

CITY OF POMPANO BEACH
BROWARD COUNTY
FLORIDA

CHARTER AMENDMENT BOARD
City Commission Conference Room

July 24, 2025
6:00 p.m.

MINUTES

The meeting was called to order by the Vice-Chair of the board, Mr. Gary Enos, at 6:23 p.m.

Those members present were:

Christopher Krzemien
Gary Enos
Heather Gilchrist
Quenton Thompson, Sr.
Robin McCombs

Late:
Whitney Rawls

Also Present:
Kervin Alfred, City Clerk
Brittany Tilson, Deputy City Clerk

* * * * *

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

MOTION was made by Christopher Krzemien and seconded by Heather Gilchrist that the minutes of April 8, 2024 to be approved.

All voted in favor of the motion.

NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Alfred suggested deviating from the agenda by discussing Item 2 prior to the election of the chair and vice-chair, given that the board was not at full capacity. The members consented to this proposal.

**ITEM 2 – CONSIDERATION FOR A CHARTER AMENDMENT
ESTABLISHING FOUR-YEAR TERMS FOR COMMISSIONERS AND
TWELVE-YEAR TERM LIMIT FOR THE MAYOR AND COMMISSIONER
POSITIONS.**

Mr. Alfred introduced himself and recapped the motion made by the Mayor at the January 14, 2025 meeting. He explained that an earlier effort in 2019 had sought to transition to four-year terms of office—however, without adding any term limits. He then opened the floor for discussion among board members.

Mr. Krzemien reported that Vice Mayor Fournier had circulated a newsletter poll indicating 83% support in favor of term limits. He inquired whether the total number of respondents to that poll was known.

Mrs. McCombs echoed Mr. Krzemien’s inquiry. She noted that the City is currently conducting a poll regarding a proposed “Dog Beach”, which is being circulated via social media and open to residents across all districts in Pompano Beach. She explained that this poll is also being shared through the City’s newsletter and email campaigns, and that such widespread distribution provides a better indication of overall resident sentiment—not merely feedback from a single district. She encouraged adopting a similar broad polling approach for the term-limits question, so the actual level of support could be known before allocating funds and placing the measure on the ballot—especially given that a similar proposal had already failed in 2019.

Mr. Alfred acknowledged the arrival of Mr. Rawls at the meeting. He proceeded to summarize the discussion to that point, noting that Mr. Krzemien had emphasized the need for more accurate data and formally requested a more comprehensive, widespread poll. When Mr. Alfred asked whether he would prefer the City conduct such a survey, Mr. Krzemien responded affirmatively, highlighting that it would be more advantageous for the City to undertake a broad poll before initiating a potentially costly charter amendment campaign.

Mr. Enos asked whether it would be precedent for the City to conduct such a poll prior to pursuing a charter amendment. Both Mr. Alfred and Mrs. McCombs responded in the negative.

Mrs. McCombs added that her view was shaped by observing the current “Dog Beach” poll.

When Mr. Enos inquired which department was overseeing that survey, Ms. Gilchrist confirmed that it is being run by the Parks and Recreation Department. Mrs. McCombs recommended leveraging the same polling system for the term-limit issue, citing its wide outreach and cost savings.

Mr. Rawls questioned the parameters of the proposed poll, noting that unlike formal political polling, the current approach lacks a defined sample size and remains open until

a specified closing date without targeting a representative number of respondents. He provided an example to illustrate this difference.

Mrs. McCombs responded that conducting a formal political poll would be significantly more costly. She reiterated that the previous poll did not disclose the total number of respondents, making it unclear whether the response rate was high or low.

Ms. Gilchrist emphasized the need for a more representative poll moving forward.

Mrs. McCombs agreed, stating that a poll reflecting the views of a broad segment of residents would better indicate public interest in a charter amendment. Conversely, a poll with limited participation would signal insufficient interest and help avoid unnecessary spending, particularly since a similar measure had already failed in 2019.

Mr. Enos added that the 2019 proposal differed structurally, as it did not include a term limit.

Mrs. McCombs pointed out that residents had already voted against extending commissioners' term lengths, and now they are being asked to consider adding a term limit.

Mr. Rawls echoed Mr. Enos's comment, agreeing that the absence of a term limit was a key issue in the previous referendum.

The board then briefly discussed the advantages of incumbency in elections.

Ms. Gilchrist asked whether it would be the board's responsibility to draft the content of the survey.

Mr. Alfred replied that it is indeed an option, but first he preferred to gather all relevant data from the Vice Mayor regarding the survey. Once that information is compiled, the board could collaboratively develop the survey content, with the City's Communications Department handling its distribution.

Mrs. McCombs asked how long the board has to submit the referendum to the Clerk's Office.

Mr. Alfred responded that, for the March 2026 election, the submission deadline would be in January 2026, and for the November 2026 general election, the deadline would be in June 2026.

Mrs. McCombs inquired about the next steps following the collection of the Vice Mayor's data, specifically whether it would be sufficient or if a broader, district-wide poll would be necessary.

Ms. Gilchrist expressed skepticism that a district-specific poll would provide convincing data, suggesting that a more comprehensive survey might be required.

Mrs. McCombs agreed but emphasized the importance of understanding the origin of the reported 83% support figure.

Ms. Gilchrist concurred, noting the necessity of examining the wording of the original poll to assess its validity.

Mr. Krzemien clarified that the previous poll was straightforward, with respondents simply pressing a green or red button to indicate support for term limits.

Mr. Alfred recommended that the board revisit Item 1 and proceed with the election of a chair and vice-chair.

ITEM 1 – ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR.

Mrs. McCombs nominated Mr. Rawls as Chair of the board, Mr. Krzemien nominated himself.

The following member(s) voted in favor of Mr. Krzemien:
Christopher Krzemien

The following member(s) voted in favor of Mr. Rawls:

Gary Enos
Heather Gilchrist
Quenton Thompkins, Sr.
Robin McCombs
Whitney Rawls

Whitney Rawls was hereby elected Chair of the Charter Amendment Advisory Board by acclamation.

Mrs. McCombs nominated Mr. Krzemien as Vice Chair of the board, a motion was made to close the vice chair nomination.

Christopher Krzemien was hereby elected Vice-Chair of the Charter Amendment Advisory Board by acclamation.

Mr. Rawls redirected the discussion back to Item 2, inquiring about the City's approach to conducting the proposed survey.

Mrs. McCombs suggested utilizing the same method employed for the "Dog Beach" survey, pending an assessment of its effectiveness.

Mr. Rawls sought clarification on the validation questions included in the previous poll. Mrs. McCombs and Mr. Krzemien indicated that the survey was straightforward, with respondents simply pressing a green or red button to indicate support for term limits.

The board then discussed various strategies for structuring the survey and disseminating it to the public.

Mr. Rawls assigned the task of determining the cost of conducting the proposed survey to the board, to which Mrs. McCombs agreed. The board also agreed that the survey should remain open for 30 days.

Ms. Gilchrist inquired about the amount of context and background information that should be provided in the survey. Mrs. McCombs responded that minimal context should be included to ensure the survey remains straightforward. Mr. Krzemien concurred, noting that excessive background information could skew the data.

Mr. Enos raised a point regarding the inclusion of staggered terms in the survey, noting that this aspect had not been explicitly addressed.

Mr. Krzemien clarified that implementing staggered terms is essential to prevent the possibility of the entire commission being voted out simultaneously, thereby maintaining continuity and experience within the board.

Mr. Enos agreed with this rationale and suggested that the survey should clearly mention the concept of staggered terms to ensure voters are fully informed.

The board deliberated on whether to present questions about staggered terms separately or to consolidate them with other related questions. After discussion, a consensus was reached to include all elements in a single, comprehensive question.

Mr. Rawls requested that Mr. Alfred coordinate with the City Attorney's Office to draft the precise language for the ballot question.

Ms. Gilchrist recommended that the survey also include a question about district representation to gauge public opinion on this issue.

With all being said, the board scheduled its next meeting for Thursday, August 21, 2025, at 6:00 p.m. to further discuss the proposed charter amendment and survey.

Mr. Alfred stated that he will coordinate with the City Attorney's Office to prepare the official ballot language for the proposed charter amendment. Additionally, he committed to providing the results of Vice Mayor Fournier's prior term limit poll for review.

The meeting adjourned at 7:06 p.m.

Submitted:
Alexandre Colo
Advisory Board Secretary