MEMBERS PRESENT:

Thomas McDonald, Chair
Thomas P. Fabricio
H. Collins Forman, Jr.
Cynthia Guerra
Suzette A. Maylor
Burnadette Norris-Weeks
Eugene Pettis
Carlos J. Reyes
Grant Smith
MEMBERS ABSENT:

Cynthia Busch
Larry S. Davis
David DiPietro
Roslyn Greenburg
Suzanne Gunzburger
James Gray Kane
Marilyn Leto
Lori Moseley
Monica Navarro
Joseph Wells
Also Present:

Sam Goren, Esquire, Goren Cherof Doody & Ezrol, PA, Counsel
Carlos Verney, Executive Director
Niki Donner, Assistant Executive Director
Mark Journey, Broward County Attorney’s Office
Shantelle Harris
Sharon Woods
Phyllis Berry
Michael Cerbola (Phonetic)
Pamela Adams
Jacqueline Reed-Tufts
Irvin Minney
State Senator Perry Thurston
Tim Lonergan, Mayor of Oakland Park
Robert Bogle
Daniel Mulieri
Kristina Braziel
Adejare McMillan
Brenda Mollison
Jude St. Hilaire (Phonetic)
Nancy Cavender, The Laws Group, Minutes Secretary
Chris Salmon, The Laws Group, Videographer
A public meeting of the Broward County Charter Review Commission was held at the African-American Research Library, 2650 Sistrunk Boulevard, Fort Lauderdale, Florida, on March 28, 2018 at 6:00 p.m.

(The following is a near-verbatim transcript of the meeting.)
CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

MR. MCDONALD: Call to order the meeting of the
Broward County Charter Review Committee.

Could I have a roll call, please?

MINUTES SECRETARY: Cynthia Busch.
Cynthia Guerra.
James Gray Kane.
Marilyn Leto.
Suzette A. Maylor.
Lori Moseley.
Eugene Pettis.
MR. PETTIS: Here.
MINUTES SECRETARY: Grant Smith.
MR. SMITH: Here.
MINUTES SECRETARY: Joseph Wells.
Larry Davis.
David DiPietro.
Thomas P. Fabricio.
MR. FABRICIO: Here.
MINUTES SECRETARY:  H. Collins Forman, Jr.

MR. FORMAN: Here.

MINUTES SECRETARY:  Roslyn Greenberg.

Suzanne Gunzburger.

Monica Navarro.

Burnadette Norris-Weeks.

MS. NORRIS-WEEKS:  Here.

MINUTES SECRETARY:  Carlos J. Reyes.

MR. REYES: Here.

MINUTES SECRETARY:  Thomas McDonald, Chair.

MR. MCDONALD: Here.

AGENDA ITEM II - PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

MR. MCDONALD: We’ll stand for the Pledge of Allegiance, please.

(PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.)

AGENDA ITEM III - INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW OF PUBLIC HEARING FORMAT - CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION CHAIR - THOMAS MCDONALD

MR. MCDONALD: Good evening. As Chair of the
Broward County Charter Review Commission, I would like to welcome you to one of the five Public Hearings being conducted by the CRC.

This hearing is an opportunity for the CRC members to receive input from the public on the proposed amendments to the Broward County Charter that will appear on the general election ballot in November of 2018.

In a moment, our general counsel will read the title of each of the resolutions into the record, which will be followed by a brief explanation of the proposed Charter amendments by our Executive Director, Carlos Verney.

In accordance with the CRC rules, each of these resolutions has been approved by an affirmative vote of at least 13 of the 19 CRC members.

Once each of the resolutions has been read into the record, I will open the meeting to public comment.

Members of the public are welcome to speak on any
of the resolutions that have been adopted by the CRC or any other matter which they would like the CRC to consider.

Please limit your comments to three minutes.

Note that tonight’s hearing is not a special meeting, and no formal action will be taken this evening.

The CRC will conduct a final meeting this coming Monday at 3:00 o’clock in the afternoon?

MR. VERNEY: That’s correct, Mr. Chair.

MR. MCDONALD: -- at the Government Center. At the conclusion of all the Public Hearings -- to conclude all the public hearings, if you have any final business before formally transmitting our proposals to the County Commission.

Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM IV - CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION RESOLUTIONS

- READ TITLE OF RESOLUTIONS INTO THE RECORD

(CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION GENERAL COUNSEL - DAVID
Mr. McDonald: Mr. Goren, our attorney?

MR. GOREN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Good evening, Mr. Chair and Commissioners.

The first item on the agenda is CRC Resolution 2018-002. And I’ll read the title into the record.

It’s a resolution of the Broward County Charter Review Commission adopting a proposed amendment to Section 10.01 of the Charter of Broward County, Florida, entitled Broward County Office of Inspector General; providing the Inspector General’s discretion as to whether to commence an investigation if good cause exists that an entity or person over whom the Inspector General has authority has engaged in misconduct or gross mismanagement; providing for presentation to the
electorate by the County Commission at a special referendum election to be held in conjunction with the November 2018 general election; providing the ballot title and summary of the chief purpose of the proposed amendment; providing for the County Attorney to re-number and to re-letter articles and sections in order to conform the amendments to the Charter; providing for severability; and providing for an effective date.

MR. VERNEY: This resolution would replace the word shall with the word may to provide for the Inspector General’s discretion as to whether to commence an investigation if good cause exists that an entity or person over whom the Inspector General has authority has engaged in misconduct or gross mismanagement.

MR. GOREN: Next, Mr. Chair, if I can, for the record, is CRC Resolution 2018-003, also a resolution of the Broward County Charter Review Commission adopting a proposed amendment to Section 8.05 of the Charter of Broward County, Florida entitled Broward County Planning
Council Powers and Function; providing for revisions and -- to the administration of Planning Council’s duties by providing for the Zoning Glossary to be contained in the County Land Use Plan, and at least one Planning Council Public Hearing for Land Use Plan amendments; providing for presentation to the electorate by the County Commission at a special referendum election to be held in conjunction with the November 2018 general election; providing the ballot title and summary of the chief purpose of the proposed amendment; providing for the County Attorney to re-number and re-letter articles and sections in order to conform the amendments to the Charter; providing for severability; and, finally, providing for an effective date.

MR. VERNEY: This resolution would include the Zoning Glossary within Broward County’s Comprehensive Land Use Plan and require at least one Planning Council Public Hearing to consider Land Use Plan amendments.

It by no means limits the Planning Council’s
ability to have multiple Public Hearings, but they are required under this proposal at least have one Public Hearing.

MR. GOREN: Thank you, Mr. Verney.

Next on the list is Item Number -- Charter Review Commission Number 2018-004. It’s a resolution of the Broward County Charter Review Commission adopting a proposed amendment to Section 9.01 of the Charter of Broward County, Florida entitled Central Examining Boards; providing for the appointment of alternate members to the Central Examining Boards; providing for presentation to the electorate by the County Commission at a special referendum election to be held in conjunction with the November 2018 general election; providing that -- the ballot title and summary of the chief purpose of the proposed amendment; providing for the County Attorney to re-number and to re-letter articles and sections in order to conform the amendments to the Charter; providing for severability; and,
finally, providing for an effective date.

MR. VERNEY: This resolution would allow for the appointment of alternate members to the Central Examining Boards.

You may be asking yourselves what exactly are the Central Examining Boards or the CEBs. The CEBs are responsible for ensuring the registration and licensing of individuals involved with the construction trades. They provide Certificates of Competency. They ensure that individuals involved in the construction trades are properly insured.

And, finally, the CEBs provide the opportunity for the public to register complaints, mediate disputes, and hear construction-related issues.

MR. GOREN: Next, Mr. Chair and Commissioners, is Resolution Number 2018-005. It’s a resolution of the Broward County Charter Review Commission adopting a proposed amendment to Section 9.02 of the Charter of Broward County, Florida entitled Building Code and Board
of Rules and Appeals; providing for a quorum of the Board of Rules and Appeals to be a majority of the total membership of the Board of Rules and Appeals; providing for presentation to the electorate by the County Commission at a special referendum election to be held in conjunction with the November 2018 general election; providing the ballot title and summary of the chief purpose of the proposed amendment; providing for the County Attorney to re-number and re-letter articles and sections in order to conform the amendments to the Charter; providing for severability; and, finally, providing for an effective date.

MR. VERNEY: This resolution would provide for a quorum of the Board of Rules and Appeals, also commonly known as BORA, to be a majority of the total membership of the Board of Rules and Appeals.

You may be also asking yourselves what is the Board of Rules and Appeals? Well, they are tasked with amending and enforcing the provisions of the Florida
CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION

Building Code.

MR. GOREN: All righty. The next item is CRC Resolution Number 2018-006. It’s a resolution of the Broward County Charter Review Commission adopting a proposed amendment to the Charter of Broward County, Florida by enacting a new Section 1.07 entitled Required Posting Of Notices, Agendas, and Backup Materials; providing that for all meetings subject to the requirements of Section 286.011 of the Florida Statutes, that all notices, agendas, and backup materials shall be posted on the County or municipality’s website no later than 48 hours prior to the scheduled meeting; providing for notice in the event of an emergency meeting; providing for presentation to the electorate by the County Commission at a special referendum election to be held in conjunction with the general election in November 2018; providing the ballot title and summary of the chief purpose of the proposed amendment; providing for the County Attorney to re-number and to re-letter
articles and sections in order to conform the amendments to the Charter; providing for severability; and providing for an effective date.

MR. VERNEY: This resolution would provide for the required posting of notices, agendas, and backup materials for all meetings subject to the sunshine law no later than 48 hours prior to the scheduled meeting, and providing for notice in the event of emergency meetings.

This resolution would allow the public to review the posting of notices, agendas, and backup materials for all sunshine meetings.

MR. GOREN: Next, for the record, Mr. Chair and Commissioners and members of the public, is CRC Resolution Number 2018-007. This is a resolution of the Broward County Charter Review Commission adopting a proposed amendment to the Charter of Broward County, Florida by enacting a new Section 11.11 entitled Broward County Affordable Housing Trust Fund; providing for the
establishment of the Broward County Affordable Housing Trust Fund; providing for a definition of affordable housing; providing for the purpose of the trust fund, revenue sources for the trust fund, the continuing nature of the trust fund, and for administration and oversight of the trust fund; providing for presentation to the electorate by the County Commission at a special referendum election to be held in conjunction with the November 2018 general election; providing for the ballot title and summary of the chief purpose of the proposed amendment; providing for the County Attorney to re-number and to re-letter articles and sections in order to conform the amendments to the Charter; providing for severability; and, finally, providing for an effective date.

MR. VERNEY: This resolution would provide for the establishment of the Broward County Affordable Housing Trust Fund, and also outlines four components.

One, it provides a definition of affordable
housing.

   Two, it provides the purpose of the trust fund.

   Three, it provides the revenue sources for the trust fund.

   Fourth and finally, it would provide the continuing nature of the trust fund and the administration and oversight of the trust fund.

   MR. GOREN: Next, please, for the record is CRC Resolution Number 2018-008. It’s a resolution of the Broward County Charter Review Commission adopting a proposed amendment to Section 4.01 of the Charter of Broward County, Florida entitled County Auditor; providing for changes to the composition of the body that appoints the County Auditor; providing for presentation to the electorate by the County Commission at a special referendum election to be held in conjunction with the November 2018 general election; providing the ballot title and summary of the chief purpose of the proposed amendment; providing for the
County Attorney to re-number and to re-letter articles and sections in order to conform the amendments to the Charter; providing for severability; and providing for an effective date.

MR. VERNEY: The resolution would provide for changes to the composition of the body that appoints the County Auditor.

It specifically would replace the State of Florida Auditor General with the president of the Florida Institute of Certified Public Accountants.

This resolution would also replace the president of Broward Community College, which is now known as Broward College, with the president of a local college or university as determined by the County Commission.

If any of the five individuals comprising the body that appoints the County Auditor declines to appoint, then a countywide business organization shall be appointed by the Broward County Commission.

MR. GOREN: Next up is CRC Resolution Number 2018-
010. It is a resolution of the Broward County Charter Review Commission adopting a proposed amendment to Section 2.01 of the Charter of Broward County, Florida entitled Composition, Terms, Qualifications, and Compensation of Members; providing that County Commission districts may not be drawn to favor or disfavor an incumbent or political party, and that districts shall not be drawn to deny racial or language minorities an equal opportunity to participate in the political process and elect representatives of their choice; providing for presentation to the electorate by the County Commission at a special referendum election to be held in conjunction with the November 2018 general election; providing the ballot title and summary of the chief purpose of the proposed amendment; providing for the County Attorney to re-number and to re-letter articles and sections in order to conform the amendments to the Charter; providing for severability; and providing for an effective date.
MR. VERNEY: This resolution would provide for the codification the Fair Districts Amendments into the Charter, and actually provide the standards for the redistricting of Broward County.

Specifically, it would provide that the County Commission districts may not be drawn to favor or disfavor an incumbent or political party, and that districts shall not be drawn to deny racial or language minorities the equal opportunity to participate in the political process and elect representatives of their choice.

MR. GOREN: So be it.

Next item is CRC Resolution Number 2018-011, which is a resolution of the Broward County Charter Review Commission adopting a proposed amendment to Section 2.01 of the Charter of Broward County, Florida entitled Composition, Terms, Qualifications, and Compensation of Members; providing for the redistricting of the County Commission districts following the decennial Census in
2020 -- that’s the year 2020 -- and every ten years thereafter, or sooner if the County Commission determines that districts have become unbalanced due to population shifts; providing for the engagement of a four-year college or university located within the State of Florida for the purposes of identifying and designating nine single member districts within Broward County; providing for the presentation to the electorate by the County Commission at a special referendum election to be held in conjunction with the November 2018 general election; providing the ballot title and summary of the chief purpose of the proposed amendment; providing for the County Attorney to re-number and to re-letter articles and sections in order to conform the amendments to the Charter; providing for severability; and providing for an effective date.

MR. VERNEY: The previous resolution outlined the standards for redistricting. This resolution provides the process for redistricting by specifically stating
that following the decennial Census in -- in the year 2020 and every ten years thereafter, or sooner if the County Commission determines that districts have become unbalanced due to population shifts, a four-year college or university located within the State of Florida would be engaged for the purpose of identifying and designating nine single member districts within Broward County.

MR. GOREN: Next, if you will, for the record, is CRC Resolution Number 2018-012. It is also a resolution of the Broward County Charter Review Commission adopting a proposed amendment to Section 10.01 of the Charter of Broward County, Florida entitled Broward County Office of Inspector General, revising the composition of the Inspector General Selection and Oversight Committee by replacing the United States Attorney for the Southern District of Florida or his or her designee or appointee with an individual appointed by the Broward County Bar Association; providing for presentation to the
electorate by the County Commission at a special referendum election to be held in conjunction with the November 2018 general election; providing the ballot title and summary of the chief purpose of the proposed amendment; providing for the County Attorney to re-number and to re-letter articles and sections in order to conform the amendments to the Charter; providing for severability; and, finally, providing for an effective date.

MR. VERNEY: This resolution would provide for replacing the United States Attorney for the Southern District of Florida, or his or her -- his or her appointee, with an individual appointed by the Broward County Bar Association on the Inspector General Selection and Oversight Committee.

MR. GOREN: And last but not least for your reading pleasure is CRC Resolution Number 2018-013, which is a resolution of the Broward County Charter Review Commission clarifying the Charter by eliminating
ineffective language and deleting language that is no longer needed as the entities referenced in the Charter are no longer in existence and serve no legally required purpose; providing for presentation to the electorate by the County Commission at a special referendum election to be held in conjunction with the November 2018 general election; providing the ballot title and summary of the chief purpose of the proposed amendment; providing for the County Attorney to re-number and to re-letter articles and sections in order to conform the amendments to the Charter; and, finally, providing for severability; and providing for an effective date.

MR. VERNEY: This resolution would provide for clarifying the -- clarification of the Charter by eliminating ineffective language and deleting language that is no longer needed as the entities referenced in the Charter are no longer in existence and serve no legally required purpose.

The entities that -- whose language will be removed...
from the Charter are the following.

The Department of Transportation. They would still be in existence, but the specific reference in the Charter would be removed.

Broward County Environmental Quality Control Board, their language would be removed. They are no longer in existence.

The Broward County Ethics Commission, no longer in existence. It would be removed.

And those are the resolutions, Mr. Chair.

MR. MCDONALD: Thank you, Carlos.

AGENDA ITEM V - PUBLIC COMMENT

MR. MCDONALD: At this time, I’m going to open the meeting for the public.

If you’d like to speak, please see Niki over here, on my left.

Right now, I only have one speaker. Oh, good, Phyllis Berry is coming up.

I have -- I can’t -- I think -- is it Shantelle
Harris?

MS. HARRIS: Yes.

MR. MCDONALD: Ms. Shantelle Harris like to speak? Is it -- is that right?

MS. HARRIS: Yes.

MR. MCDONALD: Oh, I’m sorry. Where -- where would Ms. Harris speak?

MR. GOREN: There a mic there.

MR. MCDONALD: There’s a mic right up here, Ms. Harris. Up here.

If you would -- when you come up, if you’d just state your name and address for the record.

(Inaudible.)

MS. HARRIS: Good evening everyone. I am sorry that I’m late, so I didn’t get to listen to the full agenda (inaudible).

MR. MCDONALD: I can’t -- is her mic on?

MS. NORRIS-WEEKS: She didn’t get a chance to listen to the full agenda so she’s (inaudible).
MR. MCDONALD: Oh, okay. Might not be on.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: There you go.

MR. MCDONALD: There you go. I’m sorry, Ms. Harris. There you go.

MS. HARRIS: Hi, good evening, everyone. I’m sorry that I’m late, so I was unable to hear the entire agenda, so I decline to speak.

MR. MCDONALD: Okay. What we do is we read all the resolutions that are going on the ballot, so if you have any feelings on any of those resolutions, you can come up later after the next speaker.

MS. HARRIS: Oh, okay. Thank you.

MR. MCDONALD: The next speaker is an old friend of mine, Ms. Phyllis Berry. Not -- not old in age, just --

MS. BERRY: Yeah, yeah.

(Laughter.)

MR. MCDONALD: Just a long-time friend.

MR. PETTIS: Mr. Chair, I can’t -- was it Shantelle? Does she have a copy of -- of the items if
she wants to read it?

    MR. MCDONALD: She can -- I’ll give her mine if she’d like it.

    MR. PETTIS: I’ll give her mine.

    MR. MCDONALD: Ms. Berry?

    MS. BERRY: Yeah, thank you, Mr. Chair and members.

My name is Phyllis Berry. I live at 2144 Northwest 4th Street in Fort Lauderdale.

    First, I want to thank this body for your hard work. I know -- I know you all volunteered your time. It is very much appreciated.

    And I also want to thank you for the opportunity to -- to allow me to speak in one of your meetings concerning the issue of the strong mayor.

    I know you’ve taken a position on that. I know it wasn’t unanimous. But I thank you for your deliberation on it, and I also thank you for the outcome.

    I do have one question concerning the ballot issue concerning redistricting. And this is the first time
I’m seeing it. And as I read it, it says that if the County Commission believed that there was unbalanced -- an unbalance, that they could take it to the education institution.

What if it’s someone other than the County Commission that believes that? For example, what if the NAACP or the League of Women Voters raises concerns about the fairness of it? Is there an opportunity for them to present, or is it only because the County Commissioners amongst themselves (inaudible)?

MR. MCDONALD: I’m going to ask -- I’m going to ask the attorney to answer that, Ms. Berry. I -- I thought they were referring to the size of the districts, weren’t they?

MR. GOREN: Typically, yes. But the answer, if I may quickly -- good evening, Phyllis. Nice to see you.

MS. BERRY: Nice to see you also.

MR. GOREN: Pleasure. The two items on the ballot relate -- or proposed on the ballot relate to the
redistricting process, and one relates to the substance.

The Charter Commission has taken it upon itself to embrace in the County Charter the Fair Districts Amendment to the Florida Constitution, which is not the same question that you’re asking. But that -- that’s -- that -- they both stand alone.

The -- following that issue on the ballot is a proposal to require redistricting every decennial Census or sooner.

And the sooner part comes when, if there is an imbalance in the districts, which can be prompted by the request of any third party could suggest to the County Commission an imbalance, the County Commission would be charged with the obligation of looking at the issue. They may be required by law because of an imbalance in the -- in the allocation of population by districts, would have to reopen that conversation.

The requirement, though, in the Charter that’s being proposed by the Charter Commission is that the
actual demographic information and the data which is derived through a study would be performed by an independent third party. In this case, it would be a four-year college or university anywhere in the State of Florida that would actually prepare maps and recommendations through a very transparent process and make recommendations for a plan to the County Commission to consider in the redistricting activity that would be required by the Charter.

MS. BERRY: But, again, if you could explain to me (inaudible) what triggers that going to --

MR. GOREN: It can occur from any source.

MS. BERRY: So a third party.

MR. GOREN: Yes.

MS. BERRY: So there could be -- they would bring it to the County Commission?

MR. GOREN: That’s correct.

MS. BERRY: Would the County Commission then have to vote to do it or?
MR. GOREN: The answer is that if they don’t do it, then the issue is that -- that the third party that would raise the issue about the imbalance can raise that issue in other legal forums to challenge that decision not to.

MS. BERRY: In a legal forum.

MR. GOREN: Because when you do a redistricting, there must be, within reason, equal -- equal and proportionate numbers in each district, and there are certain parameters that are the standard deviation from in each district, the end result of which is if there is an imbalance caused by a change in population or a change in location, whatever it may be, the Commission would be charged with this -- with looking in the mirror and making the right decision to re-look at those issues, if it’s before the end of the decennial Census.

MS. BERRY: Okay. Thank you.

MR. GOREN: Yes, ma’am.

MS. BERRY: Thank you again for your time, all of
MR. MCDONALD: Ms. Berry, we discussed like some things that could come up as, if you remember, back when Andrew hit in ’91, we had an influx of people into the southwest Broward County and Dade County. That would be something that would happen out of the -- extraordinary that we could re-look at it at that time, you know.

But there’s not much land left in Broward County that you could --

MS. BERRY: I just -- I was just not clear as to whether -- it seemed as if it was the County Commission, the County Commission alone, who made that decision. And it might be in the County Commission’s interest to not look at it the way maybe some organizations would (inaudible).

MR. MCDONALD: And -- and -- and you understand that --

MS. BERRY: I know you’re promising (inaudible).

MR. MCDONALD: -- the method -- if the two methods
pass, besides hiring an outside source to come up with the plan, and it’s based on trying to keep cities together, neighborhoods together, not gerrymandering, and they’re going to present those plans to the County Commission. If the County Commissioners want to deviate from those plans, they have to do it in an open setting, in a Public Hearing, with the public there, and explain -- the Commission would have to explain why they’re deviating from one of those plans.

MS. BERRY: Very good. Thank you.

MR. MCDONALD: I know some people came in late. If there is anybody else that would like to speak, feel free to -- (inaudible).

We’ve got Michael Cerbola?

MR. CERBOLA: Yes. That was very well done.

MR. MCDONALD: Thank you.

MR. CERBOLA: I had a question on the redistricting. There -- the -- I think it was the federal court case that was recently settled, they used
a district test, I think it was Wisconsin. They -- in the Supreme Court, they actually are using, I think it -- for both Democrat and Republican challenges. The one that was already determined was Republican. I think the Democratic one is coming up.

And what they did was they used a test where they vary the neighboring sections, and if it affects the outcome, they know that it was a politically influenced thing.

So apparently, it’s a valid test. I would suggest perhaps rather than counting on the NAACP waiting until there’s a problem and coming in, but then there’s already some social strife that’s causing an organization to act, just as a standard rote, anytime there's a change, use that gold standard process that they used that’s already been vetted by the federal court.

MR. MCDONALD: You want to respond to that, Sam?

MR. GOREN: I can try.
Good evening, sir.

MR. CERBOLA:  Good evening.

MR. GOREN:  The proposals that the Charter Commission has offered to the public for consideration in November subject the questions such as your own to state and federal law.

So the County Commission is bound by the laws that govern redistricting and the method by which redistricting occurs, which could be a moving target over the years.

The Charter’s a very long-term document. It doesn’t go away after a couple of years. It’s long-term, the changes occur, and this group doesn’t meet for another 12 years, just FYI.

So the end result is that as the laws may change or evolve through Supreme Court decisions or otherwise, the County Commission’s bound by those -- those changes, which may require a redistricting sooner than later -- rather than later, as well as the fact that the third
party reviewer, which is the third party university or college that might otherwise help to redistrict is bound by the same series of laws, which includes not just the statutes and federal laws, but also case decisions that would require that to be considered.

So the answer is it would be considered and could be.

MR. CERBOLA: So this would come after that. Once the -- the districts are drawn, in other words, by that third party --

MR. GOREN: Yes.

MR. CERBOLA: -- the idea would be to apply the -- to apply the mathematical analysis to that and make sure that it -- it passes the test.

MR. MCDONALD: The -- the -- I believe the third party would do that. These are usually professionals from the universities that would do that, and they would take what --

MR. GOREN: Correct.
MR. MCDONALD: -- you brought up into consideration.

MR. GOREN: Yes.

MR. MCDONALD: We’re not allowed -- not allowed to set aside a Democratic district or Republican district or a black district or white district --

MR. CERBOLA: It’s like having a mathematical (inaudible).

MR. MCDONALD: Right. It’s -- it’s not by political chicanery.

MR. CERBOLA: But apparently there’s -- there’s a lot of political tugging, because we’ve had maps for quite (inaudible) and --

MR. MCDONALD: Well, we --

(Laughter.)

MR. CERBOLA: -- and we’ve been able to optimize some amazing things, and for some reason, all that doesn’t apply in this one area.

I’m a scientist, and there -- there is at least a
dozen different ways to solve this problem. So --

MR. MCDONALD: Right. We -- we were shown case --
case studies in our -- in our hearings earlier when we
came up with this where one particular county, you could
-- you could do it -- draw it three different ways, you
could get a -- I think it was a six/three majority for
one party or a six/three for the other party, or it
could be a five/four. It’s just by where you move the
lines.

And that’s what this Charter amendment says, is
that you’re not supposed to be moving these lines to
create those types of imbalances.

MR. CERBOLA: And that’s very hard to do as -- as a
group when people are -- are deciding. So what this
algorithm does is it actually does that and -- and --
and tests each, you know, thousands and thousands of
times, if you adjust this section a little bit, how does
it affect this one, if you effect this one.

And it apparently -- and, as we were saying, I
mean, there are numerous ways. Every university could come at it a different way.

But apparently, over all these decades, they’ve finally decided, the courts at the federal level, which is a big deal, I believe, that they think this is trusted enough and they put their stamp on it.

So I’m thinking -- and I realize this is going to last decades, but as the universities come up with a better method, they could improve it.

Thank you.

MR. MCDONALD: Thank you. Appreciate it.

Was there anybody else from the public that wanted to speak? Okay.

For the record, you need to fill out your form afterwards, if you could state -- oh, you have your form here? Please state your name and address for the record.

MR. FORMAN: Wait, wait, wait. She just --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Tom, she just spoke.
MR. FORMAN: -- no, she didn’t just speak, but that microphone’s dead. Can we give her the other microphone?

MR. PETTIS: He’s giving it now.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

MS. ADAMS: Good evening and thank you. My name is Pamela Adams. I live at 425 Northwest 23rd Avenue. Yes, it’s me.

MR. MCDONALD: I didn’t recognize -- I can’t -- we can’t see. The lights (inaudible).

MS. ADAMS: I have a question about your affordable housing resolution, the fund. And I’d like to know what provisions are in the resolution to avoid the County or anyone else from sweeping those funds for uses other than affordable housing.

MR. MCDONALD: You want to answer that?

MR. GOREN: I can try.

Good evening. Nice to see you this evening, but I can’t see you, but --
MR. MCDONALD: The lights are --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. GOREN: -- the proposal of the Charter Review Commission is very -- is very serious, if you will, because it creates a trust fund within the County government. It does not provide the funding mechanism that is the source of funds, but it does provide for an irrevocable, essentially, trust that is set up which cannot be diverted and cannot be modified absent a Charter change.

So the end result is that, in some instances in the state, for example, we were -- we were told during public testimony from other experts that some state funds have been raided by the state government --

MS. ADAMS: Yes.

MR. GOREN: -- where there’s a need to divert funds for whatever purpose it may be.

In this situation, the proposal which the Charter Commission as a majority supported was to make sure that
there would be a fund maintained which was essentially impenetrable and would be protected and preserved eternally until otherwise changed by the Charter.

So the answer is it is a secure and considerate -- considered to be an impenetrable source for funding affordable housing as defined by the proposal.

MS. ADAMS: Thank you.

MR. GOREN: That was an important -- that was an important aspect to the members of the Commission that considered that issue, because they, too, were concerned that potential diversion of funds could occur, because they could. And that -- that’s not -- not contemplated by the proposal.

MS. ADAMS: That’s what my concern --

MR. GOREN: Yes, ma'am.

MS. ADAMS: -- was.

MR. MCDONALD: Thank you, Ms. Adams.

I have next Jacqueline Reed --

MR. VERNEY: It’s -- it’s fine if we leave the mic
there.

MR. MCDONALD: You can leave the mic.

Jacqueline Reed-Tufts?

MS. REED-TUFTS: Good evening, everyone. My name is Jacqueline Reed-Tufts. I’m a resident, and my address is 501 Northwest 21st Terrace, Fort Lauderdale.

And I just wanted to make a comment based on the -- the -- you not allowing the strong mayor’s vote to be placed on the ballot. And we really appreciate that, the fact that a system is in place and it is working. And we really would like to thank you for not putting that on the ballot.

MR. MCDONALD: Thank -- thank you.

I see Irv Minney out there. I can tell by his walk, I’ve known the guy for so long.

MR. MINNEY: (Inaudible.) About the strong mayor --

MR. GOREN: Sir, tell us who you are for the record so we can reflect that.
MR. FORMAN: The other microphone’s the one that’s working.

MR. MINNEY: Irvin Minney, 1800 Northwest 16th Street, Fort Lauderdale.

MR. GOREN: Thank you, sir.

MR. MINNEY: (Inaudible.)

MR. GOREN: Thank you, sir.

MR. MINNEY: My question is concerning the elected mayor or the strong mayor. Am I to assume that’s not going to be considered anymore this year?

MR. MCDONALD: This -- this is our last Public Hearing.

MR. MINNEY: This is the last Public Hearing.

MR. MCDONALD: And it’s finished. We voted it down.

MR. MINNEY: Now, additionally, I know that it appeared that you already made the decision to put that on the ballot, then you brought it to the public.

Is it possible next time you convene that -- in the
future, that you have discussion to see whether you should put something on the agenda? Like so we had to react to you, so you think you should have a -- a meeting concerning what you’re considering so we can give the input to help you make your decisions.

MR. VERNEY: I’m happy to address that.

We had -- we had meetings. We had meetings that -- that -- I guess you can consider that from the formation of the Governance Subcommittee meeting that issue was the -- the topic for most of those meetings.

I believe we’ve had a -- a June 22nd Public Hearing in 2017. I actually believe you may have attended that Public Hearing, if I’m not mistaken.

So we had public comments.

MR. MINNEY: Yeah.

The -- the -- you know, the -- but your -- to your point, I think, if you’re -- I’m not sure if you’re making this, but there is an important point that I’d like to make, that this Charter Review Commission didn’t
have the opportunity to -- to go out for Public Hearings in the beginning to gather the comments.

MR. MINNEY: That’s my point.

MR. VERNEY: Yeah, and -- and to that point, to address that point, we had six months where the Charter Review Commission was without a general counsel’s office, was without an Executive Director.

When I became the Executive Director, I had no budget. It took me two months to get money. And then the County changed their -- their internal system, so I had to access it later.

So I understand your point. It’s -- it’s a valid point, and it’s a point that, you know, I wish under different circumstances, but it’s -- it’s certainly a valid point.

In the past, with Charter Review Commissions, how they grouped their topics together was exactly the point you’re making. They actually did that, so --

MR. MCDONALD: Okay.
MR. VERNEY: -- it’s a valid point.

MR. MCDONALD: Well, before you got hired, Mr. Verney, we did have a couple Public Hearings. We had one at -- what’s the name of the park?

MR. VERNEY: You -- you had a public workshop.

MR. MCDONALD: Had a public workshop. The -- it was open to the public. The committee -- I know the League of Women Voters was there, the newspaper was there. We had a committee of all 19 members. And we picked the topics that were of interest to those 19 people.

Then we set up committees to discuss it. I mean, these were issues that -- I mean, that everybody -- we met for two years on the subcommittees to talk about it. They were publicly noticed that we discussed the strong mayor over -- you know, over a year we had Public Hearings.

I think -- who was the chair of the committee that -- Larry Davis?
MR. VERNEY: Larry Davis, correct.

MR. MCDONALD: Was -- was that chair. I mean, some of the committees that Grant -- some of the items that came out of Grant’s committee, he met for over a year, and the public was invited.

So we didn’t just come out with a -- we never actually had a resolution for the -- it was made at the -- it wasn’t made until the end, and that was by people that were supportive of a strong mayor. It was defeated, and a lot of it was -- I know Ms. Berry was there. She spoke. And who else was -- I think Pam Adams spoke at one time.

But, you know, it wasn’t tried to ram down anybody’s throat.

MR. MINNEY: No, no, I’m not suggesting that.

MR. MCDONALD: Okay.

MR. MINNEY: But I’m -- I guess (inaudible).

MR. MCDONALD: All right.

MR. MCDONALD: Maybe.
MR. MINNEY: Thank you very much.

MR. MCDONALD: Thank you.

Is there anybody else from the public that would like to speak before we close the meeting?

All right. So next -- anybody -- any of the board members like to speak before we close?

Okay. Do we want -- do we want to talk about the resolutions that we passed that aren’t Charter amendments?

MR. VERNEY: Sure.

MR. MCDONALD: Yeah. Carlos is going address -- we had two resolutions that were passed after the Marjory Stoneman Douglas. These are -- well, I’ll let Carlos explain both of them.

MR. VERNEY: On March 16th, 2018, the Broward County Charter Review Commission met and, in lieu [sic] of the tragedy that happened at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School, and there were two motions made.

The first motion was to direct general counsel’s
office to draft a resolution that would be forwarded to the County Commission asking and requesting of them to place a straw ballot vote to allow Broward County residents to express their feelings, whether they were in support of a ban on assault rifles or not.

And that motion passed ten to one.

The second motion made was, again, a resolution to direct the general -- our CRC general counsel’s office to draft a resolution that would be forwarded to the County Commission to seek any and all measures to have Section 790.33 of Florida Statutes -- that’s the preemption law that preempts local municipalities from regulating firearms within their jurisdiction. The state occupies, under Section 790.33 of Florida Statutes the whole field of firearm regulations.

That motion would be to -- to have a resolution forwarded to the County Commission so that they could have -- they could challenge that section of the Florida Statutes.
And that motion passed ten to one.

We are currently going to -- in the process of transmitting those resolutions to the County, and we hope that the County receives and considers those resolutions.

MR. MCDONALD: Thank you.

Did you want to explain why we didn’t address it ourselves?

MR. GOREN: I can.

For the record, I was able to explain to the members of the Charter Commission some concerns regarding a Statute that was just referred to by Mr. Verney. It’s called Section 790.33 of the Florida Statutes.

It’s better known as the super preemption statute in the State of Florida, which reserves unto the Legislature and the state itself total preemption with regard to anything and everything with regard to ammo, guns, rifles, any manner of things related to guns or
It’s called a super preemption statute because what it does is some very significant things if there’s a violation by local government, such as the County government or by city government, or by special district government.

In the event that local government were to try to regulate in any way, shape, or form gun management, gun control, gun ownership, or the sale and distribution of ammunition and related activities, there -- there are -- there are three potential penalties that are quite severe.

One of which is that the governor can remove from office any elected or appointed member of the body in the event of a violation of the Statute.

There’s also a potential for an imposition of the $5,000 fine individually, to be payable by the individual member of the public body for failure to comply with the Statute 790.33.
And probably even more serious than that is the potential for third party liability, whereby, for example, the NRA or some other organization, or the manufactures of the -- the manufacturers of the guns that are on the street now, AR-15s or Kalashnikovs, or call it what you will, for purposes of litigation, they could sue the public entity and individuals for their damages occasioned by the regulation or attempt to regulate guns and gun management, which would subject them to a cap of a hundred thousand dollars in potential damages, but as to the legal fees to be charged by their lawyers, they would be uncapped, with what’s called a multiplier, so that a typical fee of 500 bucks an hour, for example, could become $2,000 an hour.

Those penalties are quite severe and the consequence of which is that when this Commission debated and discussed the seriousness of that option and the moral effect of that decision, they took an oath of office as Charter Commission members to uphold the
Constitution and laws of the State of Florida and of the government, and I, as a lawyer, took a similar oath to be able to do the same thing.

And I would not be able to sign a document as to legal form, because the legal form would violate the state Statute.

There’s a distinction in the law to challenging a statute through what’s called a declaratory judgment action versus simply not complying with the law and violating it.

And this board chose not to violate the law.

Inasmuch as they had sincere and deep emotional feelings about the activities that occurred at Marjory Stoneman Douglas, they were compelled to make another decision, and they opted for the following option as described by the Charter Commission’s director.

And that is to request that the County Commission consider a straw ballot, asking the voters to consider, on a straw ballot basis, which would not change the
Charter but just simply take the temperature of the people in our community, their feeling about assault weapons, and to also support the County Commission on potentially filing a declaratory judgment action in court, whether it be state court or federal court, to challenge the preemption under 790.33 and the -- the punitive and Draconian provisions of that Statute going forward.

And that’s what that did.

MR. MCDONALD: I believe that the County Commission, Commissioner Michael Udine, is planning on bringing forward the straw ballot, and I think Vice Mayor Mark Bogen is interested in a dec action to question the legality of the law.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right.

MR. MCDONALD: I’d like to recognize our State Senator from this district, Mr. Perry Thurston.

MR. PETTIS: Perry Eugene Thurston.

MR. MCDONALD: Perry Gene Thurston, is it?
MR. PETTIS: Eugene.

MR. MCDONALD: Perry Eugene Thurston.

Is there anybody else from the public that would like to speak tonight before we close the meeting?

MR. PETTIS: Mr. Chair.

MR. MCDONALD: Yes, Mr. Pettis.

MR. PETTIS: And it’s along the lines of this gentleman’s comment. This is our fifth or sixth, I think, public meeting.

Is there any way -- and this is my first Charter Review, and very well may be my last. However, it seems a little backwards to have this series of five or six meetings after 99.99 percent of the work and decision making has been done.

Is there any way of, when we get our agenda set -- and we have public meetings and, you know, some of the individuals here came, but once we have our topics that we’re discussing, that we can have early on two or three meetings out in the public during evening hours where,
you know, a lot of our meetings started at, you know, 1:30.

MR. MCDONALD: Right.

MR. PETTIS: A lot of folks just don’t -- can’t get to us at 1:30. And we’re -- you know, we were over by 4:00 o’clock, typically.

Is there any way of -- of putting something where we can have a series of meetings early, maybe three meetings early so the public can do it and then hold these meetings at --

MR. MCDONALD: Right.

MR. PETTIS: -- the end? Because it just feels like things have been a little --

MR. MCDONALD: Yeah, you’re right, Mr. Pettis. But you got -- came on kind of halfway through?

MR. PETTIS: Right.

MR. MCDONALD: We discussed that. There was some encouragement to do it, but a lot of the board members -- you know, we can’t do anything about it now. It’s the
next one.

MR. PETTIS: No, no, no. It’s --

MR. MCDONALD: (Inaudible.)

MR. PETTIS: -- all for the future.

MR. MCDONALD: But other people had suggested it, and I’m not even sure why they decided against it. Do you remember?

MR. REYES: Didn’t we -- Mr. Chair --

MS. NORRIS-WEEKS: Well, I -- I -- I --

MR. REYES: -- didn’t we have a meeting in the --
in the Commission chambers at 6:00 o’clock at night? What was that?

MR. MCDONALD: Yes, we did.

MS. NORRIS-WEEKS: -- well, we had -- we had one --

MR. REYES: (Inaudible) public meetings.

MS. NORRIS-WEEKS: -- meeting, but that was actually under the Governance Subcommittee. It wasn’t actually a Charter Review Commission Public Hearing.

And so Mr. Minney makes a really great point. I
think he’s right. And actually --

MR. MCDONALD: But --

MS. NORRIS-WEEKS: -- for the last Charter Review Commission, we did have some Public Hearings that were, you know, before we actually got into the meat and potatoes of exactly what we were going to do.

But I think it’s going to probably change with every Charter Review Commission, Gene. And I don’t know that we can necessarily control what will take place 12 years ago and what people will decide to do as their governing rules and, you know --

MR. MCDONALD: Right.

MS. NORRIS-WEEKS: -- (inaudible) operate by.

MR. MCDONALD: The --

MS. NORRIS-WEEKS: So that’s the --

MR. MCDONALD: -- the Governance one that Ms. Weeks mentioned was -- that was mostly on the mayor, and --

MR. PETTIS: I remember that.

MR. MCDONALD: -- we had a -- we had I don’t know
how many speakers.

MR. PETTIS: There was a lot of people there.

MR. MCDONALD: A lot of people came, right.

And that was -- that was at night.

MR. PETTIS: But --

MR. MCDONALD: We also had the workshop on the weekend, I remember. It was (inaudible).

MS. NORRIS-WEEKS: Yeah, that was (inaudible).

MR. PETTIS: -- but is it something that we should leave open to the whim of future Charters of going to the public early? Why -- why does that have to --

MR. MCDONALD: I -- I would -- that’d probably be a good suggestion. I think you ought to start lobbying to get on the next Charter and you can (inaudible).

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

MR. MCDONALD: I mean, it’s a good suggestion. We -- we discussed it back then.

I have -- the only benefit of these Public Hearings, it was to clear -- that I’ve -- I’ve missed --
I went to four out of five. The one in Pembroke Pines, there was some questions that we clarified. They were concerned that Pembroke Pines had a 72-hour notice period, and they were afraid we were taking it away. We clarified that.

But we really haven’t changed much from the input at Public Hearings at the end.

You’re probably right. We probably should have more Public Hearings up front, at night (inaudible).

I am glad that Ms. Berry and Mr. Minney came to our previous ones, though, and gave us their input.

MR. VERNEY: Mr. Chair, if I may?

MR. MCDONALD: Yes.

MR. VERNEY: To the public, as well, and to the board members, I don’t know if the board members recall, but our first -- the first meeting where I was appointed, on February I believe it was the 6th, 2016, I think it was Commissioner Smith who had a suggestion that the CRC staff take down some notes and -- about the
Well, under the Charter, it’s the requirement and responsibility of the CRC staff to draft a final report. It’s the CRC staff’s intention not only to submit a final report, but also a helpful guide.

And I think the -- I would welcome the input from board members, as well as the public, on best practices, you know, because, quite simply, when -- when I came into this, there was no guide.

And I’m a firm believer that when you enter a -- an office, you leave it better than when you found it. And if future CRCs, you know, they -- you know, if they can be provided a helpful guide, a reference guide, if there are suggestions that -- that can be given to it -- because each CRC is different. And Commissioner Norris-Weeks is correct. You know, it’s different. It’s not better, it’s not worse, but just different.

And, you know, the members kind of craft their own rules, and we could provide that guiding to the next
CRC, and they could say, okay, we -- we like it, we find it helpful, but we want to do things a little differently.

But if -- if you have any public comments, those are certainly welcome, because I actually think your -- you and Commissioner Norris-Weeks and Mr. Minney are absolutely correct.

MR. MCDONALD: Thank you.

Is there anybody else from the public that would like to speak?

Any other board members?

MR. FORMAN: I have a question.

MR. MCDONALD: Yes.

MR. FORMAN: We have a meeting on Monday?

MR. MCDONALD: Yes.

MR. FORMAN: Okay. I didn’t get a notice of that, so I -- I’m -- I’ll do what I can.

And what time is that --

MR. MCDONALD: 3:00 --
MR. FORMAN: -- meeting?

MR. MCDONALD: -- 3:00 o’clock.

MR. FORMAN: Okay. I did not get a notice of the changed time of the March 16th meeting, either, from 1:30 to 10:00. So -- and I had -- I went to Governmental Center that day, and I did not have notice of it, so I was the committee of one.

And so, anyhow, I just want to make sure that it’s on Monday at 3:00 o’clock in Room 430.

MR. MCDONALD: Yes.

MR. VERNEY: Yes, Mr. Forman, and we’ll be happy to -- to -- to reach out to you --

MR. FORMAN: Okay. And --

MR. VERNEY: -- to confirm.

MR. FORMAN: -- and --

MR. VERNEY: Because I believe the meeting invites were sent, but we’ll -- we’ll double check.

MR. FORMAN: Well, I just went in my mailbox, and I don’t see it.
MR. MCDONALD: Did you go in your CRC mailbox?

MR. FORMAN: I did, yeah.

So I think that’s great if you want to have a thing. I know my daughter, the last job she completed, one of the things that she did was create a manual that got left behind. It was the cookbook. And they were discussing -- an organization I was with today, and they were saying it was just great. So I mean --

MR. MCDONALD: That’s a -- that’s a good idea. And I think that’s what Carlos was referring to. I’m going to be talking to Carlos after the --

MR. FORMAN: Right.

MR. MCDONALD: -- the meeting, because he’s -- we’re going to have to talk about the public education portion --

MR. VERNEY: Absolutely.

MR. MCDONALD: -- that we’re going to have to handle the next time.

MR. VERNEY: Absolutely.
MS. MAYLOR: Question, Mr. Chair.

MR. MCDONALD: Yes.

MS. MAYLOR: Will we get his final notes or final report, as well, to review and comment on it?

MR. VERNEY: Absolutely.

MS. NORRIS-WEEKS: And I just want to say, I guess, for the record, that Pat West was available. She came to some of our meetings. I know that she made herself available to you, Carlos.

MR. VERNEY: She did. She was great.

MS. NORRIS-WEEKS: So -- and we had rules of procedure that we pretty much implemented, and they were just about the same as we had for the last Charter Review Commission.

So -- so to really say that there was nothing in place I think is not completely accurate.

And I think that all of the Commissions are a little bit different. I don’t know that you’re necessarily going to be able to create a manual based
upon the times that will exist 12 years from now and that may not duplicate themselves for whatever reason.

So I just -- you know, I don’t want it -- I guess the -- the thought left out there that somehow the previous Executive Director, who was excellent, somehow, you know, did not --

MR. MCDONALD: One --

MS. NORRIS-WEEKS: -- do something that would have helped.

MR. VERNEY: No. And by no means was it ever that I wanted to insinuate. She -- she was -- she --

MR. MCDONALD: -- one --

MR. VERNEY: -- reached out to us and she was helpful.

MR. MCDONALD: -- one of the reasons that -- and I apologize to Mr. Minney -- one of the reasons that we ended up picking some of the times we did, you had 19 people coming from all over the County. You know what that traffic’s like. And people didn’t want to get
stuck in the rush hour traffic at night coming downtown, and they didn’t want to get stuck in the rush hour traffic. We had people come from Miramar, Hollywood. Two of us were from Parkland. We had one from Coral Springs.

And people -- so we tried to be centrally located, but maybe we should have had more at night, and we’ll recommend that at the next one.

Seeing any other -- any other comments from anybody?

MR. FORMAN: Mr. Chairman.

MR. MCDONALD: Oh, I’m sorry. Did you want to speak again?

MR. CERBOLA: Yes, if I could. Name is Mike Cerbola.

And this might be more appropriate as an example of a reason to have the public speakers first, but one of the things that I’ve heard bandied around by the students was the possibility of having a student
orchestrated bond issuance for safety in schools, where it would be what’s called a social impact -- impact bond, where there is an assurance made by the bond, and if you meet certain criteria, for example, then the payout is a little bit different. They’re done quite a bit elsewhere.

But the idea would be to -- I was real excited when you said you were going to do a straw vote. That’s very innovative. That you guys are pushing the envelope with the gun control like that was impressive, and it occurred to me that perhaps there’s a way to get something out to the voters sooner than I -- I thought possible on the possibility of the students helping to put that together.

The idea would be to make the schools safer in a fundamental way, not as much focusing on guns and restricting the physical access, but on making them the last place you’d want to go to do harm, and actually focus on education and --
MR. MCDONALD: What --

MR. CERBOLA: -- social/emotional learning and things like that, with a like 50 to $200,000,000 bond --

MR. MCDONALD: -- one of the problems I think --

MR. CERBOLA: -- issuance.

MR. MCDONALD: -- is that that’s the Broward County school system, which does not come under the Charter Review.

We’ve even addressed trying to do things such as put the Auditor over the Broward County School Board, but we’re not allowed to do anything.

MR. CERBOLA: I wonder if they could be outside of that (inaudible).

MR. MCDONALD: They may be able to do that.

MR. CERBOLA: Or you guys, through the County and working with the students, perhaps. It’s just a thought.

MR. MCDONALD: Thank you.

Any other comments or questions?
AGENDA ITEM VII - ADJOURNMENT

MR. MCDONALD: I want to thank everybody. Thank you for coming tonight.

I hope we -- how many votes -- how many people do we need to have there Monday?

MR. VERNEY: We need a quorum.

MR. GOREN: You need a quorum.

MR. MCDONALD: You need a quorum of --

MR. GOREN: Ten.

MR. MCDONALD: -- ten.

MR. VERNEY: Ten.

MR. MCDONALD: So I’m hoping that some of you will come in for the two hours. It might be our last session.

Think about how you would like Carlos to get the word out to inform the voters, and we’ll discuss that on Monday, also.

At this time, we’re adjourned.

Thank you.
(The meeting concluded at 6:56 p.m.)