

Minutes

Charter Review Commission

The City of Daytona Beach, Florida

June 3, 2014

Minutes of the Charter Review Commission of The City of Daytona Beach, Florida, held on Tuesday, June 3, 2014 at 6:00 p.m., City Hall, City Commission Chambers, 301 S. Ridgewood Avenue, Daytona Beach, Florida.

Attendance.

Members

Gary Libby	Present
Blaine Lansberry	Present
Kelly Kwiatek	Present
Thomas Leek	Present
Willie Kimmons	Present
L. Roland Blossom	Absent
Glenn S. Ritchey, Chairman	Present

Alternate Members

Ruth Trager	Present
Ed Savard	Present
Dan Bolerjack	Absent
Jill Pennington	Absent
Christi McGee	Absent
Tony Barhoo	Absent
John Huger	Absent

Also Present:

Marie Hartman, City Attorney
Ron McLemore, Deputy City Manager/Public Works
Jennifer L. Thomas, City Clerk

1. Welcome
2. Approval of the minutes

No minutes for approval.

3. Discussion – Charter Review Commission

Glenn Ritchey, Chairman called the committee to order and asked for a roll call.

Jennifer Thomas, City Clerk stated there are two alternate members present; Ed Savard and Christi McGee.

Mr. Ritchey stated this Commission was assembled by our elected City Commission. Each Commissioner chose a member on this committee to review our Charter because our current one requires a review every 10 years. We are starting our final meetings to complete a draft Charter for the City Commission to evaluate our recommendations for acceptance or see if they have any changes. They will make the decision to move forward or not or maybe add to them. The next step would be a referendum vote by the community. The referendum would be on the general election ballot and not the primary ballot set for November 4th, 2014. He asked Ron McLemore for his comments to the group.

Ron McLemore, Deputy City Manager/Operations presented some suggestions to the committee members. He explained the elected bodies meetings were not good from the onset of government. The idea was to have them focus on important issues, shorter meeting times and having Staff ready the items for decision making. The City Managers and National City Clerks Associations came up with a model process of how the agenda process should flow to get the maximum efficiency out of it. The City currently incorporates all of those factors and recommendations performed by administrative directions without a written Commission policy pertaining to the agenda process. He stated that he wanted clear rules to work by overseeing the elected body. Sometimes there is more conflict with the members of the elected body than there is between the elected body and the City Manager.

Dr. Kimmons asked Mr. McLemore if you have a disagreement between the City Manager and the Mayor, who would make the final decision.

Mr. McLemore stated his recommendation to the board was, “The Manager is responsible for administering the agenda in accordance with the policy established by the written policy, adopted by a Resolution established by the City Commission.”

Gary Libby asked why you wouldn’t include exactly what you just said into the Charter, but list it under the Duties of the Commission. The Charter Amendment would modify the responsibilities and authorities of the Commission to include access to the agenda.

Mr. McLemore stated it would say the City Manager is accountable to the City Commission to perform an administrative function with that function being the agenda process. The City Manager will do that in accordance to the rules that are set in writing of the policy.

Mr. Libby stated we need to do that because we don’t have a policy in this City.

Mr. McLemore stated his recommendations to the committee was just those words. The notes that he gave to the board last time said the City Manager would do it, in writing in accordance with Resolution written and approved by the City Commission.

Mr. Libby stated you would not put the rule in the Charter but as an Ordinance.

Mr. McLemore stated you would put the rule to have the policy in writing in the Charter.

Mr. Libby asked why it could not be put with the agenda.

Mr. McLemore stated because that it is an administrative function. The function of the City Commission is to write the rules to establish the policy. The City Manager carries out the policy. You do not have a written policy at this time but a set of practices.

Dr. Kimmons asked Mr. McLemore what the agenda process was.

Mr. McLemore stated that is the process for actually developing the agenda for the meetings. The City Manager administers that policy that is put into place by the City Commission. The final process of approval is done by the City Commission at the beginning of each commission meeting. At the beginning of each meeting the Commission has the authority to say they would like certain items to be added or taken off the agenda. At the end of the meeting they can discuss what can be added to the next agenda at which point it becomes part of public record.

Mr. Ritchey stated as a Commissioner and Mayor you have agenda reviews prior to every meeting with the City Manager.

Mr. McLemore read his recommendations to be passed on to the City Commission for approval to the members.

Mr. Libby made the motion and recommendation that the CRC accept the wording recommended by Mr. McLemore to be added to the appropriate sections of the CRC report.

Dr. Kimmons seconded the motion.

Mr. Ritchey asked if there was any further discussion.

Mr. Ritchey stated that this motion will add Section H to the Managerial Duties and a sentence stating the City Commission shall adopt a Resolution.

Ms. Hartman, City Attorney stated they were both Charter Amendments and they complement each other.

Mr. Ritchey stated he would like to see the language changed to read, "The City Commission shall adopt a Resolution."

Ms. Hartman stated in Section 12 of the Charter we would add this sentence to the Charter: "The City Commission shall adopt a Resolution". The Resolution would be later adopted by the Commission and the Resolution itself would not be a part of the Charter. The Resolution can be changed the same as any other as necessary by the City Commission.

Mr. Ritchey stated the motion will add Section H to the Managerial Duties and a sentence stating the City Commission shall adopt a Resolution.

Mr. Libby made the motion. Dr. Kimmons seconded the motion.

The motion carried 7-0.

Mr. Ritchey stated the other night we discussed criminal checks for elected officials.

Ms. Hartman stated when researching the subject, the City Commission had discussed it and by motion they said a criminal background check should be done for all city board applicants. Her understanding at the last meeting was if there was already a policy in place, it was fine and if not then they would put it in the Charter. It was only a motion by the Commission and applied only to city boards. She did add a provision to the City Charter under the City Clerk's duties that states "the City Clerk is to obtain the code enforcement and criminal history for all applicants for elected and appointed offices."

Mr. Ritchey stated we will add a provision to the City Charter under the City Clerk's duties that states "the City Clerk is to obtain the code enforcement and criminal history for all applicants for elected and appointed offices." He called for a roll call vote. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Libby made a motion. Mr. Kimmons seconded the motion.

The motion carried 7-0.

Mr. Libby asked to refer back to Item 20 because he did not think they completed discussing the initiative of the referendum.

Mr. Ritchey stated this will take us to the initiative referendum - Item 20. He asked Mr. McLemore if he or the other members had any comments.

Mr. Libby stated we were looking at the County model to apply to our situation in deciding about the 20 percent reduction being lowered to five percent. The individual that would be soliciting the signatures would have to be verified and the petitions notarized. He was in favor of following the County's model.

Mr. Ritchey asked Mr. Libby if the County had a caveat regarding the 16 cities having a part in that as well; not the overall vote of the County but a certain participation from each city.

Jennifer L. Thomas, City Clerk stated we discussed it a few months ago.

Mr. Libby asked if it could be pulled when they take a break. We could plug that language in if it's applicable.

Mr. Ritchey stated if it's applicable but if we were going to do it for the City and depending upon a certain turn out for each zone so that one or two zones could not get together and carry a referendum that the other zone or zones may not want to participate in. He would like to see what the County model says.

Mr. Libby stated he did not believe that the County model allows for sub towns within a city to reject the referendum just because they do not like it.

Mr. Ritchey stated there's a caveat in that 20 percent being lowered to five percent.

Ms. Hartman stated she could pull it up on the computer. It's five percent by zone or district.

Mr. Ritchey stated it was not just a total vote.

Ms. Hartman stated it was the petition to get it on the ballot and the vote will be a majority one.

Mr. Ritchey stated there's something other than five percent of the population voting to the electorate to put it on as a referendum.

Mr. Libby stated he did not think that would reference us as a separate city. He asked Mrs. Kuendig if she had the referendum language because it seems to mirror the County's new process accurately.

Ms. Hartman stated she pulled up the County's Charter Amendment and it states the amendments to this Charter may be proposed by a petition signed by at least five percent of the electors from each council district of the County. Any such petition shall be filed with the County Manager, executed and validated by the Supervisor of Elections.

Mr. Ritchey stated it takes five percent from each district.

Ms. Hartman stated she did not know how many districts there were.

Thomas Leek stated if you look at Item 2 under Section 41, the end of the first sentence states at least five percent of the vote from the registered voters from each zone ... then it goes on to say 20 percent of the total of registered voters and at least five percent from each zone in the city.

Mr. Libby stated the County has eliminated the 20 percent number from their Charter and we should also; make it the five percent from each zone with a majority pf the people voting.

Weegie Kuendig, 718 North Wild Olive Avenue, Daytona Beach stated what we had said in our documentation was delete all language requiring any affidavit of the circulator; delete language requiring percentages required from each zone; at a minimum, adopt the percentage requirement now used by the County or State whichever was lower for voters to get an issue or Charter amendment on the ballot.

Mr. Libby stated he would like to move to accept that language for the sake of discussion.

Mr. Ritchey stated we have a motion to accept the language Mrs. Kuendig stated. We have a second by Dr. Kimmons. We can now hold the discussion.

Mr. Leek stated he would rather defer this until he can read what the County's model states. He believes there was some language lacking in some areas that Mrs. Kuendig just read. He asked if there was a minimum number of voters needed citywide in order to get a referendum. The Charter was like the United States Constitution, you cannot make it too easy to amend.

Mr. Libby stated this was not to necessarily change the Charter but to get an item before the electorate.

Mr. Leek stated he will retract the word Charter but does not think it would be a good idea to make it too easy to put things on the ballot for a vote.

Mr. Libby agreed with Mr. Leek but was the existing language that the Save Our Neighborhood (SON) organization took issue with gives the perception of a petition drive.

Mr. Leek stated we do need to have a discussion but he has not seen any evidence where the Charter restricts anything from happening by any group of citizens at all. What they have now was very reasonable compared to other Charters he has read and unless he sees something else he does not see a reason to change it.

Dr. Kimmons stated Mrs. Kuendig put it very precise and clear.

Mr. Leek stated she referenced the County's process without using the numbers; that what was not clear to him.

Mr. Libby stated there was another SON handout that stated each specific item listed.

Mr. McLemore stated he would like to offer them a word of caution to think about. He was not sure he would recommend having certain language in the Charter stating that it would be like the County's. If you want to do it, then put your own language in there and let it be your language. It may be the same language as the County's but they may end up changing theirs a year later or so. It could end up causing potential problems in the future.

Ms. Hartman stated the only thing in the County Charter regarding the amendment by petition was the section that was read to you that states amendments to this Charter may be proposed by a petition signed by at least five percent of the electors from each municipal district in the County. Any such petition shall be filed with the County Manager and shall be executed and validated or invalidated by the Supervisor of Elections.

Mr. Libby made a motion to adopt the language and substitute “divisions of the County” to “zones in the City.”

Dr. Kimmons seconded the motion.

Mr. Leek stated the five percent is for each zone. There is no reference to the 20 percent overall. The language that SON recommended says “delete all language requiring any affidavit of the circular, delete language requiring percentages from each zone and adopt a percentage requirement now used by the County or State.

Mr. Libby stated he was in favor of adopting the County’s language to substitute “divisions of the County” to “zones in the City”. We mirror the County.

Blaine Lansberry stated we are ultimately deleting the 20 percent.

Ms. Hartman stated the initiative and referendum section of our working draft Charter only deals with adoption or repeal of an Ordinance. We took any reference to Charter Amendment out of that article of the Charter and amended Section 46 to address an amendment of the Charter.

Mr. Leek stated Section 40 refers only to an Ordinance.

Ms. Hartman stated correct; it’s a procedure neither regulated nor mandated by state law. It’s a procedure solely for adoption of an Ordinance by referendum or to repeal an Ordinance that the City Commission adopted.

Mr. Libby stated the motion on the floor is to adopt the language that Ms. Hartman gave them for Ordinances and etcetera with a substitution of “divisions of the County” to “zones of the City”.

Ms. Hartman stated the section she read from the County deals with the amendment of the County Charter.

Mr. Libby asked if there was a section on the repeal of Ordinances.

Ms. Hartman stated she does not know if they have one.

Mr. Libby asked Ms. Kuendig whether or not the SON question was about Ordinances and/or Charter revisions.

Mr. Ritchey stated both.

Mr. Libby withdrew his initial motion.

Mr. Kimmons withdrew his second.

Mr. Libby stated we have a new motion to adopt the County language with a substitution of zone for the divisions of the City to be applicable to both Ordinances and Charter provisions.

Mr. Kimmons seconded the motion.

Mr. Leek asked if they were just replacing paragraph two and how does that effect the rest of that section.

Ms. Hartman asked Mr. Libby if his proposal was to use the County's language for the initiative and referendum and for Charter amendment.

Mr. Libby stated yes.

Ms. Hartman asked about a further change in section 46.

Mr. Leek stated we already approved the current language.

Ms. Hartman stated yes and to make the changes in section 41.

Ms. Lansberry stated she was getting lost as to the point of all of this.

Mr. Libby stated the language seems to be outdated and discriminatory and does not give a perception of citizen's access into the process. The recommendation was adoption rather than to adopt language from a municipality or jurisdiction that had undergone this review and tailor make it for our needs.

Ms. Lansberry stated we keep using the word perception but we should go back to reality where we do a better job of helping people through the process.

Mr. Ritchey stated he agreed that some adjustments need to be made but does not agree in the languages where people could adopt putting a referendum on the agenda to cut water bills, budgets, salaries and that could be very damaging to the City.

Mr. Libby stated he agreed.

Mr. Leek asked how are they out of line with the other Charters in the 21st century.

Mr. Libby stated the citizens of the SON group can answer this.

Weegie Kuendig, 718 North Wild Olive Avenue, Daytona Beach stated your own County has a different set of rules. It is a right for citizens to petition their government and when you put road blocks in front of that, this is the part we're trying to eliminate. The suggestions we handed in are not in any way Charter language, they were merely ideas to be presented and somehow be written into Charter language. We should follow County rules as an example of what you might put into the Charter.

Ms. Lansberry stated so it's the percentages and the circulator.

Mr. Libby stated Mr. Ritchey the motion that's currently on the floor eliminates the second item addressing the reduction in the number.

Mr. Ritchey stated he would like to hear the motion again.

Mr. Libby stated he will withdraw his motion because it referenced Ms. Hartman's quote of the County language.

Mr. Kimmons withdrew his second.

Mr. Ritchey stated to Ms. Hartman that he was looking to her for some guidance on what exactly the impact has by any action we take on the circulator.

Mr. Libby stated the motion would be the elimination of the circulator and the reduction from 20 to five percent.

Ms. Lansberry stated she recalled one person speaking to the circulator issue and he was quite passionate about that issue.

Mr. Ritchey stated he had a failed attempt called STAND (Striving Toward A Different Daytona) that dealt with water bills but will not be in favor of doing away with the City attorney's office. It interferes with the budget that's been set by the Commission but he is flexible when it comes to a better way to make it more approachable by the citizens of the community.

Mr. Libby stated his suggestion that maybe Ms. Hartman and Mrs. Kuendig could meet and collaborate on this together. He has some reservations about the circulator also.

Ms. Hartman stated with respect of the circulator those provisions have already been removed from the Charter Amendment petition process. The only requirements for the Charter Amendment petition are those which are imposed by the Supervisor of Elections (SOE) in order to verify the signatures. A number of the Charters did not have initiative referendum provisions for Ordinance initiatives at all.

Mr. Libby asked Ms. Hartman to eliminate the Ordinance part of this and just going with amendments to the Charter, the only reduction would be the motion to go from the 20 to the five percent.

Mr. Leek stated the Charter has its own section, Section 46 and it doesn't have any reference to percentages; it's only the Ordinance section that had percentages.

Ms. Hartman stated the State Statute that is referenced in Section 46 is a 10 percent requirement by statute.

Mr. Leek asked if it was possible to change the Ordinance language to reflect using that same home rule 166 which has the minimum percentages required by the state or maximum.

Ms. Hartman stated we would change it from 10 percent to 20.

Mr. Libby motioned that that language be amended to not less than 10 percent.

Mr. Kimmons seconded the motion.

Mr. Ritchey stated this is very important and to hurry through it wouldn't be doing any justice.

Mr. Libby stated the man who is circulating the petitions should be required to have his signature certified.

Mr. Ritchey stated he agreed with the change from 20 to 10 instead of 20 to five.

Mr. Libby made a motion to change the percentage from 20 to 10. Mr. Ritchey seconded the motion.

The motion carried 7-0.

Ms. Hartman stated that would be a change to Section 41 in your working draft; Section 41 paragraph three where it says 20 percent – we would change that to 10.

Mr. Ritchey stated the motion was to change the percentage from 20 to 10.

Mr. Libby made the motion and recommendation to accept the wording to be added to the appropriate sections of the CRC report. Mr. Ritchey seconded the motion.

The motion carried 7-0.

Dr. Kimmons stated he was aware they approved the background checks and asked if it was for elected official or board members.

Mr. Ritchey stated it was for both.

Mr. Kimmons asked if a person with a criminal history has been exonerated of a crime and the record cleared, what happens next.

Mr. Ritchey stated he believes it's the flexibility issue he was talking about earlier. The review is important but it does not prohibit the hiring. It is up to the personnel department because if we bind them and say no one with a criminal history can serve would be a mistake.

Mr. Libby asked City Clerk Thomas to look into the County language.

Mr. Ritchey stated this would be an issue for the City Attorney. He did not think this subject needed to be part of the Charter.

Mr. Libby stated we gave the responsibility to the City Clerk as a Charter officer.

Mr. Ritchey stated it was his suggestion but he can understand how mistakes have been made. The flexibility should remain with the people that do the actual hiring or appointing.

Mr. Libby stated there is a huge difference between arrested and convicted or arrested or convicted.

Mr. Ritchey stated he still did not want to put something in the Charter that would be so prohibited. Moving along now, we have made great progress in going through our list. It is not our authority to approve but discuss the subject to move it forward to the City Commission. They will determine whether any changes are to be made and it will become the citizen's and community's voters' choice to have them adopted or not.

Mr. Leek stated we had discussed requiring the City Manager to make quarterly financial reports.

Mr. Ritchey stated he thought that had passed and also added an annual State of the City address by the Mayor.

Mr. Libby stated the fair share allocation of funds may have been quarterly.

Mr. Leek state no, this was completely separate; a business report ...

Mr. Ritchey stated he remembers that. He asked Mr. Leek if he was saying quarterly financial reports.

Mr. Leek stated yes. It would compare actual expenditures to the budget just like you would in a business but for the City and the City Manager would be required to answer to the City Commission.

Mr. Ritchey stated he understands that but with that motion it would be six meetings.

Mr. Libby asked if this could be a policy by the Commission rather than forcing it into the Charter.

Mr. Leek stated it could be a policy.

Mr. Ritchey remembered the discussion and they did approve the reports.

Ms. Hartman stated she believed it was placed under the City Manager's duties to Section 28. She could not recall any action or decision on what should be added.

Jim Cameron, Senior Vice President of Government Relations for the Daytona Beach Regional Chamber of Commerce, 126 East Orange Avenue, Daytona Beach stated the discussion tonight as it relates to the petitioning process should concur with the state law. They do like the idea of seven members on the Planning Board and the periodic budget status reports. He would like to recommend, in addition to the Charter, the idea of a recommendation to the Commission that they review the current City advisory boards for possible mergers or restructuring. He commended the efforts of the CRC.

Mr. Ritchey stated he agrees with Mr. Cameron and as a member of this Commission had stated earlier, you are elected to a zone but when you sit up here, you vote on citywide issues. He appreciated Mr. Cameron's comments.

Mr. Blossom stated Mr. Cameron made a great comment on streamlining some of the advisory boards. We have too many boards that are inactive or not viable.

Mr. Cameron stated there was a task force many years ago and we did look into that concern.

Mr. Ritchey stated it was still important for the citizens and non-citizens to participate even though they may not have been elected.

Dr. Kimmons stated they should have a specified month for the Mayor's annual address.

Mr. Ritchey stated if you have a newly elected Mayor in November and then ask him to make the address in January – that's not quite fair.

Dr. Kimmons stated he was suggesting January, but he thinks they should have a specified time.

Mr. Libby stated the County does it at the end of the year as a summary and a look forward.

Mr. Ritchey stated the County Chair gave one recently, just after his heart attack. He scheduled it a week after.

Mr. Libby stated he believes these addresses were given in a "summer" month and it was a look forward into the next year.

Dr. Kimmons stated he didn't care as long as it was a specified time.

Mr. Ritchey asked for Mr. McLemore's opinion.

Ron McLemore, Deputy City Manager/Operations, stated the question is if they want to be in sync with the fiscal year or the calendar year. If they gave the address in October, after the adoption of the budget, they would have everything right in hand.

Mr. Ritchey stated November would be good.

Ms. Hartman stated the elections are held at the beginning of November.

Dr. Kimmons stated he would like that stated that it is immediately after the budget process.

Mr. McLemore stated the first of November would be good.

Mr. Libby stated that Number 23 bothered him tremendously and was a tight vote. The suggestion was never "confirmation" by the City Commission on the hiring of department heads. The wording was "review" by the City Commission. He was unsure if that would have made a difference in the final vote.

Ms. Lansberry stated she took notes during that and the item failed 2-to-5.

Mr. Libby stated he remembered that.

Mr. Ritchey stated he wouldn't mind seeing language that stated the City Manager should introduce all Department Head new hires to the Commission; whoever hires someone should fire that person.

Mr. Libby stated the response he received was that it may be months before the Commission meets the new department heads.

Mr. Ritchey stated they could suggest to add that language.

Mr. Leek stated he found what he was looking for. Originally he had it as Item H but now it would have to be Item I. It states: "submit to the City Commission a quarterly financial report describing budget versus actual spending including capital expenditures."

Mr. Libby stated he would second that.

Mr. Ritchey clarified it includes capital expenditures.

Mr. Leek stated yes, on the fiscal quarter.

Ms. Hartman asked Mr. Leek to read the motion again.

Mr. Libby stated he thinks that report would be easy to do but that it won't make sense with the way money flows in and out of the City. He asked about doing it maybe twice a year.

Mr. Leek stated the report would be two to three pages showing operating or capital expenditures.

Mr. Libby stated he understands.

Mr. Leek stated and showing progress on capital expenditures. They budgeted a million dollars for a certain project and they have spent \$500,000 and they are half done. Each of those could have a footnote explaining an aberration.

Mr. Libby stated he has managed a non-for-profit budget that is in many ways like a City budget. There are a lot of unknowns. He had to report monthly to a board and there were a lot of footnotes trying to explain. There are a lot of cash transfers in our budget. It is the City Manager managing the City resources. He believes reporting twice a year would be more accurate.

Mr. Ritchey stated he believes with the Mayor giving a report three times a year would suffice.

Mr. Libby stated if Mr. Leek feels strongly about quarterly ...

Mr. Leek stated he thought he was making a compromise by asking for quarterly. He is used to having to make monthly reports. If three times is more doable. He sees this as a concise three or four page document.

Mr. Libby stated that the devil is in the details and the wording on the motion needs to be more specific. The motion is pretty general.

Mr. Leek stated that the motion was pretty specific; fully reporting the revenue and expenses.

Mr. Libby he agrees with him, he just doesn't know how accurate it could be the way City finances work.

Mr. Leek stated if it is not accurate...if the bookkeeping for the City isn't accurate.

Mr. Libby stated no one is saying the bookkeeping isn't accurate.

Mr. Leek stated then the report would be accurate.

Dr. Kimmons stated they thought they made a compromise with the Mayor's address and they would go from four to three.

Mr. Leek stated he agreed.

Mr. Libby stated he accepts that and amended his second.

Ms. Hartman asked if that would amend it to every four months.

Mr. McLemore stated that they already do quarterly reports.

Mr. Libby stated if we are already doing that, then we don't need Charter amendment.

Mr. Leeks asked if the Commission got these reports or just the Departments.

Mr. McLemore stated he believes they do.

Mr. Ritchey stated we will take the 'belief' out of it and make it part of the motion.

Mr. Libby amended back his second.

Mr. Ritchey stated they would be putting language in the Charter for the Commission to receive this quarterly report.

Ms. Lansberry asked if it would just be a report or would there be a presentation as well.

Mr. Leek stated he would expect a discussion if not a formal presentation.

Ms. Lansberry clarified that it would be at a meeting.

Mr. Leek stated yes.

Mr. Ritchey stated the discussion would be determined by the Commission.

Dr. Kimmons stated the Mayor can combine all the reports and make one big report.

Mr. Ritchey stated the motion was for the Commission to receive quarterly reports. He called for a roll call vote. The motion passed unanimously.

Gary Libby	Yea
Blaine Lansberry	Yea
Kelly Kwiatek	Yea
Thomas Leek	Yea
Dr. Willie Kimmons	Yea
L. Roland Blossom	Yea
Glenn S. Ritchey	Yea

Ms. Hartman asked if she should add the language for 'in the month of November' to the Mayor's Address.

Mr. Ritchey stated yes.

Mr. Leeks asked what do they do when there's a new Mayor.

Mr. Ritchey stated you would schedule it while the old Mayor is still presiding.

Mr. Leek asked if it would be enough time to close the books.

Mr. McLemore stated you would have a quarterly report and not a year ending report but it could be done.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

Neil Harrington, 101 Grand Oak Circle, Daytona Beach, stated we don't have enough advisory boards and if the current boards don't work that is the fault of the Commission.

Mr. Ritchey stated the conversation wasn't necessarily about getting rid of boards but about streamlining and perhaps merging boards.

Mr. Harrington stated there are too many lobbyists in the City than is good for the City.

Mr. Ritchey thanked Mr. Harrington for speaking. He thanked the CRC for all their hard work. He announced the presentation of the report to the City Commission will be on June 18, 2014.

4. Closing remarks

Mr. Libby stated he was going to type up some comments and submit them to the City Clerk. He thanked Mr. Ritchey, the Mayor and the Commission. He thanked the CRC. He is glad they are going to include the proposals that were voted down and the suggestions from the public. He thanked City staff for their work. He suggested better ways to perform the Charter Review in the future. He suggested having access to experts for best practices for government.

Mr. Ritchey remembers that and he believes some of the comments were that no one knows better what the City of Daytona Beach needs than the City itself and they didn't need to pay a professional.

Mr. Libby stated the credibility of the CRC work would be enhanced by a variety of opinions. He feels their job is not over but just beginning as they move the report to the Commission.

Dr. Kimmons stated his colleagues have a diversity of knowledge. He was proud to volunteer and participate.

Ms. Lansberry thanked the citizens that participated in the process. She thanked City staff for all the work they did and information they provided. She thanked the other members of the CRC.

06-03-14

Kelly Kwiatek thanked the City staff for all their help. She thanked the CRC and the public for their participation.

Mr. Leek thanked City staff and the citizens for their participation. He recommends that citizens communicate with their Commissioner on a regular basis. He thanked the CRC and enjoyed the debates they had. They should all be proud of the work they did.

Mr. Ritchey gave accolades to Mr. Blossom. He thanked the City staff for all their hard work and the materials they provided. He thanked the citizens for coming out. He thanked the Commission for appointing them and giving them an opportunity to serve.

5. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further discussion or comments the meeting was adjourned at 7:50 p.m.


JENNIFER L. THOMAS
City Clerk

Attested/Certified: City Clerk

RECORD REQUIRED TO APPEAL: In accordance with Florida Statute 286.0105 if you should decide to appeal any decision the City Commission makes about any matter at this meeting, you will need a record of the proceedings. You are responsible for providing this record. You may hire a court reporter to make a verbatim transcript, or you may buy a cd of the meeting for \$2.00 at the City Clerk's office. Copies of cds are only made upon request. The City is not responsible for any mechanical failure of the recording equipment.

STATE OF FLORIDA)

COUNTY OF VOLUSIA)

I, JENNIFER L. THOMAS, City Clerk and custodian of the official records of The City of Daytona Beach, Florida, do hereby certify that the attached is a true and correct original record of **Charter Review Commission's (CRC) minutes** for the meeting dated **June 3, 2014**, as it appears in the files and records of The City of Daytona Beach.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand as such City Clerk and affixed hereto the official seal of The City of Daytona Beach, Florida, on this 1st day of September, 2014.


JENNIFER L. THOMAS
CITY CLERK