

Summary of Discussion
Broward County Charter Review Commission
Wednesday, August 8, 2007
Broward County Governmental Center
115 South Andrews Avenue, Room 430, Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301
10:00 AM – 1:00 PM

Members Present:

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

Members Absent:

Ms. Patricia Good
Mr. Robert Penezic, Esq.
Mr. Richard J. Weiss, Esq.

Others Attending:

Devin Avery, Broward County Vision Broward
Pete Corwin, Assistant to the County Administrator
Chedley Etienne, Administrative Assistant, CRC
Ellen Feld, Esq.
Dan Glickman, Resident, Deerfield Beach, FL
Matthue Goldstein, Broward County Planning Council
Samuel Goren, Esq., General Counsel
Yolanda Grooms, Administrative Specialist, CRC
Maria Gross, Assistant Director, CRC
Phyllis A. King, Transcriber, PKING Consulting
Robin Rorapaugh, Hollywood, FL

Kurt Spitzer, Kurt Spitzer & Associates, Inc.
Mr. David Tolces, Esq., Assistant General Counsel
Lisa Vondrak, News Abstracts
Patricia G. West, Executive Director, CRC
Mr. Mel Wilson, Esq., Special Counsel

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

A meeting of the Broward County Charter Review Commission ("CRC" or "Commission, "Committee") was held at 10:00 a.m. on Wednesday, August 08, 2007 at the Broward County Governmental Center – Room 430, Fort Lauderdale, FL.

I Call to Order/Roll Call

The Chair Lori Moseley called the meeting to order at 10:08 a.m. and requested the roll call by Phyllis A. King, PKING Consulting, Inc. Upon completion of the roll, the Chair called for approval of the June 13th Summary of Discussion.

II Approval of June 13, 2007 Summary of Discussion

The Chair requested a **motion for approval** of the CRC June 13th Summary of Discussion. A motion was made by Mr. Benson; seconded by Ms. Tanner. The Chair called for all in favor, I's were stated and the motion was approved unanimously.

III Chair and Executive Director's Report

The Chair thanked the entire Commission for their hard work and diligence while working over the summer. She advised that the subcommittee reports have really been very interesting. She then recognized Ms. West.

Ms. West reviewed items distributed by staff in their folders which included the following:

- A **Schedule of Subcommittee Meeting Dates** reflecting dates of meetings up until the end of the year. Ms. West advised that these dates are subject to change but would at least help Commission members with their calendars. She pointed out that the Land

Use and Transportation Subcommittees meet twice a month, and the other subcommittee meet on the same date as the Charter Review Commission.

- **Correspondence from General Counsel** regarding several issues, some of which have been taken up in subcommittees including MPO, Legal Review of Proposed Charter Amendments through Citizen Initiative Process, and a Revised Memo on the Metropolitan Transportation Authority. *The Chair asked Mr. Goren, if a legal memo is relevant to a Subcommittee if he could highlight what the memo is prior to beginning the conversations with the Subcommittees, so that the full CRC already has that opinion.*
- **Planning Council Road Closure Proposal** Ms. West reminded members of their vote at the last full CRC to forward this issue to the Land Use Subcommittee. She advised that she was directed to ensure that the Broward League of Cities had an opportunity to respond. She advised that a copy of her letter to the President of the League advising her of the Planning Council's proposed working draft and asking for feedback regarding that matter. Ms. West stated that CRC General Counsel would be able to advise of the current status of the issue since last Thursday's meeting of the Planning Council.

Mr. Goren: The Broward League of Cities (BLC) Board Meeting met last Thursday to discuss the Proposal from the Broward County Planning Council to suggest a potential change to the Charter governing the issue of road closures and abandonments of roadways. This actually may affect cities in the sense of cross-roads or things of that type. The General Counsel for the Broward County Planning Council, Andy Maurodis was present. He made a brief presentation on the Proposal which was a Planning Council initiative that this Board has submitted for further review by its own subcommittee. The BLC Board elected to defer the matter for further review pending some analysis by its own staff. Not taking any specific feeling on the item, but sought to have it further reviewed by its own staff. Notwithstanding the fact that Ms. West had requested some kind of response back from the BLC as of last Friday. Having said that, some cities have begun to adopt resolutions to support the Planning Council's concept of potential change in the Charter; one of which was Coral Springs, Pembroke Pines and several others that have come to the table opposing it as the case may be. But at the moment, the BLC has made the decision not to take a public stand yet, but has sent it down for further review by one of its own subcommittees.

- **CRC Subcommittee Summaries of Issues** Ms. West explained that the Issue Summaries are the outcome of member requests to find out what is being discussed in other subcommittees. She advised that they are working on documents which will be updated after each subcommittee meeting by adding additional information so that the full CRC is kept up to date on subcommittee progress.

Ms. West advised that she is communicating with Dickey Consulting regarding the possibility of a Public Outreach Campaign. She advised that a proposal has been submitted and is pending her review. She stated that she will take direction from the Chair if she wants to move forward with that in case requests come in from certain groups in the Community regarding Charter Changes. The Public Outreach Campaign will attempt to address questions regarding the proposed changes recommended by this Commission.

- **Updated Legal Analysis: Property Tax Reform** from Weiss Serota Helfman et. al. provided for Committee information purposes.

Ms. West reminded the Commission of deadlines for their proposed language drafts from subcommittees regarding their recommendations. Charter Amendments are due by the full CRC meeting in September. As a reminder Ms. West informed the Commission that this would be a first attempt, and they will be reviewed and 10 votes would be required in order to have General Council draft the language.

Mr. Goren: Yes Ma'am.

[End of Executive Director's Report]

The Chair called for Subcommittee Reports beginning with Administrative Issues / Governance.

IV. SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

Administrative Issues / Governance (AGSC) Report – Dr. Irv Rosenbaum, Chair

Dr. Rosenbaum advised that the following has occurred with the AGSC since the last full CRC meeting:

- Mr. Kurt Spitzer, President, Kurt Spitzer & Associates, Inc. spoke to the AGSC during an AGSC workshop on Tuesday evening, August 7, 2007.
- The AGSC has begun to finalize and focus on the issues of Structure / Form of Government, Mayor; duties of the Mayor, the type of Mayor; elected Commissioners, the Census - redistricting; Ethics and Budget and Finance.
- During meetings the subcommittee focused on all of the issues before them with the exception of Budget and Finance.
- Mr. Corwin presented to the AGSC about the Finance Department and the fact that it provides internal services. This issue has been clarified and will probably be a non-issue as the AGSC moves forward. This issue came about as a result of what other entities do with their budget and finance. Broward County government does not have an Office of Tax Collector and is a little bit different from other Charters.
- The AGSC has worked on a Scope of Work and made sure it has received considerable input from the County Commissioners.
- Yesterday's Workshop focused on the Chief Executive and the Elected Mayor, the At-Large Commission Districts and whether there would be 1, 2, or 3 and the total number of Commissioners.
- The AGSC discussed the Census; redistricting was reviewed and the subcommittee agreed that it will be dealt with at the next meeting.
- Ethics – the AGSC requested Mr. Goren prepare drafts pertaining to a *Non-interference Clause* and the other *Propriety Issues*.
- The AGSC has had the opportunity to hear from Commissioner Kristen Jacobs who spent a great deal of time talking about her views on the various issues.

Dr. Rosenbaum explained that the AGSC is moving towards closure and hopes to meet the September deadline.

Mr. Esack asked Dr. Rosenbaum if he foresees any recommendations coming forward from the AGSC. Dr. Rosenbaum replied that he sees that there will be some recommendations for change brought forward for the full CRC to consider.

The Chair advised the Committee that Mr. Spitzer is present at today's meeting. She invited him to sit at the table to provide a brief overview to the full Committee.

Kurt Spitzer, President, Kurt Spitzer & Associates, Inc.

Mr. Spitzer: Thank you madam Chair. Well, I think the primary discussion of last night's subcommittee meeting focused on three general subjects. One was the ***Districting Scheme*** employed by the Charter from Broward County. Let me say first of all, that these issues are somewhat interrelated. The Districting Scheme then: ***What type of head / leader of the Executive or Administrative Branch should the Charter specify?*** Right now, the Charter as do most Counties in Florida, Charter or otherwise, provides for a Professional Manager who is retained by the County Commission and is hired and fired based on qualifications and performance. There are alternatives to that available to the voters of Broward County. There are numerous variations of these alternatives, but in a summary fashion there are three.

- First, you could consider what some people have called a '**Weak Mayor**' – that person is directly elected/selected by the voters of Broward County; would be elected on a County-wide basis; would be the ceremonial head of Broward County government. You would still have a Professional Manager who is hired and fired by the County Commission as a whole. The Manager would still prepare the budget, and supervise the departments under the control of the County Commission. But you could add some duties or keep some of the duties that your Mayor's position currently has and it would be a leadership position. It would be elected County-wide if the remaining districts were all elected (let's say 8) from Single-member districts. Because of the County-wide nature of electing this position, it would enjoy some greater authority than the other positions and it would be a step in the direction of having a more specifically identified leader of the County. But you would still keep the Professional Manager under that system. There are some cities in Volusia County where they recently amended their Charter to provide for a directly elected Chair of the County. There are two other options:
- The extreme example would be that which is used in Jacksonville, Duval County and the City of Tampa, where there is a true '**Elected Executive**' form of government. There is a complete separation in duties and responsibilities between the Legislative Branch and the Executive Branch. The Mayor has complete authority over the Administrative Branch of the County, is both the ceremonial and managerial head of the County government. The Professional Manager's position is typically not specified in the Charter, although it could be, but it's typically not specified. In Tampa the Department

Heads report to the Mayor. There is created by the Administrative Code, a Chief of Staff position which coordinates those activities, but it's not specified in the Charter.

- A step in between those two general models is that which is used in Orange County, Florida. In some cities where you have a directly selected head of the Executive Branch and that person is either called the '**Elected Chair or the Mayor of the County**'. But that person sits with and still chairs the meetings of the County Commission; so this position has two different functions. This position is both the ceremonial and managerial head of the Executive Branch of the County. But still on a weekly basis or every two weeks, or however often the County Commission meets, that person sits with the County Commission; Chairs their meeting; responds to inquiries from the County Commission and interacts with the Commission. So it's a little bit of a different system. In Orange County, the districting scheme that they have employed is a system of a total of seven (7) Commissioners; one of which is the Mayor who is elected County-wide, but the balance of the County Commission is six (6) County Commissioners all elected from Single-member Districts. You can do something like that with the current nine (9) mix that you have in either case, whether the Weak Mayor, Elected Executive or the Elected Chair.

So these are sort of interrelated with the districting scheme, but if the decision of the Commission is to not change the basic structure of the County independently of those issues, you could consider some changes to your districting scheme or not. Because you are a Charter County, you have numerous options available in terms of what you can push out for the considerations of the voters.

The Chair asked Mr. Spitzer to explain the different ways of districting – Single-member, At-Large, Resident, so that everyone will know.

Mr. Spitzer: Well, there are many options that are available to you. You have now a system of nine (9) Commissioners elected from **Single-member Districts**. Prior to going to that system, you had a system, I believe, of seven (7) who were elected At-Large. They lived in residence areas, but were elected by all of the voters on a County-wide basis. There are numerous arguments for or against either of those particular systems. Generally speaking, with regard to Single-member Districts, the people who are elected from Single-member Districts are more

responsive to the people in that District and reflective of the folks who elected them. At the same time, the people who are elected from Single-member Districts, generally speaking, are less responsive to some of the issues or concerns that may exist in other parts of the jurisdiction.

People elected **At-Large** - the requirement for residence areas guarantees that there is some geographic dispersion of people throughout the County, but they are elected County-wide and those types of systems may diminish the ability to elect minority members to the County Commission.

There are some Counties that have mixtures of both. You could do a mix consistent with or without changes to the Executive Branch although Hillsborough and Pinellas Counties have gone to systems of seven (7) mixtures, where four (4) are elected from Districts and three (3) are elected At-Large; given the demographics of those Counties, that has given them the ability to draw **Minority Influence Districts** in Pinellas County. There is one African American from a Single-Member District, although also, is Calvin Harris who is elected on a County-wide basis, who is an African American. With a system of three (3) and four (4), it allows each elector in the County to vote for a majority of the County Commission. The vote for three (3) people who are elected At-Large and they vote for his or her Single-member Commissioner, so it tends to balance some of the advantages of both of the Single-member or the At-Large system.

The Chair called for questions from the members.

Mr. Spitzer offered to prepare and provide a written summary of his remarks from the August 7 AGSC workshop presentation.

There being no questions, the Chair thanked Mr. Spitzer.

Mr. Ketcham requested a list of major Charter Counties in Florida and their makeup.

The Chair advised that this is already available in the backup of the AGSC subcommittee information.

Mr. Goren: Madam Chair if I may, just one issue that may help supplement the review. Last night, one of the conversation pieces that the subcommittee discussed was the method by which districts are actually confirmed and how they are established. There was conversation

with regard to some cities in Broward County, for example, that require that a public institution independent of the city do their analysis of the districts including the proportionality, the compactness and the constitutional requirements in that analysis. Once provided with options, local government collegial bodies are beholden to those options which are presented, and to change them would dilute the potential legal impact of their independence or their objectivity; that might have been an item that you would address.

Mr. Spitzer: I thank you for mentioning that. There are; I'm not as familiar with Municipal Charters as I am with County Charters, but there is one interesting feature in the Brevard County Charter that requires the County Commission to appoint a Commission, an independent body of electors, within the County. that comes back, studies districting issues and comes back to the County Commission with a recommendation. That attempts to insulate the districting process from the politics of that. I have worked with that group and they were insulated from those sorts of politics. You could do that or you could require an institution of higher learning to come back with a Districting Plan. In either case, you could give them guidelines in the Charter as to criteria they must look at: to follow major natural boundaries, try to not split cities or neighborhoods, in addition to keeping the districts as nearly equal in population as possible.

Ms. Rogers reminded Mr. Spitzer of his comments regarding awareness and consideration of plans for development in certain communities during districting.

Mr. Spitzer: Yes. Just in the normal process of redistricting, the districts need to be very close in population to one another. There are some deviations from the average that are allowed. If in the normal districting process, no matter who does the re-districting, they are able to consider and they should consider areas where you know over the next 5 or 10 years, there is going to be a significant amount of development. What you can do in those cases is to under-populate those districts to the extent that you are allowed, in anticipation of future growth coming in over the next several years. You probably could insert some sort of guidance like that into the Charter.

Ms. Tanner asked if this would include when the re-districting should occur, such as the centennial when data becomes un-skewed as far as the Census goes.

Mr. Spitzer: Well it has to be done every 10 years – the Census is done every 10 years; Florida law requires it. Although some Counties ignore this requirement, it requires the

Counties to redistrict the odd numbered year after the Census is done, so that it is ready in time for the next series or election. The County Commission can redistrict more frequently than that, but they are required to re-district at least every 10 years.

Ms. Tanner asked if re-districting could be something that is required if districts became a certain percentage disproportioned?

Mr. Spitzer: The Brevard Charter mentions that. It says, if they know that a district is more than 25% over the average, then that triggers a sort of a mid-process re-districting.

The Chair stated that part of the conversation included a discussion of sort of *“hybrid forms.”* If you had Single-member Districts and At-Large Residential Districts which might be a way, the At-Large Districts would be larger to have a better balance, so at least when they got off-kilter, it wouldn't be as egregious as it is in Single-member.

Dr. Rosenbaum advised the Commission that the AGSC is not approaching any of the changes from the point of view of an existing problem. They are looking towards the future before any potential problems, attempting to provide a government that is responsive to the residents of Broward County.

[End Speaker and AGSC Report]

Health / Social Services Subcommittee (HSSC) Report – Wil Trower, Chair

Mr. Trower reminded the Commission who the members of the HSSC are. He advised that the following has occurred with the HSSC since the last full CRC meeting:

- The HSSC has been meeting on a regular basis. The HSSC Summary does not include the June 25th and July 17th meeting summaries which will be provided soon.
- Discussions have been held with a number of the major players in the Health and Children's Services, as well as the Housing areas.
- Extensive discussions have been held with people from various Health and Social Services agencies. The overall impression is that there is effectively a very good relationship between the not-for-profits and governmental agencies that are working on Children's Services issues. They've actually segmented the services around the County in such a way that the State covers certain areas; the County covers certain areas, and the Children's Services Council (CSC) which is a large player, covers areas also.

Mr. Trower advised that the HSSC has felt that the basic issue in Children's Services in terms of the provision of services has been covered. He stated that there is a good deal of articulation between the various agencies that are providing those services. He advised that one issue, which is not uncommon that is problematic, is the issue of *funding*.

- Because of the issue of funding, the HSSC plans to discuss with General Council the possibility of making a recommendation to ***keep the Children's Services Programs as a priority within the County budget structure.***

Mr. Trower advised that the HSSC feels that there is a great deal of efficiency with Children's Services and the management of the services has been relatively well done.

Mr. Trower advised with regard to Housing that most are well aware of the various issues confronting Broward County as the growth occurs, as we have a very high service level industry among our employees and our population. With the housing costs, insurance costs and other costs going up housing has become a bigger issue than it has been. The HSSC gained great insight into Broward Housing through presentations provided by Mr. Steve Werthman on Homeless Initiative and Mr. Ralph Stone from the County's Housing and Community Development Division.

Mr. Trower advised that the HSSC has really gotten a better appreciation for some of the issues confronting Broward County with housing.

- One of the recommendations the HSSC plans to bring forward is the ***recommendation to create an Affordable Housing Council.*** The HSSC will be meeting today to further discuss suggestions of members from Realtors, Bankers, Housing Representatives, Not-for-Profits and other affected parties. He explained that one thought is that there are a lot of different agencies and municipalities who are involved in housing programs and one of the things you see, not unlike Children's Services, was the lack of a really effective oversight, or an effective way for all of these various agencies to get together and compare notes. There are some, and there is a lot of good work going on in Broward County that the Committee learned about. He advised, there seems to be a way to move another step forward, being pro-active and ***trying to create a Housing Council that would allow the County to really optimize the dollars that are coming in from the Feds and the State, to work together to collaborate on grants and other initiatives to provide that.***

The Chair advised that she is not aware if there is, but asked Mr. Trower if there is a Broward County Housing Finance Authority and if they are appointed by the County Commission.

Mr. Trower advised that he believed this is Mr. Stone's area.

The Chair suggested as the HSSC continues to explore its recommendations, that they also explore how one interacts with the other.

Mr. Trower advised that he would have to look at the research, but his recollection of that is, there still is no umbrella type relationship that should exist between all the other agencies. There is some working together and there is some communication with these various agencies. He stated again that this is one of the things that the HSSC is working on that will be developed more completely for the September submission.

Mr. Trower pointed out that there are a lot of different agencies that are working on various issues and he believes that there is some redundancy and probably some efficiency that could be developed by better coordination. Now with dollars scarce and the issues that are arising around the community, he advised that this is where the HSSC's thinking is.

Ms. Weeks advised as a caveat to Mr. Trower 's statement, "This idea did not just come from the HSSC, but experts came in and advised that this is something that is missing and it was very convincing."

Dr. Rosenbaum added that another item that came out of the AGSC is that they are talking about putting something in the Charter to define the County-wide responsibilities, e.g. Housing, Transportation, etc. He added that they need to be defined someplace in the Charter, not to limit the County, but to say that these area-wide issues are important.

The Chair stated that she and Ms. West discussed that each of the subcommittees overlap in some fashion and as the CRC moves forward the overlaps will become more prevalent as recommendations and directions come forth. She added that it is obvious to see that one has relevance to another and going forward, the Commission should make efforts to ensure that the pieces fit.

Mr. Trower stated that a good example of this is Transit Oriented Development which affects both Transportation and Land Use subcommittees.

The Chair announced plans to combine subcommittee meetings for dialogue on overlapping matters.

[End HSSC Report]

Land Use Subcommittee (LUSC) Report – Richard Weiss, Esq., Chair

The Chair moved on to Public Safety in order to give Mr. Weiss time to arrive.

[End LUSC Report]

Public Safety Subcommittee (PSSC) Report – Dr. Mark Lieberman, Chair

Dr. Lieberman reminded the Commission that the PSSC is charged with reviewing the following issues: Emergency Management Coordination with BSO, Fire Rescue Coordination, Fire Fighter Minimum Standards and providing accountability for existing Charter Amendments for Fire Fighters and Intergovernmental Interactions in Emergencies. He advised that the following has occurred with the PSSC since the last full CRC meeting:

- Six meetings have been held to-date; the seventh to be held today.
- The PSSC has heard from experts with Fire Rescue, Police Department, EOC, and realizes the need among the 31 cities of the County regarding Fire Rescue and coordinating Police with emergencies.
- The PSSC has heard from experts and are aware that Communications Technology exists and is in the process of trying to determine if the system currently in place is adequate. The PSSC has been advised that the infrastructure does exist.
- The PSSC has heard from Dr. Bruce Moeller regarding Closest Unit Response and the CAD system and going forward in putting the Computer Aided Dispatch system in place.
- The PSSC has also heard from Mr. Joe Benavides regarding Minimum Standards of Service for Fire Rescue and Communications issues.
- The PSSC has had two presentations from Mr. Rick Carpani regarding Communications.
- Multiple discussions have taken place regarding Fire Fighter Minimum Standards.

Dr. Lieberman advised that the most pressing issue seems to be the need for the County to fully fund the infrastructure using a CAD system that will allow all of the municipalities to participate. He stated that this goes back to funding; therefore, he is not sure that it will be something that the Charter will be able to impact.

- The Broward County Fire Rescue Council is reviewing components of the issue regarding radio and computers for the communications system. The question remains whether the County should fully fund this initiative or if municipalities should create funding for it as well.
- Discussions have been held regarding having Law Enforcement added to the Fire Rescue Council and bringing in more participation with Law Enforcement.
- The PSSC is looking to ***recommend changing the name and composition of the Broward County Fire Rescue Council and calling it the Broward County Public Safety Council. It's a nine-member Council at this point and looking at the possibility of increasing the membership to eleven (11) or thirteen (13) members.*** Additional members suggested for consideration, is a member from the Police Chief's Association, a member from the Broward Emergency Management Agency, a member from the Regional Public Safety Communications Committee and a member from the Fraternal Order of Police; further discussions will be held at this afternoon's meeting.

- A representative from the EOC also presented before the PSSC. It was suggested that they need to do a better job in long-term recovery; their greatest challenge is responding to vulnerable needs population.
- Chief Bruce Moeller of the Fire Chief's Association provided the PSSC with a plan that was developed after Hurricane Wilma to address issues related to notification of the Public and making decisions in times of emergencies. There were questions as to who is in charge of emergencies, and according to Mr. Moeller, Section 2.04G designates the Mayor who is in charge during emergencies.
- Discussion was held with Chief Pudney from the City of Plantation Volunteer Fire Department. Plantation is the only municipality in Broward County that has an all volunteer Fire Department. The PSSC heard how that works and how Minimum Standards would affect them; probably the most.
- Discussions are planned to be ongoing today and should be wrapped up shortly.

Mr. Mena added that back in April, he inquired about existing programs available for pets, gas stations and generators at nursing homes. He advised that he received no response on two of these issues and requests they be addressed by the PSSC.

The Chair added that part of this conversation should be whether the State supersedes the authority of the County in relation to these issues, as most of it is State Legislature.

The Chair suggested to Dr. Lieberman that the PSSC consider inclusion of the PBA (Police Benevolent Association) as a part of the Public Safety Council.

Ms. Eisinger informed the Commission that the PSSC specifically requested that the FRC make suggestions of any other groups in order to avoid leaving out any representation.

Mr. Wilson: Currently the FOP would be the 13th member recommended by the Committee.

Ms. Kaletta advised that one of the primary reasons that the Council was expanded was to include police so that it will become an overall safety, and not just Fire.

The Chair advised that she is not sure that all municipalities have FOP, and wanted to ensure that all were involved. She called for the Transportation Subcommittee Report and asked Mr. Benson to make the Land Use Subcommittee report after Transportation is finished.

[End PSSC Report]

Transportation Subcommittee (TSC) Report – Michael Buckner, Esq., Chair

Mr. Buckner thanked the members of the Transportation subcommittee for all their hard work over the summer as there have been a lot of great discussions, good questions and involvement without which, he does not believe the TSC would have been able to tackle some of the difficult issues based upon the calendar regarding Mass Transit and Transportation. He advised that the following has occurred with the TSC since the last full CRC meeting:

- The TSC met on numerous occasions.
- Took a tour of the Fort Lauderdale Hollywood International Airport.
- Staff is currently coordinating with Port Everglades for a TSC tour of the Seaport.
- All members of the TSC including the Chair has an open request to utilize Mass Transit vehicles to get a sense of what it is like to ride Mass Transit in Broward County.

Mr. Buckner reminded the Commission of the charge of the TSC which was to look at Airport and Seaport operations, Mass Transit, The Right to Public Transportation as it relates to Mass Transit, and the organization and membership of the MPO. He advised that during recent meetings that the TSC discussed the following:

- Recent tribulations involving the Airport, including the County's failure to hire a permanent Airport Director.
- Recent alleged violations of conflict of interest policies by two Airport Managers who were fired; and
- Alleged legal and ethical conflicts by a spouse of the County Commission.

Mr. Buckner advised that the TSC at this time (subject to change) has decided not to make any proposed Charter Amendments at this time concerning the Airport in part, because both Airport and Seaport are trying to coordinate their operations. The TSC has heard testimony that any change at the Airport could possibly adversely affect the working relationship with the Seaport that if there are any changes at the Airport, then changes at the Seaport also need to be made in terms of the governance structure. Mr. Buckner advised that the TSC will continue to monitor Airport issues to determine if a Charter revision is needed to address the efficiency of the operations.

Mr. Buckner added that in his own personal opinion, the County has not done a good job in administering the Airport pursuant to the recent issues involving the Airport. He believes that the governance needs to be a much higher priority than it is now.

- As a result of research, testimony, and discussions, the TSC **voted to consider the creation of a Broward County Metropolitan Transportation Authority** at the July 10, 2007 meeting. The MTA would be proposed to address the deficiencies that the TSC feels exist concerning Mass Transit in Broward County.

Mr. Buckner explained that although the last CRC (2002), the voters approved a Charter Amendment that the County was supposed to emphasize Mass Transit, it has not happened. He pointed out that only recently the County Commission has created a Office/Department of Transportation. Yet still, funding and the emphasis on Mass Transit have not been made.

Mr. Buckner advised that the TSC learned that although the Airport and Seaport report to a very Senior County Administrator (the #2 County Administrator); that has not happened to Mass Transit. He advised that Mass Transit remains lost among the shuffle of the other various departments in Broward County. The TSC has learned that there are future funding obligations that are going to have to be made in terms of replacing buses as well as other infrastructure needs that have not and will not be made under the current governance structure. As a result:

- The TSC has approved the further consideration of research of the proposed MTA. Such an authority would be an entity of County government and headed by a seven member Board of Trustees.
- The Purpose of the MTA would be two-fold: To Plan, Develop, Finance, Construct and Operate a comprehensive multi-modal public Transit System for Broward County. Secondly, it will be created to fulfill Broward County's commitment to a Comprehensive Multi-modal Public Transit System which shall provide all persons with mobility and circulation throughout Broward County and the South Florida Region, in accordance with appropriate transportation plans and through an accessible transit system provided at a reasonable cost and adequate for different environmental social needs.
- Mr. Buckner explained that the TSC believes that this type of authority would create more of an emphasis on Mass Transit in Broward County. At the same time, serve as

an intermediate step to a future regional authority that would combine the Mass Transit needs of Miami-Dade, Broward and Palm Beach County.

- He further advised that the TSC heard testimony from the current MPO Chair on June 21st, Weston City Commissioner Daniel Stermer, as well as Joe Giulietti of the South Florida Regional Transportation Authority and other County and regional officials; all stressed the fact that Transportation is a regional issue and that one of the other issues is that Transit needs a dedicated funding source. Although there has been progress made in terms of regional issues, there still remains a lot to work on.
- The TSC is working with CRC General Counsel to further refine the MTA proposal and will continue the process at the August 16, 2007 meeting in order to present a full and complete recommendation to the full CRC.

Mr. Goren: Michael is accurate. We provided an opinion which is in the backup and it makes certain findings at this time based upon certain information and the subcommittee has not yet refined its conclusions and therefore we've left open various options that might be available, many of which are driven by budgetary issues and the compulsory obligation, as it were, to fund or some other alternate resource which is being explored by the subcommittee as well. There are other sub-options that might be viable and would be then proposed back to the full Board. We are working with Michael and his group to get you something in more detail later. There are a lot of open options still available under the terms of our opinion as well.

Ms. Weeks asked if the Board of Trustee members would be specified and how the MTA would differ from the MPO and RTA.

Mr. Buckner responded that in his opinion which might be revised by the TSC is that 4 members would be nominated by the Broward County Mayor and confirmed by the County Commission. One would be nominated by the Broward County League of Cities. One member would be nominated by the Broward County School Board and one member nominated by the Broward County Legislative Delegation. He explained that this would be an attempt to create a broad base representation from various different constituencies and other areas around the County. He advised also that the reason it is suggested that the Legislative Delegation provide a member is because this is an intermediate step and the TSC wishes to involve them because the proposal currently has language to give the MTA authority to ultimately go to the State legislature to ask for a dedicated funding source as well as to explore creation of a State

Authority. Mr. Buckner added that the TSC felt that something needed to get started in terms of having emphasis on Transportation needs and that due to what is currently happening in Tallahassee it was felt that such a State Authority would not be adequately considered right now due to various funding issues currently ongoing.

In response to Ms. Weeks, question concerning the MPO and SFRTA and other entities, Mr. Buckner advised that the MPO is a Transportation Planning entity and the body that actually coordinates among municipalities and other areas of the County the transportation needs of the County and prioritizes that with the appropriate funding. He explained that the MPO does not implement or operate any Mass Transit in Broward County as it is being done right now by the Mass Transit Division of Broward County. Mr. Buckner advised that the RTA runs and operates the Tri-Rail system that runs from Palm Beach County to Miami-Dade County through Broward County. He advised that the Director of the SFRTA informed the TSC that once Broward County has a dedicated funding source albeit a penny sales tax, bed tax etc. and Palm Beach as well then all three Counties would then be in the position to merge all of their Mass Transit Authorities into either the RTA or creating a new Super-regional Authority to handle all Mass Transit needs. Mr. Buckner explained that the expert testimony advised that this needs to happen and before it occurs, this *region* will continue to have transportation issues and problems because it is not a Broward County issue but a South Florida regional issue.

Mr. Buckner advised that this proposed MTA would bridge the gap in terms of providing more of an emphasis on Mass Transit which is currently not being provided by the County Commission for various reasons. It will also provide an interim step in terms of moving toward a regional RTA. He advised that it also gives the politicians of Broward County cover because they are not going to ask for a dedicated funding source. He advised that the TSC had testimony from the Broward County Mayor who informed them that 441 Corridor is the most heavily traveled corridor in Broward County. When looking at the MPO Plan it calls for some type of Mass Transit solution either light rail or some type of viable solution along that corridor. He pointed out that the Mayor advised that people along that corridor do not want such a solution there.

Members of the TSC are working toward keeping political issues out and trying to create a non-partisan, non-political look at Transportation needs.

Mr. Mena reminded Mr. Buckner of TSC discussion that the appointees by the Mayor would have a transportation background.

Ms. Weeks asked if MTA decisions would go back to the County Commission for final approval.

Mr. Buckner replied that the only thing that would go for further approval by the County Commission would be the funding. Right now because there is no dedicated funding source, that money would have to come from whatever money is currently being dedicated to Mass Transit. He advised that the TSC is working with General Counsel to further refine this but it would be essentially what other entities within Broward County have to do; whereas, they must go to the County Commission; propose a budget and then the County Commission would work with that budget and either decrease or increase it.

Mr. Buckner added that under the proposal any other decision concerning Mass Transit would be taken out of the hands of the County Commission and would be dedicated to this Authority.

Mr. Trower asked Mr. Buckner if the amendment would include a requirement for funding.

Mr. Buckner replied, no, because based upon information for General Counsel the Charter cannot dictate any type of funding source. However, the proposal gives the MTA the authority to go and seek out dedicated funding sources.

The Chair clarified that funding can be directed as with Fire Rescue that it will be paid for by whomever, but not tell them where they get the funds.

Mr. Goren: That's in part correct. The other part of the issue as Michael described it is the fact that this proposed group we feel probably could not, and we're looking at the issues a little more carefully, if established, could not require for example there be a separate carve out for this organization out of the County budget without having to go through a process. The initial thought process was to simply require it as a mandate which creates certain legal challenges under State statute. So the objective would be to find some other harmonious ground that would allow for a funding mechanism much like the Sheriff or other constitutional officers, wherein some other mechanism that would not have that conflict and that's an open issue at the moment. It's not defined yet; it's simply a conversation piece.

Ms. Tanner advised that the TSC has a really good working document that legal is assisting them with and they are trying really hard to provide a focus on necessity and need for regionalism and she believes by creating the Authority is a step in the right direction.

Mr. Esack advised that it is the intent of the TSC to bring the document to the full CRC so that it can be voted on as a whole in an attempt to further advance it.

Ms. Rogers stated from discussion that she felt the creation of this new organization would not achieve goals of the County. She asked how it is proposed to access a dedicated funding source as had in the Sheriff's budget as she believes that there should be something in the document that says that Transportation needs to be a priority and for it to be a priority it should be funded.

Mr. Buckner explained that for the interim period the MTA would be using funds that were dedicated to Mass Transit. He advised that the real purpose of the Authority is to provide the County the opportunity to go and seek dedicated funding without political considerations to weigh them down in terms of seeking other legal funding sources.

Ms. Rogers asked if one of the charges of the MTA would be to market, communicate, and educate the general population on dedicated funding sources because she explained that the problem has been without a local match there is no way to access state and federal funds. Therefore, she stated that she needs to understand where the TSC is going with the Authority because this is a known deficiency and everything that is done should lead to the ability to access those federal funds. She advised that she does not see this need being met with the proposed MTA.

Mr. Benson stated that what he understands that to be part of the situation is to begin to think beyond what is presently known to exist. Palm Beach County, Miami-Dade County and Broward County each currently have dedicated sources of funding for Mass Transit. He explained that the intent as he envisions it is to have those dedicated sources of funding to be redirected to the RTA and that RTA becomes the entity to help identify Mass Transit needs and respond to them. He further stated that if this MTA can become the entity that will satisfy Broward County's Transportation obligation within the Tri-County area we will then have the foundation to begin to build to get to the other funding sources (State and Federal) to cause for the dollars to begin to flow to meet our Transportation obligations. He added that the intent is to think beyond what is presently known to be in existence and then move in a new direction.

Mr. Benson expressed to the Chair that when she mentioned the fact that there needs to be a joint meeting between the Land Use subcommittee and the Transportation subcommittee that

he thinks the CRC will begin to establish the basic foundations at least in Broward County to begin to move and if Broward County can become that paradigm, it could be replicated in both Miami-Dade and Palm Beach Counties.

Mr. Mena advised that the TSC is trying to get the politics out of Transportation because it has been the stumbling block all along. He advised if there is any way to get the MTA to build a road or a bridge, whatever it is, without have a politician have to answer to some district which has been the problem, then you gain something which we do not have at this time.

Mr. Ketcham added that this is what a democracy is about. That you didn't have a group that just went in and put a bridge and a highway and a neighborhood just didn't want it.

The Chair explained that the discussion is Mass Transit.

Mr. Ketcham advised that he agrees with everything that he has heard but explained that if there are people on 441 who do not wish to have it done, they have a right to have their voices heard.

Ms. Kaletta stated that the CRC is looking at **County-wide priority** what is best for the County, not what's best for one individual. She added if an individual does not want a road in front of their home but the road helps the rest, then, she is sorry but at some point what is best for all has to be reviewed rather than what's best for one or two.

Ms. Kaletta stated that this to her is what the whole thing is. Looking at setting forth a vehicle so that it can be expanded from where the County is now with piece-meal things to where it can be grown County-wide. She added that she feels the emphasis that everyone on the subcommittee has had is opening the door so that Broward County can move forward with something positive - for not only the County but for the entire region.

The Chair stated that it is becoming more and more evident to her that the theme of this CRC is ***thinking forward and thinking about regionalism*** which she stated is very proactive of the Commission.

[End TSC Report]

Land Use Subcommittee (LUSC) Report – Commissioner Hayward Benson, Vice-Chair

Mr. Benson advised that the following has occurred with the LUSC since the last full CRC meeting:

- LUSC members have been surprised at the lack of public input on Land Use Issues.
- The LUSC generated a survey to be sent to areas and to people whom were thought would be part of the constituency and would have a response and it is pending.
- The LUSC has had presentations by the Broward County Department of Urban Planning and Redevelopment and The South Florida Regional Planning Council and as a result an item was generated which might promote a level of controversy.
- The City of Dania has indicated at a staff level that it will not be supportive of a proposed Charter Revision that would allow the Broward County Planning Council to have authority over municipalities and their decisions with regard to road closures.
- General Counsel advised that a discussion occurred at the League of Cities level and a subcommittee has been created there to conduct review and reporting. Once this is complete it will probably give the LUSC direction as to where it will be going in the future with that item.
- Mr. Benson pointed out that a Broward County Planning Council proposal for a potential Charter Amendment to Sections 8.05 sub-section H and 11.01 Sub-section C is included in subcommittee folders attached to a letter from Mr. Larry Leeds of Dania Beach.
- The LUSC was educated in terms of the various levels of approvals with regard to Land Use and its utilization. He advised that there is a redundancy that you'd find in all of that process which has yet to be clarified. He pointed out, however, that there has been no on slot of informational data to suggestion particular changes.
- Recommendations if any for September 1, 2007 remains open to discussion.
- Ms. West advised with regard to the status of the Open Space issue which the CRC forwarded to the LUSC for review and consideration as requested by Commissioner Jacobs that staff has gathered research information and will be providing it to the LUSC at their next meeting.

Ms. Tanner asked about the \$400 million bond issue – Save our Parks and the provision about going back out to the voters.

The Chair asked that LUSC check into land in SW Ranches which is going to be used for a City Hall which might be an exception, or potentially others similar to it.

Mr. Benson requested it be placed on the next LUSC Agenda.

Ms. Eisinger questioned legal if there is an Agreement between the municipalities and the County to maintain the lands.

Mr. Goren: There is a perpetual conservation easement that covers any County property which was purchased with bond money. Which puts significant restrictions, reservations on the future use or disposition of the property as well and if it's converted for some other purposes, it causes other financial implications to occur. That my recollection occurs when any County moneys were allocated up to the \$2 million or whatever the number was, that was, in fact placed on those properties as a covenant of record perpetually.

Mr. Benson pointed out that the difference is - the intent is - to get it into the Charter.

Mr. Mena advised that he is confused and asked if a Charter Amendment has the right to impose a restriction to a City that is now being able to close the door to some street that belongs to the City.

Mr. Goren: I did not write the provision. It was prepared by the Broward County Planning Council, but my understanding of it, which was provided by Andy Maurodis at the presentation to the League of Cities Board meeting last Thursday, was the fact that it would not apply to internal road closures. It would not apply arguably to the Home Rule authority of Cities to in fact abandon or vacate roads within their own City. The objective was whether or not roads which connected between two different cities would impact essential services such as police, fire rescue and others and that was the concept that was described in the language that the Planning Council proposed to this body and would otherwise propose to the voters. The objective is not, with due respect, to those that might think otherwise to be an issue of effecting Home Rule authority within any municipality and that was Andy's as their General Counsel, his proposal to this body.

Mr. Mena pointed out to Mr. Goren that the letter from Mr. Leeds specifically says "approve or deny a closure of a City roadway." He stated that it does not specify or clarify whether they are talking about a City roadway.

Mr. Benson corrected Mr. Mena asking him to read the provision itself and not the letter as it restricts it from State and Federal.

The Chair referred to the exact verbiage giving the Planning Council *authority* over municipalities. She stated that the Planning Council was formed to be a voice of the municipalities to provide information for the County Commission. Therefore, it does not seem appropriate that they would be given authority over municipalities.

Mr. Benson officially requested a joint meeting between the LUSC and TSC.

The Chair and Ms. West both advised that it will happen.

Ms. Rogers acknowledged that consensus is that the Planning Council should not have the authority. Therefore, she asked if there should be some entity in place to mitigate the road closure types of issues between cities.

The Chair stated that she's not sure if it belongs in the Charter.

Ms. Rogers asked the Commission if something should be put in the Charter or if the CRC should recommend to the County Commission by ordinance that something needs to be done.

The Chair advised that this is more of an issue of how the Planning Council functions as opposed to giving the Planning Council additional authority over municipalities which she states might be the real question that should be going to the LUSC.

Mr. Mena stated that the question is: *Is there is an authority that could arbitrate between municipalities.*

The Chair advised that she does not think that the Planning Council should be this entity.

Mr. Mena suggested considering Ms. Rogers' idea by putting some authority in place as an arbitrator to handle situations such as that which occurred between Southwest Ranches and Pembroke Pines.

The Chair again stated that she just does not believe it should be in the Charter.

Ms. Kaletta advised that she does think this is a County issue and it should be referred back to the LUSC for further discussion.

There being no further discussion, the Chair moved on to Item V.

[End LUSC Report]

V FORMAT / CONTENT OF PROPOSED RECOMMENDATIONS

Ms. West asked Mr. Goren to share his thoughts with the members of the subcommittees about what they should be thinking as far as language for proposed amendments / recommendations.

Mr. Goren: Obviously, the Board has met multiple times in recent months and your subcommittees have met as well and they have begun to generate various conversations and potential recommendations. Just remember what the rules state with regard to preparation. That the good investment of time and effort thus far has been very helpful but to the extent of having something on the table for discussion requires 10 votes to get there. It takes 10 of you to actually want to logistically and programmatically discuss anything of any consequence that may have come from a Subcommittee or not. There is nothing in the rules that suggests that if it wasn't reviewed by a subcommittee that it could not otherwise be brought up at a regular meeting for the purpose. Remember also, that the rules require that if you choose to implement and to put on the ballot a specific question or two or more would require 13 votes during a public session of this Board. I think what would be helpful is as the Board develops its own decision making, which I'm sure will come in the near term because the clock is ticking as they say and the delivery date for documents, although June 1, we have to backtrack to get there as the Board knows and it has to set a timeframe to get there; a timeline efficiently, without the potential of having a barrier at Broward County when you make the delivery. We can draft ballot language, but we can't draft without knowing what your concepts are. So the Motion to Discuss, actually, gets you to the point of having an idea; whether it is, and I don't choose to even give an example because that would be wrong. There are many examples of what you've heard just this morning where you can create discussion pieces on any number of different items. If you then evolve from a 10-vote minimum to a 13-vote minimum and just say draft the language. We can, I suspect under a 10-vote discussion, for discussion, we could draft language subject to your 13-vote discussion to put it forward. Whatever your preference is; the vote count matters and we are – I'm happy, David's happy, the office is happy, to create language that would be specific enough to enable you to make an appropriate and informed decision on the subject. Bearing in mind that towards the end of the last session of the Charter Commission, there was a very fast moving train at the end which becomes more difficult where we were actually drafting ballot language as it was being developed by the Board and that is where it gets very interesting, very challenging but also created a lot of timing issues. The good news is that we

wrote on time. The good news further is that the Charter now states very clearly that what you propose to the County Commission is what the voters get to see. It cannot be sanitized, reviewed, modified, or otherwise by the County Commission. That is in the Charter. The consequence of which is that it has to be right; it has to be good; it has to be your product which gets delivered for appropriate handling by the Commission and their role is to accept it; file it and transmit it to a ballot for the Supervisor of Elections on the November ballot. That does not mean they cannot be challenged by third parties or otherwise even questioned by the County Commission as such. The end result of which is that it is your product that gets on the ballot. Our finite draftsperson-ship comes from your directions and we're prepared to do that, whether it is one question or ten questions.

There was some conversation early on as to what the distinction was between a Charter Revision and Charter Amendments. A *Revision* being a revision to the entire Charter which would be, hypothetically, one question which when it fails it ends. Whereas, *Amendments* to various parts of the Charter are certainly viable an option available should you decide to exercise them. We're prepared to prepare whatever language is needed to support your decision making but that time is going to come fairly soon. Come the fall, if you get the 10 vote minimum to discuss and move forward from there we're going to start drafting what you ask us to draft. For example, we were asked a couple of questions by Irv's subcommittee last evening, which in a sense is drafting, but not really. You asked for example for copies of other Charters regarding non-interference as an ethics issue. Where else is it said in City Charters or other Charters where the Manager who runs the government should not be interfered with by the County Commission or City Commission? We're going to provide that specifically.

One of the questions that was asked of us was to provide some language regarding the non-debate provision of the Chapter 112 where elected officials may have a conflict under the statute and be unable to vote on the subject because of a conflict, but may still debate the subject matter and may still sit on the dais and have an exchange with their colleagues on the subject matter. The conversation was just, show us some language or some otherwise given language that you can create, I suppose, which would support making that a precluded act, that you could not debate, you could not discuss and would not be able to do that. That is getting close to what would be a drafting technique. We've not gone there yet. We'll get that subcommittee some information that will help them, but it is a topic that may come back to this Board. Where under State Law if there is a choice to be more stringent in State Statute

governing ethics, that is an option which can be exercised by local government to do that and that is an option that you could do.

The Chair advised that as the format that when subcommittees come through with their reports only one subcommittee will be addressed per meeting in order to give the Commission the opportunity to actually explore what they've written.

Ms. Weeks requested that draft language for each Subcommittee be forwarded to the respective Subcommittee members for review prior to the debate.

Mr. Goren: I understanding what you are asking for and as a lawyer, let me explain the next step if I can. If the final draft of what you will end up doing at some point in time – The end product that will ultimately go to the County Commission will be a resolution. The resolution will have several component parts to it. There will be a ballot title, which explains to the voters what they are voting on and a ballot question. The ballot title has no more than 15 words and the ballot question can be no more than 75 words. That's the final product and you're not asking for final product. They may not know though that there is such a vehicle to get to the final conclusion. We can certainly draft language that would not be that severe, that specific early on in the process.

A conversation ensued between Ms. West and Ms. Weeks regarding proposed language and debate process amongst the subcommittees. Ms. West advised that this is a question that was posed to her before whether it was okay for General Counsel to begin to draft language prior to the full CRC having the opportunity to hear what the concept is or seeing it.

Ms. Kaletta pointed out that draft language was prepared by the Chair of the TSC which was very well done.

Mr. Benson advised that he agrees with Ms. Weeks and it appears to him that when the subcommittee comes with a proposed recommendation it should come in some fashion of what it will look like.

Mr. Rogow advised that when the proposed Charter Amendment is presented to the full CRC it should be in the form of the actual proposed Charter Amendment so when discussion begins for the 10 people vote they know what they are voting on.

Mr. Goren: These are your rules, you get to interpret your own rules and if the key to your conversation is to have something affirmative in front of you that can be looked at reviewed, accepted, or evaluated as a discussion piece, we can do that. Obviously the concept is to move from concept to an actual document that you can debate, discuss and dispose of and that can be read into the rules. Just remember that the rules say **Motion to Discuss** and **Motion to Approve**, so we need to get to that level at some future time.

Mr. Trower asked if a formal modification needs to be made to the CRC rules to clear up the issue.

Mr. Goren: I think it's your consensus on how your rules are applied.

The Chair asked if it is consensus to that interpretation that the subcommittees will come forward with some type of legal language.

Ms. Tanner advised that the TSC was given a memo from General Counsel telling them that they were precluded from being able to have a draft forwarded to them as a subcommittee. She asked if this could be utilized to simply reverse the process.

The Chair stated that it is a rule change.

Mr. Goren: Our concerns, if you will, are creating a treadmill affect for this public body that has constraints both financial and by time. We're happy to do whatever is appropriate to get to whatever level is appropriate. Our concerns have been that we need to be directed to do that and I think that's what we're hearing this morning.

The Chair asked if there is consensus and the interpretation being that the subcommittees will submit actual **draft proposed language**.

Mr. Goren: What would be very useful to us is, we will show you the form of resolution we think is the base document for the future, and we will use that form as a premise for your review.

Ms. Kaletta asked Mr. Goren if this in the long run will save him time.

Mr. Goren: The answer is yes, because the framework will be the same for any one question. It's just the substance of the ballot title and the ballot question which will differ depending on what this Board would like to do.

The Chair advised that once actual language is drafted, she believes that the public will then come forward. She stated if they do not come. The Commission will go to them.

VI NEW BUSINESS

The Chair advised that as the CRC continues to go forward, municipal and county budgets are being greatly reduced. She stated that her own municipality has cut back \$12 million from their budget. She asked that the Commission keeps this in mind as they move forward. She reminded the Commission that come January the voters will determine whether there will be greater reductions.

NEXT MEETING

Rosh Hashanah begins at sun-down on September 12th. The Chair asked the Commission to keep this in mind for the next meeting.

Mr. Buckner requested a vote to authorize a joint subcommittee meeting between Land Use and Transportation and any other subcommittees. The Chair advised that there was consensus.

Mr. Buckner requested additional time to research and consider the issues requiring joint meetings.

The Chair suggested that subcommittees bring forth what they've been working on by the September 1 date and after that more time can be added for joint meetings. She advised that she is not willing to give up the September 1st deadline. The Chair advised that an additional month could be given to the subcommittees for additional joint meetings.

Ms. Rogers questioned how the Chair plans to entertain only 1 subcommittee proposal for discussion.

The Chair replied that one subcommittee will be discussed per meeting.

Ms. Rogers confirmed that only one subcommittee would be reporting at the September 12, 2007 meeting.

Mr. Buckner explained that he did not believe that the TSC would be ready to come up with a recommendation from the joint subcommittees.

Ms. Rogers explained that there is time because only one subcommittee will be reviewed on the 12th.

The Chair called for public comment.

XI PUBLIC COMMENT

Dan Glickman, Deerfield Beach, Florida

Mr. Glickman thanked the members of the TSC for their very interesting conversations. He then advised that there always seems to be confusion between Public Transit and public things including roads and bridges. He requested the CRC consider instead of having a Metropolitan Transportation Authority, that the Transit Authority be called the Broward Transit Authority. He stated that the idea of having brevity is having not only brevity, but precision and clarity, which is one reason why he asked for the Broward Transit Authority. Mr. Glickman advised with regard to the Right to Public Transportation, it has occurred to him during conversations that it is really about the right to public *Transit*. While people have not been against it, they haven't been exactly for it in terms of documenting it either. Mr. Glickman advised that it is in the Charter as one of the enumerated rights; and if it weren't it would, therefore, be a politician's cover and thereby remove politics from Transit.

[End Public Comment]

XII ADJOURNMENT

There being no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 12:13 p.m. The next meeting of the full Charter Review Commission will be held on Wednesday, September 12, 2007 at 10:00 am.

The minutes of this meeting are recorded on CD # 08.08.07 (BCGV CTR)

