

CITY OF POMPANO BEACH  
BROWARD COUNTY  
FLORIDA

CHARTER AMENDMENT BOARD  
City Commission Conference Room

August 21, 2025  
6:00 p.m.

***MINUTES***

The meeting was called to order by the Vice-Chair of the board, Mr. Christopher Krzemien, at 6:03 p.m.

Those members present were:

Gary Enos  
Heather Gilchrist  
Robin McCombs  
Christopher Krzemien

Late:

Quenton Thompson, Sr.

Absent:

Whitney Rawls

Also Present:

Brittany Tilson, Deputy City Clerk

\* \* \* \* \*

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

MOTION was made by Heather Gilchrist and seconded by Gary Enos that the minutes of July 24, 2025 be approved.

All voted in favor of the motion.

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

Mr. Krzemien presented the backup packet, which included the results of the vice-mayor's survey on term limits and a draft of the proposed ballot language prepared

by the city attorney. He asked whether everyone had reviewed the documents in the packet; the Board replied in the affirmative. He then opened the floor for discussion.

Mrs. McCombs explained that, in accordance with her assignment to conduct polling, she distributed a document to all members (attached as Exhibit 1). Drawing from Google research and discussions with the City's Communication Director, she obtained a cost estimate. She further reported that, based on her conversations with consultants, telephone surveys tend to be prohibitively expensive. While she acknowledged that phone surveys can yield accurate data, she cautioned that their utility is diminished by challenges such as robot and spam calls.

Mr. Krzemien asked what the cost would be to place the ballot question on a special election. Mr. Enos replied that the current draft assumes use of a special election, but he was unsure whether the Board would support that. Ms. Tilson clarified that the draft was intended merely to show what the ballot language would look like if the measure were placed as soon as possible. She noted that including a question on the ballot is expensive, but she did not have a precise figure.

Mr. Enos raised a concern that turnout is typically much lower in special elections as compared to regular elections. The members then briefly discussed whether the ballot question should go on a special or regular election and agreed that they would recommend to the Commission NOT to use a special election for a matter of that magnitude, but rather to place it on a regular election.

Mrs. McCombs resumed the discussion on polling, proposing a hybrid approach: using the city's email system to reach residents broadly and supplementing with a small targeted sample of phone calls—primarily for older residents who may not use email—in order to keep costs minimal.

Ms. Gilchrist supported the hybrid approach and asked whether the Board could recruit volunteers to help with the phone calls. Mr. Krzemien responded that he believed doing so would introduce significant bias. Mrs. McCombs concurred with Mr. Krzemien's concern about bias.

Ms. Gilchrist further emphasized that the survey questions would need to be crafted with care: some elements must be explained clearly and fairly to respondents. That precision, she said, is another advantage of the hybrid method.

The Board then briefly reviewed past polling methods and the last set of ballot questions (which had failed in a different format). They agreed that they should ascertain precisely what the residents want before committing taxpayer funds to a new survey.

Mr. Enos asked, given Mrs. McCombs's conversations with the City's Communication Director, how the surveys should be structured. Mrs. McCombs provided a summary of what she was told by the Communication Director regarding design, distribution, and methodology.

Mr. Krzemien posed a question: what if the poll only surveyed “supervoters”? Ms. Gilchrist responded that doing so would skew the results. Although such a sample might more closely reflect actual electoral outcomes, it would not produce the “portrait” of community sentiment the Board is seeking.

Mr. Krzemien stated that he believes some form of polling is necessary, reasoning that placing the question on the ballot without first gauging residents’ sentiment would be risky and potentially more costly if the measure fails.

Mr. Gilchrist asked whether Mrs. McCombs had come across any AI-based polling solutions while doing her research. Mrs. McCombs said that ChatGPT yielded cost estimates and responses similar to those she received from consultants, but she had not yet identified a specific AI polling platform (although she acknowledged one likely exists).

Mrs. McCombs stated that the polling data from District 3—despite being based on just over 200 voters—was sufficient to present to the Commission, because it showed overwhelmingly supportive responses. She added that the City’s Communication Director noted the city newsletter is sent to 70,000 email recipients.

Mr. Krzemien asked whether the 232 responses came from those 70,000; Mrs. McCombs clarified that they did not. The Board then resumed discussion of possible survey methods. They agreed to recommend that City staff distribute a survey via the newsletter to the 70,000 email addresses.

Following that, the Board turned to a discussion of the specific questions that should be included in the survey. They proposed the following:

- Are you in favor of term limits for the commissioners and the mayor?
- Are you in favor of extending the term of the commissioners from 2 years to 4 years?
- Are you in favor of staggered terms for the city commission?

Mr. Krzemien added that, in addition to the substantive questions, the survey should include qualifiers such as name, address, and district—primarily to help prevent duplicate submissions.

Ms. Gilchrist inquired whether the proposed term limits would be based on cumulative years in office or on consecutive terms. Mrs. McCombs clarified that most cities implement term limits based on consecutive terms, allowing individuals to step out after serving their maximum consecutive terms and return to run in later years. Mr. Colo supported this approach, noting that his own survey indicated that the majority of cities with term limits adopt this consecutive-term model.

Mr. Krzemien asked whether the Board had any additional concerns regarding the draft. All members confirmed that all issues had been addressed.

The Board then discussed a contingency plan: if the results from the newsletter survey were inconclusive, they would consider conducting a follow-up phone survey to gather more definitive data. The Board noted that, assuming the newsletter survey begins in October, there would be ample time to gather and analyze data by January. This timeline would allow for well-informed decisions, well in advance of the June deadline to add items to the November regular election ballot.

Mr. Krzemien emphasized the importance of including qualifying questions in the survey to ensure responses are from the intended participants and to prevent duplicate submissions.

The next meeting is scheduled on January 15, 2025.

The meeting adjourned at 6:54 p.m.

Submitted:

Alexandre Colo

Advisory Board Secretary