Plans and the amendment process which is excruciatingly slow here at the County, as are many things. Commissioner Ritter expressed that she understands the thoughtful and deliberative process that goes into government. Progress is not made when the wheels stop. The Planning Council currently approves recertification for certain things.

Recommendation: *She added that she is a new County Commission representative on the Planning Council and stated her understanding about retaining authority over the process and the delays and the costs incurred in development and re-development. Commissioner Ritter recommended that perhaps the staff should review the recertification process and remove a couple of the steps in between to shorten the process. She stated that because the Charter requires the Planning Council consider recertification of local Land Use Plans an amendment to the Charter would be required in order to take out that step. She then advised that there might be Planning Council members who would disagree with her.*

Issue 5 - Commission Management form of Government vs. Mayor Form of Government:

Commissioner Ritter remembered when the previous Chair of the Broward County Legislative Delegation Senator Skip Campbell decided he was going to sponsor a Strong Mayor Bill to pass the Legislature and come to the voters of Broward County to decide whether or not we wanted to change our system of governance in Broward County. She emphasized that she was one of four Broward County members of the delegation who was adamantly opposed to and voted against that particular piece of legislation and continued to vote against it as it made its way to the floor. Commissioner Ritter believed that there were four (4) who voted against the legislation in the full House, all from Broward County. Commissioner Ritter advised that this was because they understood that what was in that particular Bill was extremely onerous for the residents who live in Broward and it took away all the power of the County Commission and gave it to one person. She advised that none of them wanted that and as a result there was a competing amendment on the ballot at the same time, which was to provide for nine (9) single-member districts, moving from the seven (7) County wide prior to 2000. She voted for it, worked for it, and she remembers debating colleagues about how bad the Strong Mayor Bill was at the time.

Commissioner Ritter believes that having nine (9) Commissioners forces the pendulum to swing way too far to one side. She stated that the Legislature is parochial and the County Commission is extraordinarily parochial. She stated that a prime example would be yesterday's meeting where the County Commission discussed Agenda Item #20 (and it does not matter what it was) where the discussion was a lot of *"well, that is my District, oh no-no that's my District, well yes it's my District too and I represent more of that District than you do so its really my issue not yours"*. Commissioner Ritter expressed her dissatisfaction and disappointment and stressed that the commission is a "County Commission." . Commissioner Ritter stated that she would still oppose a Strong Mayor if it was framed the way the previous one was framed because it gave too much power to one person. She mentioned Miami-Dade as an example and gave some details. .

Commissioner Ritter stated that she finds it really disturbing that for example she can write a letter to anyone with only her own opinion, yet when the letter is received, you may very well believe that that is the policy of the County Commission as a whole. She stated that some of her colleagues have done this and she has received phone calls asking why and the answer is *"well that's not my opinion, that's his or her opinion"*. She stated that there is no one here in

Broward County to look to as the “Leader of Policy Makers” and that there are 9 different opinions, and that things move very slowly in Broward County.

Recommendation: *Commissioner Ritter stated that she would hope that the CRC will debate the issue of the Mayor and if the Commission chooses to go in that direction she hopes that it is crafted extremely carefully, unlike the delegation legislation in 2000 which was crafted very poorly and very sloppily. She stated that she thinks it might be time to say, we need someone here to lead us who has a County wide perspective because she believes that districting has really been disadvantageous to those who live in Broward County.*

Commissioner Ritter thanked the Commission for allowing her to speak.

Ms. West asked Commissioner Ritter to send her comments electronically for distribution to the CRC members. Commissioner Ritter offered to send an outline of her talk. The Chair thanked Commissioner Ritter. **[End Commissioner Ritter Interview]**

Mr. Mena requested a copy of the 2000 opinion of the Strong Mayor. He explained that he is confused as to why the State was involved in the decision, so he would like to take a look at the language. The Chair stated that the State was involved because they decided they wanted to be. Mr. Mena again requested the documentation and The Chair agreed it would be provided.

Commissioner Ken Keechl – 10:57 a.m. – 11:08 a.m.

The Chair welcomed Commissioner Ken Keechl. Commissioner Keechl thanked the CRC for having him. He stated as most already know he and Commissioner Ritter are the two newest County Commissioners and he thinks it is interesting that the CRC is having the entire County Commission interview because he thinks each probably brings a different perspective to the County Commission. Commissioner Keechl stated that he believes he brings the most different perspective because he has never held a political office before he was elected to the seat and is not jaded by the process. He expressed his thoughts about his current observations, his present reactions to his position and his knowledge that some issues were eliminated. The Chair advised that nothing has been knocked off the table as of yet, that the items were recommendations.

Commissioner Keechl stated that he had four (4) topics to address with the Charter that he thinks are very important. Commissioner Keechl expressed his thoughts about how important

and powerful the CRC is and quoted his father, which is "If it is not broke, don't fix it". He stated that this is his philosophy with regard to our Charter after reviewing the Charter and CRC minutes.

Issue 1 - Districts:

Commissioner Keechl stated that he is in favor of keeping the nine (9) single-member Districts because 9 is perfect for dividing our County into Districts. He expressed his views that he is in close contact with his constituents and colleagues as a County Commissioner and that he cannot be an expert on other areas in the County but when in session he's representing the entire County. He stated that he is making decisions that he thinks are best for the entire County. Commissioner Keechl expressed his views on parochialism on the County Commission and everyone has an agenda. Commissioner Keechl stated that he is not making decisions to favor District 4 and hurt District 9 and he does not believe that his colleagues are doing that either.

Recommendation: *Commissioner Keechl stated that he would not be opposed to keeping 9 single-member districts, but having them run County wide, the Commissioners do deal with County wide issues and he thinks it is extremely important to have the Commissioners representing areas. He advised that he is concerned about losing that ability to look out for 1/9th of the County and focus on it. Commissioner Keechl expressed his concern about property taxes; that voters should be able to remove someone even if they do not live in their district and therefore advocates that the Commissioners run County-wide.*

Issue 2 - Strong Mayor vs. Weak Mayor:

Commissioner Keechl reiterated his short tenure of three months and the time and effort involved in the position. He also mentioned that he recognizes the political aspect of the position; that having a professional Administrator guide the Commissioners is advantageous; in regard to his awareness of how the County Commission works.

Recommendation: *Commissioner Keechl stated that a Strong Mayor would be a good thing if you get the right Mayor, but cautioned against installing the wrong person. He reiterated his earlier statement: "if it ain't broke, don't fix it". Commissioner Keechl stated that he followed the County Commission while he was running for office and he is currently involved daily and he thinks the County Commission works well the way it is.*

Issue 3 - County Land Use Issues:

Commissioner Keechl stated that he believes that the County must continue to have regional over-site with regard to land use issues. He expressed further by referencing the city officials and then went into detail about the project “*The Commons*”, and cited it as a perfect example of why regional over-site on a Broward County level is appropriate. He added that he believes that the County Commission works well with the Cities and the Commission has received the message from the Cities with regard to it being a two way street.

Recommendation: *Commissioner Keechl informed the Commission that he is an Environmentalist and having that extra level of protection with regard to land use issues is extremely important to him and he believes to the people of Broward County. Therefore, he would strongly advise the CRC to be extremely careful with regard to any recommendation to the voters to take away that power.*

Issue 4 - Constitutional Officers:

Commissioner Keechl stated that he believes that the Constitutional Officers should become Chartered Officers and his main reason for this suggestion is because of the budget process. He stated the County Commissioners’ hands are extremely tied with regard to the budgets of the Constitutional Officers and that the CRC needs to rein in their spending. He added that it is unfair for the County Commission to take the brunt of the voter’s anger when the Commission can’t say to the Constitutional Officers, as we are going through this process of listening to the will of the voter, *you must do the same thing.*

Recommendation: Commissioner Keechl stated that he believes that these suggested Chartered Constitutional Officers should be elected and not appointed and he believes in the right of the voter to make the decision to remove public officials

Commissioner Keechl advised that this was all of his commentary. He wished everyone a Happy Valentines Day. The Commission wished him the same. **[End Commissioner Keechl’s Interview]**

The Chair called for a break and requested everyone return in approximately 3 minutes. The meeting resumed at 11:17 a.m. at which time, The Chair welcomed Commissioner John Rodstrom.

Commissioner John Rodstrom – 11:18 a.m. – 11:25 a.m.

Commissioner Rodstrom advised the CRC that he appreciated the CRC members serving the public and being a part of this role as it is a very vital role. He stated that the last time he was before the CRC approximately six years ago there were (3) three issues that he spoke about. He advised that he is now down to two issues because the last time his issue regarding *Term Limits* was implemented. He stated that this was a very positive change; therefore, he is happy about it. Commissioner Rodstrom stated that he has no doubt in his mind that one of the items he will speak about does not have a great chance of passing, but he believes it will be very helpful to County government, that is, the issue of Non-partisan Elections.

Issue 1 - Non-partisan Elections:

Commissioner Rodstrom stated that he does not see the value of having partisan elections at the County or city level; but he understands the politics involved; so, he will not spend a lot of time talking about it because he just does not think it is something that is realistic. Commissioner Rodstrom stated that he recognizes the fact that we have nine single-member Districts and that is just the way that it has evolved. He stated that he has run County wide and in a single-member District. Commissioner Rodstrom stated that he never knew until he ran County wide that there are two (2) Century Villages. He stated that running County wide is actually a good thing; the newspapers would portray it as being a bad thing and that you need a lot of money, but frankly he believes you raise as much money now as you raised when he was running County wide and as a candidate he thinks he's been exposed to a lot more areas in the County. Commissioner Rodstrom stated that there are other reasons why we have single-member Districts, but he supports that reason and he thinks there should be inclusion and everyone should have the opportunity to serve. Therefore, he stated that the question is then, do you have some mix? Commissioner Rodstrom stated that he represents Fort Lauderdale Airport and he has constituents on both sides of the Airport. He stated that the *only* Commissioner who has an impact as far as those constituents are concerned is him. Therefore, no one else on the Commission is impacted by those constituents and they feel very frustrated and alone that no one really identifies with their plight and that is the problem, the real negative of a single member.

Recommendation: *Commissioner Rodstrom stated that the question is: if we had some “At Large” Districts, then how do we do it? He gave the examples of north of Broward and Orlando He stated that 9 is a workable number but beyond that it becomes cumbersome to work with. Commissioner Rodstrom pointed out the philosophical and political implications of changing to at large commissioners and the re-districting required, and he believed it would be a better government that way. He also stated that he thinks the voters would support the CRC. The politicians might not like it, but he thinks it would be good government.*

Issue 2 - Strong Mayor:

Commissioner Rodstrom stated there seems to be a discussion each year and that the news media loves the thought of a Strong Mayor. He stated that his problem with a Strong Mayor is that “just because you can get elected, doesn’t mean you are capable of running the government”. He discussed the County Administrative form of government and the professionals needed to run it. He also mentioned the negative campaigning that is standard operating procedure now; the cost of running a campaign and its effect on the quality of the candidates who run for the office of Mayor.

Recommendation: *Commissioner Rodstrom implored the CRC not to fix something that he does not see as being broken. He advised that he does read the stories about needing a Mayor during times of hurricane preparedness etc, but he does not believe that our appointed Mayor has done that badly. Commissioner Rodstrom’s suggestions were: 1) appoint that person for 2 years and put more credibility in that position, 2). appointment would coalesce the group and move the Commissioners forward in a positive direction, hopefully for the County Commissioner Rodstrom stated that he had the experience and expertise to do the job, but that others should be offered the opportunity and mentioned Broward County has had the first Hispanic and African-American Mayors in Broward County’s history and he is very proud of these accomplishments.*

Commissioner Rodstrom asked if the Commission had any questions. The Chair advised that there were no questions at this time. Commissioner Rodstrom thanked the CRC for giving him an opportunity to give his thoughts. **[End Commissioner Rodstrom Interview]**

The CRC took a break for lunch (11:26 a.m. to 11:55 a.m.)

The Chair called the meeting back to order at 11:55 a.m.

Committee to Establish Subcommittees (CES) discussion continued

The Chair recognized Ms. Jeffreys-Tanner.

Ms. Jeffreys-Tanner stated that she wanted to reiterate the fact that the CES did not leave everything that could not be opened back up. It is not off the table, it has just been streamlined.

Mr. Weiss stated that he feels badly that the actions of the CES caused people to feel uncomfortable. He stated that he wanted to explain at least from his point of view what he thought the CES was doing. Mr. Weiss stated that the bylaws / rules that the CRC adopted are that this would be a carry-over from the last Charter Review. Just because of the fact that the CRC is so limited on time, that things are so difficult and complicated. Mr. Weiss reminded everyone that the ruling adopted was that it takes 10 people because of the fact that it takes a super majority to put something on the ballot. He advised what was done in the past CRC and carried forward to this one is that if the Commission can't start out with a base of 10 people who wished to discuss an item, then there was no way that the Commission would get the two thirds. So what was done in the past CRC, if there were not 10 people on a motion to discuss an item, then there was no possible way to get to the two thirds necessary to put it on the ballot.

He advised that this was carried forward for economies of time because there were some issues that the Commission really does need to spend a lot of time on. Mr. Weiss stated that he believes there were 9 persons at the CES meeting and what he thought they were doing was expressing thoughts. He was not at the meeting when the CES was set up but he was appointed to the CES in absentia; so, he did not understand that it was a more limited task. Mr. Weiss stated that from his point of view he was trying to express the items that the group did not have the interest to discuss. Mr. Weiss stated that he would be happy to go back through the list and if there are 10 votes to discuss it, then he requested to discuss it. However, he did not mean to exclude any discussions about anything. Mr. Weiss added that he may be looking at it as a lawyer, but he felt that the Commission needs to start now with the issues that the Commission will really spend a lot of time on. Mr. Weiss apologized to Mr. Ketcham and reiterated if there are any issues that have 10 votes to discuss, he is happy to discuss it at length. He added that his suggestion would be that if there are things on the list that people really don't want to discuss, that they should be voted on, and if there are items deleted from the list that people want to discuss, that they should be talked about briefly; if there are 10 votes to

discuss, he suggested that they should go back on the list. He then apologized if his actions as a part of the CES offended anyone as he did not mean it.

The Chair advised that she would allow Mr. Buckner and Mr. Trower the opportunity to speak and then she plans to move forward for the sake of the one remaining hour. She advised that she would like for the Commission to get consensus on all that it can within the remaining hour if possible.

Mr. Buckner stated that as a member of the Commission he wished to echo what Mr. Weiss said. He also stated that he is very sensitive to the fact that a member feels the CES overstepped its bounds. Mr. Buckner stated that he did, however, feel that the CES did fulfill its basic expectations and directive. He referred everyone to the Summary of the Meeting, page 6. Mr. Weiss actually made the recommendation, which was carried by the Committee, that the CES establish subcommittees, which was done and then place all items under the relevant subcommittee, which was done. Mr. Buckner stated that the CES also provided the recommendations as instructed on page 6. Mr. Buckner stated that all of the strikethroughs are recommendations and he apologized for not being clear, but the CES did fulfill the purpose of the CRC and if the terms of the communication of its recommendation was not clear enough then he thinks that for not only the CES subcommittee but other subcommittees, they need to make sure that it is done properly the next time.

Mr. Trower asked the Chair what the process is as the CRC goes forward. If the Commission breaks up as charged into the five or six subcommittees, do those subcommittees have the authority to conduct research and investigation and feel out the different issues that might be on the list? He stated that his understanding of the CES was to categorize issues heard about in government; to define a template and then let the subcommittees go out and do the investigation, interviewing and data gathering in a more discrete level and to come back to the entire CRC with recommendations. He further stated that he does not think the CRC needs to spend a lot of time being very microscopic in what specific issue will be discussed because he does not feel that he knows enough about some of the issues to really target a particular initiative at this point.

The Chair stated that she believes part of the issue was that the Commission decided it needed to have a jumping off place. She reminded everyone that the interviews have not been completed and the Commission agreed that it will continue to interview other individuals on

other topics as the CRC goes forward and she envisioned that the Commission had to start somewhere. She stated that there might be other issues that come up, but she believes the Commission needs to start somewhere. She also stated that as the subcommittees begin to get into their work, maybe they will learn something that the Commission does not know and she would view that as the obligation of the subcommittee to hash it out and bring forward. She advised everyone that the goal was to get going somewhere and have a framework in which to begin.

Mr. Mena stated that he thinks the Commission is worrying too much about time. He stated that he would like to see the CRC do a thorough job in a subject or topic rather than worry so much about time. He added that it seems to him that the purpose is to try not to reinvent the wheel. Several people who have come to speak have said if it is not broken then don't fix it and he agrees with this to some degree. However, some of the items don't need to be fixed. To address some of the expensive time he mentioned that, obviously, the Strong Mayor business is coming up more and more and the CRC will need to spend a lot of time on that but he requested that the Commission not rush through just because of time as he is concerned about that.

The Chair stated that the issue is not rushing; it is to have a framework in which to begin and if you don't have a framework, you can't begin.

Mr. Benson asked at what point will the CRC start selecting the items to go either back on or take some off. The Chair responded that if the current conversation is ended she will be able to get there; that is her objective.

Dr. Rosenbaum stated with respect to time and having been on the CRC before, he advised that he has been in the crunch where the Charter could not get anything done. He stated that this problem occurs again and again, and if you can't do justice to items, he suggested picking fewer topics; doing justice to those topics that you have and doing a good job and don't try to do everything.

The Chair stated that she wants to go through the list to see what has consensus and then the areas that do not have consensus will be addressed later. She advised that she wanted to see if some subcommittees could be determined, if possible, and she will not know until she asks the entire Commission. She stated that the items that have no consensus will be revisited.

Ms. Good stated that seeing that there was a lot of commentary on the items which were stricken, and then maybe everyone is somewhat in agreement that... [Inaudible the Chair spoke at same time as speaker 12:07:50]. The Chair stated that this is what she is trying to do and began to state the motions for subcommittees:

Motion No.	Subcommittee Title / Description	Status (Pass/Fail)	Count (Y vs. N)
1	Administrative Issues/Governance	Passed	Unanimously
2	Constitutional Officers (by roll call)	Failed	7 yes / 11 no
3	Environmental (Chair called for motion) There being no motion – item failed	Failed	Unanimously
4	Health / Social Services (Chair called, moved and seconded) (by roll call)	Passed	17 yes / 1 no
5	Land Use (moved and seconded) (by roll call)	Passed	Unanimously
6	Public Safety (moved and seconded) (by roll call)	Passed	Unanimously
7	Transportation (moved and seconded) (by roll call)	Passed	Unanimously
8	Special Districts (moved and seconded) (by roll call) Mr. Ketcham clarified that the CES had discussion so that the 10 people who were not at the CES meeting do not have the benefit of that discussion. The Chair advised that the discussion ensued as the CES was trying to break the items down to see whether and where they fit. She confirmed that the CES did do this.	Failed	8 yes / 10 no

The Chair recognized Ms. Norris-Weeks. Ms. Norris-Weeks stated that she was not sure if this was the appropriate time, but several articles have come up dealing with Environmental issues and Water and Land Use since the CES meeting. She is wondering if that could be an issue if the Commission agrees that this can be an issue that can be put with the Land Use issue since it has been agreed to have that issue as a subcommittee.

The Chair informed Ms. Norris-Weeks that the Commission did not agree to have Environmental as a subcommittee as it was voted no. Ms. Norris-Weeks clarified her position and asked to

incorporate as a part of the discussion because she believes it is not limited to the things that are set forth under Land Use. The Chair advised that this would be fine if more information is found as a subcommittee going forward. Ms. Norris-Weeks clarified that Environmental is not something that the subcommittee would be barred from discussing or incorporating if they see fit. The Chair responded by saying no but the Commission said no that there would not... *[did not complete sentence]... Mr. Benson spoke simultaneously.*

Mr. Benson advised that there is a supposition that the categorization is correct. Ms. Rogers concurred stating that the issue is closed. Mr. Benson continued by stating that this is what he believes to be Ms. Norris-Weeks' issue. If the supposition is that the categorization is correct, then he believes the Chair's position would be right, but if the supposition is that the categorization as it stands eliminates the probability of some of those items not being discussed then he believes the Commission needs to look at a way to get some of the items discussed. Because by eliminating Special Districts, the supposition is that you automatically eliminate the items that are under there. Many in the dais disagreed. Mr. Benson stated that he hoped he is wrong.

The Chair recognized Mr. Penezic who stated that unless he is mistaken, what was just voted on was whether the Commission is going to have specific subcommittees titled as so voted. The issues that necessarily fell under those specific subcommittees are by no means off the table as this is the theory by which he was voting. Mr. Benson responded that this is fine. The Chair confirmed that Mr. Penezic is correct.

Mr. Weiss suggested the Commission move forward, advising that there is going to be enough disagreement on substantive issues. The last thing needed is disagreements on procedure.

Mr. Benson responded to the contrary advising that the devil is in the details.

Mr. Weiss stated that he agrees, but what he is trying to do is remove the procedural issues off the table. He stated that everyone knows what they are voting for and he would suggest that now that particular subcommittees have been decided and having worked on these subcommittees he stated that just on the Administrative Issue of Governance, you can spend years on all of those issues and then there are some that have been eliminated that some people might want to put back in. Mr. Weiss asked what the intentions were regarding the subject matter of the subcommittee discussions.

Mr. Benson stated that he thought that discussion was next. Mr. Benson stated that this is what he is trying to understand: what procedure will be used so that the subcommittees will basically have some direction as to what the Commission would like them to discuss.

The Chair advised that her thought process is that what was taken from the list of 35 was broken down into the subcommittees. She stated that to her this was also a kicking off point because the Commission had already agreed on those 35 issues when the workshop began. Therefore, as opposed to the subcommittees going off somewhere else at the present time, she believes what was listed was part of the Commission's thought process when it developed the initial 35 items; so, under those listed, they would be the kicking off point for the beginning of the research for the subcommittees. She then asked if that was alright with everyone present. She then asked why would the Commission have 35 issues that it put down if they are not the ones the Commission wanted to discuss and when the CES met it was to categorize those issues.

Ms. Kaletta asked if this meant, for sake of argument, that the Public Safety Committee cannot then deal with firefighter minimum standards or, as a subcommittee can they bring those back up? The Chair stated that her understanding of the process is what the subcommittee needs to start with is the ones that are not crossed out. There was total disagreement from the dais.

Ms. Kaletta stated that her thought as a subcommittee, anything on the list could be reviewed, but the focus would need to be moved to 1, 2 or 3 items. She suggested that the subcommittee would not be able to focus on all of the items under any one of the suggested subcommittees. She then advised that it should be left up to the subcommittees to make a decision on which direction they want to focus on a couple of things. One is what is viable and what is not? What is likely to pass and what is likely to be of use to the County? The second would be whether it is something that is going to pass the whole Commission once the subcommittee brings it back to the Commission. Ms. Kaletta advised that she does not think the Commission should limit the subcommittees if it has made a decision on what the subcommittees are; now she advised that she believes it should be up to the subcommittees to decide which of the issues using the list as a structure to start with and she does not think the Commission should put binders on the subcommittees.

Ms. Norris-Weeks stated that she does not agree nor disagree with what Ms. Kaletta has just stated, but her issue is when she brought up the Environmental Issue going under Land Use; both Mr. Weiss and Ms. Jeffreys-Tanner stated that they thought it was actually placed under

Land Use when the discussion was held. Ms. Norris-Weeks then informed the Commission that she does not know how there could be a Land Use discussion without dealing with water and the environment. She then suggested that, however, the subcommittees choose to go forward; she would just like to ensure that "Environment" is added to the list with the Commissions consent.

The Chair recognized Mr. Weiss. Mr. Weiss advised that he had to leave in a few moments but he wanted to state that while he understands what Ms. Kaletta was saying, he does not really agree because he does think that the Commission should be telling the subcommittees because he thinks that there is a bad feeling where the CES decided what should be discussed and not discussed. He stated that he thinks the Commission should be telling the subcommittees what to discuss. Mr. Weiss stated that if there are not 10 votes on this Committee to discuss Census and Re-Districting, for example, if there are not 10 votes, then that Administrative Issues/Governance Committee should not spend any time on it.

Ms. West advised the Chair that Mr. Weiss is correct and the only way to handle it is issue by issue.

Mr. Weiss continued stating that the only way to do this fairly so that everyone gets to discuss it is to go down the list and if there are 10 votes to discuss "structure/form of government" then the Committee should discuss it. If there is not, at least for the purposes of some economy, and he advised that someone could bring it up later if they want to, but for the purpose of focusing the subcommittees, there must be a starting off point and if the Commission starts off with the entire world as subject for the subcommittee discussions then you will never get to the issues. Therefore, Mr. Weiss reiterated his suggestion, i.e. to go through each item and if there are 10 votes to discuss them, and there could be a discussion about whether they should be discussed, as he believes this is what some people were asking for; but he stated that he thinks the Commission should be directing those subcommittees. If Mr. Benson has an issue that he wants to have some Committee to discuss and there are 10 people who want to discuss that issue, then that Committee should discuss it. If there are not 10 people, then there should not be a discussion

The Chair asked the Commission if they agreed that she does it this way. Mr. Weiss advised the dais even though all of the Commission is someone political; this is not the time to be nice. He suggested that if you know in your heart and mind that you are never going to vote for re-

districting; this is the time to vote no. Because what will happen is the subcommittee is going to go out and study. He stated that if a member has some question in mind then vote to discuss it, but he stated that the tendency is to try to get along, go along; so, the problem is if there is no support of the issue, the Commission is just wasting time and as Mr. Mena said there is no time to discuss in detail the items that have some chance of getting through the Commission. Mr. Weiss stated in summary so, as not nice as it might be and as non-politically correct, this is the time to vote "no" if you are just not going to vote positively in the end about an issue.

The Chair returned to the motions, this time including all sub-topics. Mr. Weiss suggested a hand vote vs. voice vote and if the item is controversial then a voice vote should take place.

Ms. Rogers asked if she could make a statement. The Chair advised then she would be allowing Ms. Rogers to cut in line before others. She advised that Mr. Benson is before and other people; Ms. Kaletta and others were cut off; she stated she was stopping the queue in an effort to move along. The Chair then asked if it was okay with everyone if she just moved along.

Ms. Rogers replied no, because there is something she would like to bring before the subcategory votes took place. The Chair advised that she would then have to allow others on the queue to speak. Ms. Rogers replied, unless they would like to waive their chance to speak but she does not.

The Chair recognized Ms. Kaletta and apologized for being disrespectful; Ms. Kaletta stated that she agrees with what Mr. Weiss said, but the only reason she made her statement before was because she thought the Commission was going to go forward and let the subcommittees make the determinations, but she is okay with going through each item.

Mr. Benson stated that he agrees with Mr. Weiss's assessment; however, he has some concern as to how the other items will be added back to the list for consideration if in fact the Commission is just going to go down the list and say Yea or Nay because there may need to be some discussion about each of the items that has a strikethrough. He then asked if the Commission is just going to say Yea or Nay, then how does it deal with the ones that have been recommended for striking.

The Chair responded that there weren't 10 people that wanted them to stay. Mr. Benson advised that this was incorrect, stating that there has been no opportunity to make that decision as to whether they wanted them stricken. Multiple speakers stated that the subcommittees

were voted on. The Chair stated that this is not what Mr. Benson is saying. Mr. Benson stated that the CES had a discussion about the grouping that is on the list. The Chair replied subcommittees – not groupings. Mr. Benson stated that the CES agreed to five groupings. Mr. Weiss responded yes. The Chair replied subcommittees.

Mr. Benson stated that he asked the question earlier, is the supposition there that if that grouping is there and there are listings under the grouping, does that automatically eliminate them and he stated that he was assured that it did not. He again asked the question, “How are we going to get the ones that have been ostensibly struck, when in fact we have not had discussion as to whether or not they should be added back”? The Chair stated that the Commission will go through the list that is there and the ones that were struck the procedure will be figured out after. Mr. Benson replied ok.

Ms. Eisinger requested a point of clarification. Mr. Penezic reminded everyone that the public hearing is going to be held this afternoon and there will be more items from public comment, yet the Commission is taking votes for what should be on subcommittee before hearing from the public. Mr. Penezic stated to him the strikes are almost a little premature. He stated that maybe the items can be moved in and the list theoretically kept open, but he thinks that what is voted on today, he can't image that someone won't come to the next meeting and request to add a new subcommittee.

The Chair and Ms. West advised that this would be throughout the process and it would not surprise her. Mr. Penezic again expressed that he is not sure that what is being done today is not premature.

The Chair advised that there was a need to start, yet it does not mean that as the Commission learns something new that it will not change. But the discussion was to start somewhere and obviously whatever the additional input received would be added because it was decided to also continue interviewing people. She advised that it is a fluid process but to her you have to start somewhere and at the same time be open to additional dialogue.

Ms. Eisinger agreed with the Chair. She then pointed out that it seems that some of the issues have come up repeatedly and they will be a priority in terms of hashing out and addressing. She stated that she agrees that with the public hearings the Commission also has to be open minded that there could be some perspectives and points of view that **do** have to be addressed.

Ms. Eisinger stated that in looking and deciding on the listed items for discussion, she advised that some of the topics are already addressed via ordinance or whatever it may be; so they may not require being addressed within the Charter. The Chair stated that Ms. Eisinger is correct and this was part of the subcommittee's conversation, too. She then proceeded to call the list.

Motion No.	Subcommittee Title / Description	Status (Pass/Fail)	Count (Y vs. N)
1	Administrative Issues/Governance	Passed	Unanimously
2	Structural-form of government	Passed	Unanimously
3	Mayor: duties; strong vs. weak	Passed	Unanimously
4	Census / re-districting	Passed	Unanimously
5	Ethics – (by roll call)	Passed	10 Y / 8 No
6	Budget/Finance	Passed	10 Y / 8 No
7	CRC/MESC <i>the way CRC is formed and its duties and MESC overlap.</i>	Failed	4 Y / 14 No
8	Compensation for County Commissioners	Discussion	Discussion

Mr. Benson requested that Compensation for County Commissioners be added back or stay, to the extent that he is allowed to make an observation, he would like to do so. The Chair stated that she was trying to get a consensus as to whether there are 10 people willing to discuss the issue. Mr. Benson stated that this is why he asked his question earlier and he wants it on there. The Chair replied that she understood but people are not lobbying their individual issue; she said she is trying to keep the vote going. Ms. Good asked for a description of the topic. The Chair responded that it was regarding increasing or decreasing the salary of the County Commissioners and part of the conversation was that they go through the State process and the salaries automatically rise through the State.

Mr. Benson stated that the issue of Compensation for County Commissioners is presently in the Charter and it is addressed with **Section 2.01 Item D** in the Charter, which states “The Commissioners’ salaries shall be determined and established in accordance with the general law of the State of Florida pertaining to compensation for Commissioners of *non-chartered* counties...” Mr. Benson reminded everyone that Broward County is a Charter County and because of that, the Commission should not have an incongruent position on the issues. He advised that if Broward County is a Chartered County then let the County establish what those salaries should be. Mr. Benson clarified his position stating that he should have prefaced his

statement by stating that his issue is not about the amount of money anyone is making in this regard. He stated that they are not making enough. His point is that the Charter should be brought inline with what the activities are within this government. We are a Charter government, and, therefore, the salaries that are paid for our elected officials as Commissioners should reflect that. Not in line with a non-charter County.

The Chair stated that the other side of the discussion so that there are two sides on the floor is that this was picked as a means of measuring and it was used as a criteria of the State and this is what was done when the Charter was formulated. She then stated that now it is up to the Commission to vote how they so choose.

The Chair returned to the **motion** items.

Motion No.	Subcommittee Title / Description	Status (Pass/Fail)	Count (Y vs. N)
8	Compensation for County Commissioners	Failed	7 Y / 11 N
9	County livable wage <i>should it be in Charter?</i>	Failed	Unanimously
10	Supermajority vote for County Commission Decisions <i>like land use or other issues</i>	Failed	Unanimously
XX	Health / Social Services Issues	Discussion	Discussion

The Chair skipped to Health/Social Services Issues. A discussion ensued between multiple speakers as to the way the Chair was going through the list. General consensus requested she continue through the entire list including all strikethroughs.

Motion No.	Subcommittee Title / Description	Status (Pass/Fail)	Count (Y vs. N)
11	Coordination between city and county	Failed	Unanimously
12	Courts	Failed	Unanimously
13	Review of Constitutional Officers, including Supervisor of Elections (SOE)	Failed	5 Y / 13 N
14	Environmental: Water	Discussion	Discussion

Ms. Norris-Weeks requested that environmental items “Land and Water” go under Land Use as it relates to Land Use Committee. The Chair responded that it was duly noted.

Motion No.	Subcommittee Title / Description	Status (Pass/Fail)	Count (Y vs. N)
14	Environmental: Water	Passed	13 Y / 5 N
15	Environmental: Land	Passed	13 Y / 5 N
16	Health/Social Services: Housing	Passed	10 Y / 8 N
17	Hospital Districts	Discussion	Discussion

Mr. Trower stated that he was abstaining. Mr. Goren advised for the record that he consulted and conferred with Mr. Trower and for the record confirmed that Mr. Trower has no conflict of interest and if he chose to vote, which he has done by virtue of the no-vote collectively, he did not have a conflict under Chapter 112 and there is no issue of any kind legally.

Ms. Rogers asked if any of the Commission can decide not to vote on an issue. Mr. Goren stated “no”, unless there is a conflict under State statute. He advised that Mr. Trower did vote, but there was no conflict anyway.

Motion No.	Subcommittee Title / Description	Status (Pass/Fail)	Count (Y vs. N)
17	Hospital Districts	Failed	Unanimously
18	Children’s Services	Passed	Unanimously
19	Land Use: MPO	Discussion	Discussion

Mr. Benson stated that he is not sure how to deal with the MPO issue. Ms. Eisinger stated that she thought that it was not within the Commission’s purview.

Mr. Goren stated that Miami-Dade and Palm Beach do their MPO’s somewhat differently. He informed the Commission that Broward County has inter-local agreements that govern the issue. He stated that if the Commission wishes to leave the MPO on the table, he will additionally research the issue of how it is done elsewhere because it is not done the same way in Broward County and there may be another option; he stated that there is preemption by State statute.

Motion No.	Subcommittee Title / Description	Status (Pass/Fail)	Count (Y vs. N)
19	Land Use: MPO	Passed	11+
20	Land Use: Planning Council	Passed	10+
21	Land Use: Impact Fees	Discussion	Discussion

Ms. Kaletta advised that the MESC spent an extensive amount of time discussing impact fees and it is something that because of how revenues are included or generated in the County, impact fees as they are will be virtually non-existent after a while because there is not much impacting done and there were other ways that were discussed as to how money can be generated. She advised that there is very little green space left in Broward County for new construction to be built. So as a result there is very little in the long run; so she advised that this is something that could possibly be looked at.

Ms. Jeffreys-Tanner asked if this could possibly be included with the Development Review Process. Ms. Kaletta responded that she did not care; she just does not think that it should not be reviewed. The Chair stated that she will see how the vote goes.

Motion No.	Subcommittee Title / Description	Status (Pass/Fail)	Count (Y vs. N)
21	Land Use: Impact Fees	Passed	10+
22	Land Use: Permitting/development Review Process (see platting)	Passed	10+
23	Land Use: Unincorporated areas (annexation) <i>the Chair stated for the record 16,000 people</i>	Failed	Unanimously
24	Land Use: Building and construction <i>The Chair advised that this is part of the permitting process and the Board of Adjustments which the CRC has not gotten into but there is a Board of Adjustments and some other issues with that.</i>	Passed	10+
25	Land Use: County Authority	Passed	10+
26	Land Use: Platting process/administrative approval (MESC) <i>The Chair advised that this would probably relate to what Commissioner Ritter spoke about on the finding of the MESC.</i>	Passed	10+
27	Land Use: Shifting land use authority to municipality – REMOVED <i>A discussion ensued by multiple speakers as to whether this is the same as County Authority. It was determined by the Chair that it's the same therefore the item was removed.</i>	Failed	Unanimously
28	Land Use: RLUPA (religious)	Failed	Unanimously
29	Public Safety: Emergency Management/coordination	Passed	10+
30	Public Safety: Fire Rescue Coordination	Passed	Unanimously
31	Public Safety: Traffic Engineering	Discussion	Discussion

The Chair stated that she believed it was determined that traffic engineering did not belong in the Charter and asked Mr. Goren if she was correct. Mr. Goren replied that it might have been subsumed in another category, which was discussed. The Chair stated that it implies citing of traffic lights and other things. Several Commission members stated that traffic engineering should fall under Land Use. The Chair stated that to her this meant the process of getting traffic lights etc.

Mr. Goren stated that he recalled that the conversation included a discussion of the multiple agreements County wide with various cities with regard to the County's role in that conversation, which by contract in some respects is protective of the cities because the County takes over that

responsibility. Mr. Goren advised that if the Commission wanted to address that in the Charter, it is doable, but the Committee at the time thought not to include it.

Motion No.	Subcommittee Title / Description	Status (Pass/Fail)	Count (Y vs. N)
31	Public Safety: Traffic Engineering	Failed	Unanimously
32	Public Safety: Firefighter Minimum Standards	Discussion	Discussion

Ms. Kaletta stated that Commissioner Ritter addressed Firefighter Minimum Standards very eloquently. She advised that the MESC spent 2 years looking at some of the items and Minimum Firefighter Standards was something looked at in one of her committees. She advised that the MESC met with the Broward County Council of Professional Firefighters and there are some real disparities around the County regarding staffing of firehouses and that kind of thing to where she does not think that some realize how much jeopardy they may be in. But she suggested that it is something that she thinks should be looked at.

Motion No.	Subcommittee Title / Description	Status (Pass/Fail)	Count (Y vs. N)
32	Public Safety: Firefighter Minimum Standards	Passed	10+
33	Public Safety: Provide Accountability for existing Charter Amendment for firefighters <i>The Chair advised that this is in relation to the Fire Rescue Council and how it relates to communication and how it is already written into the Charter of the County. Mr. Goren advised that the last Charter created the Fire Rescue Council and there was a compromise and a brokered relationship between the League of Cities and the County Commission to address first responders, closest unit response, infrastructure, and communications and the issue was whether or not it has been successful or whether or not the committee or council is performing up to par.</i>	Passed	10+
34	Public Safety: Intergovernmental Interaction in emergencies	Discussion	Discussion

Mr. Mena asked if you are going to have an Emergency Management Coordination and Fire Rescue Coordination, how you could leave Intergovernmental Interaction in Emergencies out. He stated that this is something that is in between cities that it should all be encompassed.

The Chair stated that some were integrated in the thought process.

Ms. Rogers asked how can the Commission have a conversation on Public Safety and not include BSO. She stated that she knows for most cities whenever the firefighters roll, often the

BSO rolls with the fire services also and there is always communication between BSO and Fire. Therefore, she stated that when looking at Public Safety she cannot separate the Fire from the BSO. The Chair stated that it did not appear because it was not in the 35 items. Ms. Rogers stated that when she said public safety, she was including BSO as well. The Chair stated that truth be told, Emergency Management and Coordination does not limit it, it just did not specifically say, but if it is Coordination, then it is Coordination. The Chair asked everyone if this was his or her understanding. Overall general response from the Commission was this is a correct understanding. Ms. Rogers stated that she just wanted to make sure when the Committees read that it is on the table.

The Chair moved on.

Motion No.	Subcommittee Title / Description	Status (Pass/Fail)	Count (Y vs. N)
34	Public Safety: Intergovernmental Interaction in emergencies	Passed	Unanimously
35	Transportation: Airport/seaport <i>The Chair explained that this is whether they should function together or separately.</i>	Passed	10+
36	Transportation: Mass Transit	Passed	10+
37	Transportation: Rail	Failed	4 Y / 14 N
38	Special Districts: County Authority over special districts <i>The Chair explained that this is for how the Special Districts function in interaction. She explained that Special Districts imply separation: whether there should be County Oversight or not and what the County involvement should be with Special Districts. The Chair conferred with Mr. Goren and asked whether a lot of this is also by State statute. Mr. Goren responded that most all is established by Special Legislation which Special Districts are basically untouchable except by Legislature.</i>	Discussion	Discussion

Ms. Rogers made the observation that most Special Districts were developed or implemented during the time of development. She advised that some of the discussions held within the MESOC were that there was no end to when they would cease to function, even whether or not they have a current function today. She advised that they were brought in and discussed with regard to their useful life. The Chair asked Ms. Rogers if this was more a State Legislative issue more than a County issue.

Ms. Rogers responded that these are some of the things that are on the table for the Commission to determine whether or not because the CES might have had discussion and have

information that the Commission might not have, as the general body, to truly decide whether or not it should really be off the table. She stated that there is no way you can talk about water and environmental issues and know what is going on with the various water management districts and water flows etc. without looking at the full picture.

Dr. Rosenbaum stated that there are two issues, one being whether they should exist and the other is whether they should be coordinated. He stated that he thinks Ms. Rogers made a good point because she mentioned the water, then what about the drainage districts. He further stated that there is no coordinating mechanism for the districts. He stated that if the Commission does not deal with both issues he has stated that it should at least deal with the coordination mechanism.

Mr. Mena stated that Coral Springs has five (5) Water Districts and they can do nothing with it because it is all from the Legislature in Tallahassee; so he asked why waste the Commission's time. He stated that the Commission can't do anything about it but it can recommend until it turns blue. He added he does not feel the Commission will get anywhere with it unless the Commission goes to the Legislature. Therefore, he stated that he does not see it in the realm of this particular Committee.

Ms. Eisinger concurred with Mr. Mena. She stated that while it is something that merits discussion, she does not believe that the CRC is the forum for it.

Ms. West reminded everyone that Mr. Goren stated earlier that if there were issues that the Commission might not deal with in the Charter that there might be other recommendations that the CRC could make to the County Commission if they wanted to recommend a Legislative item.

The Chair stated that it is whether it fits in a subcommittee or it will fit in another topic.

Motion No.	Subcommittee Title / Description	Status (Pass/Fail)	Count (Y vs. N)
38	Special Districts: County Authority over special districts (coordination) / Dependent and Independent districts	Passed	10 Y / 8 N

The Chair requested that everyone email Ms. West their subcommittees of interest for service. Upon receipt she will then break the Commission down into subcommittees with Chairs of those Committees and those Chairs will call the meetings.

Ms. Kaletta suggested that based on her experiences with the MESC that the Commission trusts the subcommittees to do their research and come back with reports on what they think and how they feel about it because it worked very well with the MESC.

Ms. Eisinger asked how many subcommittees each person is being asked to serve on. The Chair and Ms. West responded, a maximum of 2. Ms. Eisinger clarified that this meant 1 or 2. The Chair responded that she was correct.

Dr. Lieberman asked how many members are on a committee. The Chair responded that there are five committees and it depends how it flows out. Dr. Lieberman asked if the Chair would like their selections ranked by first and second choice. The Chair responded this is a good idea and requested everyone do this.

Mr. Goren instructed the dais to please only communicate back with Ms. West and not with one another in the context of decision-making. He advised that legally the temptation to do so must be resisted. He stated when communicating individual preferences no member should communicate with a colleague to check their preference or respond to their preference. Mr. Goren reminded everyone that emails are a matter of public record and the subject matter of much conversation these days and in the future.

Mr. Ketcham suggested going forward that if anyone finds something else that they would like to have discussed that the person would write up a "pro" why they want it discussed, email it to Ms. West. Ms. West would send it out to all the members so that at the next meeting it can be voted on as new business. The Chair agreed stating that it sounds like a reasonable procedure.

For confirmation purposes, Mr. Penezic requested that Ms. West email the list of subcommittees and the titles under each for everyone to use when making a selection.

Ms. Norris-Weeks stated that she was sure that there might be a disproportionate number of members signing up for the different subcommittees; therefore, she requested that the Chair appoint members to subcommittees as she sees fit. The Chair stated that she will take that into consideration and she will see how the numbers work as requests come in.

Ms. Rogers asked if everyone remembered the structure that was adopted by the MESC during the 2 years. She explained that the subcommittees were required to report at every meeting so that the MESC was kept abreast of the subcommittee discussions so that if there was input or suggestions for the subcommittee to take back to its next meeting, there was always opportunity. Therefore, whatever schedule is adopted, the subcommittee Chairs would report the subcommittee findings at every meeting so that the Commission would know what the subcommittee is doing at all times.

The Chair stated that this is agreed and respectfully requested as part of the Charge to the Chairs that if the report to the Commission is brief that is good; it does not mean that the subcommittee was not doing anything; it means that the subcommittee is hashing it out. The Chair requested that Ms. West be given an estimate on how long the conversation will be in order to allocate proper time when doing the agenda.

Future Interviewees

The Chair suggested the following for future interviewees:

- Public Safety
- Fire Rescue Council
- Union that Governs Fire
- BSO
- Fraternal Order of Police (FOP)
- Police Benevolent Association (PBA)

The Chair stated if it is okay with everyone staff will try to coordinate those as the next topic.

Mr. Maus asked the Chair with regard to Land Use plans when the Commission would have someone from the Planning Council speak. The Chair stated that the staff will make every attempt to lump everyone together for Fire. Then, for Land Use they will try to lump the Planning Council including the staff, their Chair and the Regional Planning Council and their Chair and their staff because it is different staff.

Dr. Lieberman stated that he thought the Fire Rescue Council was for next month. The Chair stated she was trying to leave flexibility for Ms. West to do Land Use or Fire Rescue depending upon their availability. The Chair asked Dr. Lieberman if he had another topic. Dr. Lieberman

responded no, however there was a speaker he wanted to invite. He advised that the speaker is with North Broward Hospital Districts Emergency Services. The Chair stated that there would also be a South Broward counterpart. Dr. Lieberman concurred.

Mr. Mena stated that during hurricanes there is a special Emergency Coordinating type of Department. Mr. Goren replied that this is Emergency Management and they are cross-referenced in the Charter with regard to the Mayor's duties. That is a department of County government. Mr. Mena stated that he thinks they should be invited also.

The Chair advised that each of the topics might take more than one week; but she is asking Ms. West if it is humanly possible, to try to keep them lumped together.

Ms. Kaletta apologized for being so verbal but she stated that she writes better than she speaks. Ms. West suggested a motion to extend the meeting.

Motion to extend the meeting made by Ms. Kaletta, Seconded by Mr. Trower and all were in favor.

Ms. Kaletta stated that the comments she wished to make were related to the public hearing held in Hollywood last week. She stated that while she agrees with the 5-minute rule for speakers. She stated that there may be times when there could be an exception to that rule. It smacks of all things wrong with governmental rule when there is one speaker, he/she is held to five minutes, and there is something of value to be gained by extending that time. Ms. Kaletta stated that she understands the need to control large numbers of speakers and to control an individual speaker who may want to take advantage of a situation where they can talk on and on about irrelevant issues. That is something she stated she is sure as Chairman it can be taken care of. Ms. Kaletta stated that the other issue has to do with the lone presenter at this meeting; she stated that she cannot say to do this per speaker, because he said little, other than saying that he would be handing out a list of issues. Ms. Kaletta stated that it is clear in the rules of conduct that the Commissioners can ask questions of presenters. It is also clear that staff or legal counsel will answer any questions of the Commission. Ms. Kaletta stated that when she asked the question if the Commission could ask questions of this presenter; several things happened. She stated that first a comment was made that these items were pretty straight forward there is no question about that. Second, Mr. Goren gave very insightful opinions of each item and how it related to the Charter. This was important and it was good for the

Commission to hear this information. Ms. Kaletta stated that her concern was that she also thought it would have been helpful to the Committee to have been able to ask two (2) questions. Why did he and his constituents come up with those particular items and what ideas did they have for remedy. By asking those questions Ms. Kaletta stated that the Commission could have been better informed to make decisions later in this process, and it would have made the CRC's trip to Hollywood much more valuable and worthwhile. Ms. Kaletta stated that it is highly advantageous for presenters to provide written material of their issues, but she does not think that it is sufficient for written material to be presented with no explanation or discussion. She thanked the Commission for the opportunity to express her concerns.

The Chair explained for those who were not at the public hearing that the Commissioner of West Park gave the Commission a list of items. She advised Ms. Kaletta that she agrees with both sides of what she is saying, but on the flip side she explained that a lot of people are intimidated in public and would prefer to give written documentation of what they are saying, rather than speak. She also advised that some people find it intimidating to be asked questions at a public hearing so it is a double-edge sword. The Chair stated that if the Commission would like to change the procedure and have questions going from the Commission, then there would be a vote to change the procedure because it was already voted on.

Ms. Kaletta explained that the procedure already exists and if he is a Commissioner, surely he has to be able to stand in front of a group of people and talk. The Chair explained that she just does not want to make the judgment call for someone else; if they choose not to speak, that was their choice. Ms. Kaletta stated then they should send someone who could answer questions. The Chair advised that she hears Ms. Kaletta, but that is who they sent. Ms. Kaletta again stressed her point, that the Commission does have the right to ask the questions and she was denied the right to ask the gentleman, where the rules came from and what recommendations did they have for resolution.

The Chair stated that if the body wants to change the process...Ms. West explained that the right to ask questions is part of the rules. Ms. Kaletta stated she was not asking for a change in process. The Chair apologized stating that she was confused and messed up the rules. She advised that she will try not to do that again.

Ms. West reminded everyone that the Commission member's responsibilities are on the back of the Public Hearing Agendas. She confirmed that it does indicate that Commission members

can ask questions of the speaker and that Mr. Goren and Ms. West have an opportunity to try to answer or do further research. Ms. West noted for the record that the meeting will be moved to Commission Chambers for the Public Hearing.

V Public Comment

The Chair inquired if there was more than one person who had public comment. Mr. Goren advised the Chair that the Public Hearing was posted for 2:00 p.m. in Commission Chambers. The Chair stated that the Agenda says public comment for 2 minutes; therefore, she was asking because everyone has been sitting and waiting. The Chair advised everyone if they want to come back later, they should feel free to do so.

The Chair opened the floor for public comment and gave each speaker 3 minutes to speak.

Mr. Joe Benavides – Broward County Firefighters (Registered Lobbyist)

Mr. Benavides introduced himself and advised the Commission that he appreciates the time to speak and the good committee work that the Commission will be doing. He stated that he represents the Broward County Council of Professional Fire Fighters and he is a retired Captain. Mr. Benavides stated that he has been working for the Firefighters for the past 25 years. He stated for those who do know him, each time he comes back to the MESC or the CRC he discusses this subject matter, and he has made a career out of it; so he really appreciates the discussion. Mr. Benavides advised the Commission that they are closer now than they ever have been on a standard level of service County-wide. It is probably the most important discussion for the people of Broward County, the municipalities and the Broward County Commission; so, at the end of the day today, he stated, we are very close to where we should be heading.

He stated that he hopes that as the CRC looks at the minimum standard level of service Countywide and standards and efficiencies where governments work together to create emergency response protocols and communications that your Committee and the good work that hopefully you will deliver will put Broward County where it should be where you have other Counties in the State already with a standard level of service Countywide. Mr. Benavides advised that our County should not be behind the eight ball; we should be leaders; we are one of the leading communities in service delivery but it is scattered about, dissimilar, not the same. He stated that the purpose of the firefighters is that they want to go to work and serve the

community every day and for his representation to the Commission is that the firefighters believe that anyone who comes to Broward County should expect the same service delivery, whether they are in Margate or Hallandale Beach. He stated that once the firefighters respond they want to ensure that they are servicing the community at the same level, with the same protocol, the same standards and with the same response. He advised the CRC that they have the ability to do this and they are just a few words away in the Charter from making that happen. Mr. Benavides stated that he hopes at the end of the day the Commissions good work will challenge them to get the job done. **(End of Statement)**

The Chair thanked Mr. Benavides for speaking.

Mr. Mark Cohen – Broward Firefighters-Paramedics L4321IAFF

Mr. Cohen introduced himself to the Commission he advised that he is the newly elected Executive-Vice President for Local 4321, Broward Firefighters and Paramedics who work for now BSO x County. He advised that he is also a Battalion Chief and is as close to an expert as possible in Fire and EMS and he is an Instructor for the University of Miami Center for Research and Medical Education. Mr. Cohen stated that he loves Broward County; he loves everything about it; he has been here for 23 years and he plans on staying. Mr. Cohen stated that his goal is to make Broward County safe for everyone. He stated that each city is proud of their Fire Rescue and Police Department; the people in the County are very mobile. He advised the Commission that he covers BSO service areas but he lives in Coral Springs. He stated that he wants to make sure that Coral Springs has a high level of service and that we all have a high level of service; so, it is important that when the CRC goes through this process, he stated that he could be an objective person for the CRC. He can give his opinion and be a good resource for the CRC and he will be following the process. Mr. Cohen stated that Public Safety is a big thing and when he retires he wants to know that he is safe in the County that he calls home and he loves very much. **(End of Statement)**

The Chair thanked Mr. Cohen.

Mr. Mena asked when the Commission will be able to speak with the speakers because he is trying to gather information. He stated that he is confused as to why the people are present. The Chair stated they are present because they wanted to make public comments.

Ms. Gloria Katz – Smart Growth Partnership

Ms. Katz introduced herself and informed the Commission that she was a Commissioner for 4 years in the City of Fort Lauderdale and she is now the Executive Director of the Smart Growth Partnership, which is supported by the Environmental Protection Agency, ULI and Smart Growth America. Ms. Katz stated that the issues plaguing the County now range from Affordable Housing to Traffic Congestion. She stated that across the nation, cities, regions, counties and states are dealing with these very same growth issues by using Smart Growth as a strategy and incorporating it into their land use plans and governments. She stated that Section 8 of the Broward County Charter addresses Land Use and she suggests inserting direction to the Planning Council to identify opportunities to incorporate the principals of smart growth into the County Land Use Plan which include:

- Specifically creating a range of housing options and choices
- Walkable neighborhoods
- Encouraging community and stakeholder collaboration
- Mixing land uses
- Encouraging compact building design
- Preserving open space
- Fostering communities with a sense of place
- Making development decisions predictable, fair and cost effective
- Providing transportation choices
- Providing a healthy environment; and
- Allowing for social equity

Ms. Katz stated that there are several ways to set standards of place building that will guide redevelopment efforts and tighten up the environmental standards in our Land Use Plan. She stated that some of the strategies that can be used to accommodate new growth and also allow us a good quality of life include:

- The County Action Programs be included in the Land Use Plan if they wish, which is to establish allowing collaborations and model ordinances
- Giving a toolbox to cities
- Having a monitoring program for cities

- Creating an office of smart growth, where policies and regulations can be incorporated
- Giving on-going support to cities, and
- Having a grant program for projects which can be established

Ms. Katz stated that the present County Code is suburban and Broward County is no longer suburban. Therefore, she said we are having a poor quality of life, all of the constituents are complaining about high-rises and traffic. She stated that a Land Use Plan is the way to correct that. She said we could be using form base or smart codes, anything that allows cities more flexibility instead of having them come up against the cement wall of some of the County's plans. Ms. Katz stated that the Planning Council should then propose, pursuant to Section 8, of the County Commission amendments to the Land Use Plan to implement in their findings.

Ms. Katz thanked the Commission. **(End of Statement)** The Chair thanked Ms. Katz; and apologized for not recognizing her.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further discussion and no other public comment the meeting was adjourned at 1:19 p.m.

The minutes of this meeting are recorded on CD # 2.14.07 (BCGV CTR)