

CITY OF POMPANO BEACH
BROWARD COUNTY
FLORIDA

CHARTER AMENDMENT BOARD
City Commission Conference Room

October 2, 2025
6:00 p.m.

MINUTES (DRAFT)

The meeting was called to order by the Chair of the board, Mr. Whitney Rawls, at 6:01 p.m.

Those members present were:

Gary Enos
Heather Gilchrist
Christopher Krzemien
Quenton Thompkins, Sr.
Whitney Rawls

Absent:
Robin McCombs

Also Present:
Kervin Alfred, City Clerk

* * * * *

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

MOTION was made by Christopher Krzemien and seconded by Heather Gilchrist that the minutes of August 21, 2025 be approved.

All voted in favor of the motion.

OLD BUSINESS

ITEM 1 - FOLLOW UP DISCUSSION OF THE PROPOSED SURVEY.

Alexandre Colo, Recording Secretary, provided a summary of the last meeting. The board had requested city staff to conduct a survey to gauge residents' opinions on term limits. Staff initially researched options and estimated the cost of a phone-call survey at between \$20,000 and \$35,000. However, they later concluded that the survey was unnecessary, because the referendum will ultimately go before the voters as the Commission intends. Therefore, conducting the survey would impose an avoidable cost on the City, given that it is already expensive to place a question on the ballot.

Mr. Rawls asked the board whether they were in agreement to forgo the idea of conducting the survey. Mr. Krzemien responded that if city staff deem it unnecessary, he is in agreement, noting that he is satisfied the matter was examined thoroughly. Mr. Rawls expressed the same sentiments.

Mr. Alfred reiterated that the cost of the election is approximately \$177,000. He explained that while a lower-cost survey would likely not meet expectations, a more accurate and broadly representative survey would cost about \$35,000. Staff therefore recommended forgoing the survey to avoid additional expenses beyond the election cost.

Mr. Enos asked whether the referenced election cost pertained to the special election, noting that at the last board meeting there had been a consensus not to place the referendum question on the special election ballot. Mr. Rawls clarified that this topic would be addressed under Item 2.

A motion to opt out of conducting the survey was made by Ms. Gilchrist and seconded by Mr. Enos. The motion carried unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

ITEM 2 – CONSIDERATION OF THE LATEST VERSION OF THE CITY ATTORNEY DRAFT REFERENDUM ORDINANCE TO BE PRESENTED TO THE CITY COMMISSION ON OCTOBER 14, 2025.

Mr. Rawls confirmed that all members had an opportunity to review the City Attorney's memo and the draft referendum. He then turned the floor over to city staff for a brief summary of the matter.

Mr. Alfred stated that he had reached out to the City Attorney, who was unable to attend today's meeting due to the Yom Kippur holiday. He explained that the City Attorney provided insight regarding the referendum, noting that the version presented today differs from the previous one, as it incorporates all changes into a single, simplified question for voters. The City Attorney deemed this approach the best way to present the referendum to both the Commission and the electors. Mr. Alfred further noted that the City Attorney recommended placing the referendum on the March special election ballot so that all provisions would be in place for candidates running in the November election.

Ms. Gilchrist asked whether there was any reason to expedite the process beyond a desire to move it along. Mr. Alfred replied that if the referendum were placed on the November election ballot, even if approved, all provisions would not take effect until 2028. Ms. Gilchrist expressed dissatisfaction with this explanation.

Mr. Enos stated that while this is an important matter, he does not believe it is a core services issue that requires fast-tracking. He noted that if approved by the voters, it is unlikely to be revisited for decades, and he does not see the point of placing it on the special election ballot given the typically low voter turnout.

Ms. Gilchrist pointed out that holding the election sooner does not save money, as the Commission will still run every two years. Mr. Alfred clarified that in upcoming elections, the SOE, under Joe Scott, would waive the election fee if it is a candidate-only race. Mr. Krzemien responded that the county would need to be reimbursed by the State to then reimburse the City. However, since this election includes ballot questions and is not just to fill a seat, the State would not provide reimbursement, and the cost would come from the city budget, which he stated he does not support.

Mr. Krzemien stated that he reviewed the amendment language and found it satisfactory except for the special election component. He advised the board to make a motion recommending that the City Commission approve the ballot language, excluding the special election portion, noting that nothing gives him a sense of urgency or indicates that taxpayers would want it expedited. Ms. Gilchrist agreed with his recommendation.

Mr. Rawls asked whether the cost could exceed the \$177,000 threshold, to which Mr. Alfred replied that it would only occur if additional pages are generated.

The board then engaged in an extensive discussion regarding the odd- and even-numbered district format presented in the City Attorney's draft.

A motion was made by Mr. Krzemien, seconded by Mr. Thompkins, that the board support the referendum language as drafted by the City Attorney, while excluding placement on the Special Election ballot. The motion was unanimously approved by the board.

Mr. Rawls then opened the floor for discussion on the special election matter.

Mr. Enos expressed concern about potential public questions regarding the City's motive for placing the referendum on the Special Election ballot, noting that there is currently significant division in the city and that voter turnout may be low. He did, however, acknowledge that the referendum language itself is well-written.

Mr. Krzemien agreed and expressed concern that voters might be confused by the referendum question regarding the odd- and even-numbered district format.

Ms. Gilchrist emphasized the importance of educating the public through this process, noting that it will require time. Mr. Thompkins echoed Ms. Gilchrist's point, stating that many voters are not informed prior to elections and may choose not to vote when they lack understanding or knowledge about a ballot question.

Mr. Rawls agreed with the points raised and recommended that the City implement a comprehensive public education campaign to inform and educate Pompano Beach residents about the referendum.

He then asked the board for their sentiments on holding a special election, and all members indicated that they were not in favor.

A motion was then moved by Ms. Gilchrist, seconded by Mr. Enos, to recommend the City Commission against holding a special election. The motion was unanimously approved by the board.

The date of the next meeting will be announced, as the board is awaiting the City Commission's decision on the matter. In the meantime, city staff was tasked with conducting a survey regarding the Mayor's role, following a discussion related to this issue.

The meeting adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

Submitted:

Alexandre Colo

Advisory Board Secretary