



Alachua County Charter Review Commission

Meeting Minutes – Monday, April 19, 2010

Commission Members

Robert Ackerman

Robert Brinkman

DJ Ferguson

Mitch Glaeser, Vice Chair

Armando R. Grundy-
Gomes

J. K. Irby, Chair

Joseph W. Little

AuBroncee S. Martin

John Martin

Bill Richards

Jim Stringfellow

Rod Tuttle

Lura W. Williams Martin

Ashley Wood

Guy York

County Staff:
Richelle Sucara
Deputy County Manager

Alachua County
Charter Review
Commission
Attn: Richelle Sucara
P.O. Box 2877
Gainesville, FL 32602

Telephone:
352-374-5210
Fax:
352-338-7363

CRC Members Present: Robert Ackerman, Robert Brinkman, DJ Ferguson, Mitch Glaeser, Armando Grundy-Gomes, J.K. Irby, Joseph Little, Aubroncee Martin, John Martin, Bill Richards, James Stringfellow, Rod Tuttle, Lura Williams Martin, Ashley Wood, Guy York

CRC Members Absent: None

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m.

1. Approval of Minutes of March 24, 2010.

Joe Little moved that the March 24, 2010 minutes be accepted as presented. The motion was agreed to.

2. General comments by members.

The chair recognized any commission member wishing to make comments.

3. Citizen Comments.

The chair recognized twenty eight citizens wishing to address the commission.

Armando Grundy-Gomes moved to rescind the action taken at the March 24, 2010 meeting and reconsider the following proposal:

“D) Any other provision of this County charter notwithstanding, any amendment to this Charter proposed by petition, the charter review commission or the board of county commissioners that, in whole or in part, transfers or limits a service, function, power or authority of a municipality shall be effective within or in regard to a municipality only if the amendment is approved by a majority of the voters of Alachua County voting in a referendum and also approved by a majority of the voters voting in a referendum in that municipality.”

After discussion the motion to reconsider was agreed to and the proposal was placed back before the commission. Yes: 11 No 4

After discussion, the commission agreed to carry forward the proposal to the public hearing phase.

Voting Yes: 11

Voting No: 4

Therefore, this proposal will be carried forward to the public hearing phase.

4. Second Reading of ballot language of previously considered proposals.

Attorney Sarah Bleakley reviewed draft ballot language of current proposals whereupon, after discussion on each proposal, the commission considered whether each proposal should be carried forward to the public hearing phase with the following result:

Question 1: Single member district elections for board of county commissioners.

Voting to move the question forward: 7

Voting to not move the question forward: 8

Therefore, Question 1 is no longer under consideration.

Question 2: Nonpartisan election of board of county commissioners.

Without objection the chair consolidated this question with question 8.

Question 3: Citizens initiative petition requirements for ordinances.

Voting to move the question forward: 15

Voting to not move the question forward: 0

Therefore, Question 3 is still under consideration and will be carried forward to the public hearing phase.

Question 4: Limitation of county commissioner's authority to amend or repeal ordinance approved by citizens initiative.

Mitch Glaeser moved to amend the proposal by replacing the requirement for unanimous vote by approval with 4/5 vote (super majority).

After discussion, the amendment was agreed to. 13 Yes 2 No

The CRC then considered the proposal as amended and whether or not the proposal should be carried forward to the public hearing phase.

Voting to move the question forward: 15

Voting to not move the question forward: 0

Therefore, Question 4 is still under consideration and will be carried forward to the public hearing phase.

Question 5: Replacing the board of county commissioners with a board of charter commissioners.

Voting to move the question forward: 9

Voting to not move the question forward: 6

Therefore, Question 5 is still under consideration and will be carried forward to the public hearing phase.

Question 6: Seven member board of charter commissioners, five elected from districts and two elected county wide.

Robert Ackerman moved to amend the proposal by replacing five elected from districts with four elected by districts and replacing two elected at large by three elected at large.

After discussion, the amendment was not agreed to. Yes: 5 No: 10

The CRC then considered the proposal as amended and whether or not the proposal should be carried forward to the public hearing phase.

Voting to move the question forward: 4

Voting to not move the question forward: 11

Therefore, Question 6 is no longer consideration.

Question 7: Elect five charter commissioners from electors in single member districts.

Voting to move the question forward: 7

Voting to not move the question forward: 8

Therefore, Question 7 is no longer under consideration.

Question 8: Non-partisan election of board of county commissioners.

Voting to move the question forward: 8

Voting to not move the question forward: 7

Therefore, Question 8 is still under consideration and will be carried forward to the public hearing phase.

Question 9: Term limits for charter commissioners.

Joe Little moved to amend the proposal by replacing eight consecutive years with 12 consecutive years.

After discussion the amendment was agreed to. Yes: 12 No: 3

The CRC then considered the proposal as amended and whether or not the amended proposal should be carried forward to the public hearing phase.

Voting to move the question forward: 7

Voting to not move the question forward: 8

Therefore, Question 9 as amended is no longer under consideration.

Question 10: Limiting the salary of the members and chair of the board of charter commissioners.

Robert Ackerman moved to amend the proposal by replacing the wording setting the salary as a percentage of non-charter counties with wording that would require that the charter commission set their salary by ordinance.

After discussion, the amendment was agreed to. Yes: 12 No: 3

The CRC then considered the proposal as amended and whether or not the amended proposal should be carried forward to the public hearing phase.

Voting to move the question forward: 10

Voting to not move the question forward: 5

Therefore, Question 10 as amended is still under consideration and will be carried forward to the public hearing phase.

Question 11: Abolishing constitutional officers and replacing with charter officers elected in nonpartisan election.

Voting to move the question forward: 10

Voting to not move the question forward: 5

Therefore, Question 11 is still under consideration and will be carried forward to the public hearing phase.

The Chair announced how the public hearings would be conducted and thanked the commission for their work and the citizens for their participation.

Without objection the Chair adjourned the meeting.