```
CITY OF CORAL GABLES
1
                      CHARTER REVIEW COMMITTEE
                        VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT
2
       THURSDAY, JANUARY 16, 2025, COMMENCING AT 9:05 A.M.
3
4
    Board Members Present:
5
    Donald D. Slesnick, II, Chairman
6
    Annie Betancourt
    Jane Moscowitz
    Felix Pardo
    Thomas Wells
8
9
10
11
12
13
    City Staff:
14
    Cristina Suarez, City Attorney
15
    Stephanie Throckmorton, Deputy City Attorney
    Yolande A. Davis, Deputy City Clerk
16
    Desiree Liguori, Assistant City Clerk
    Amos Rojas, Jr., City Manager
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
THEREUPON:
1
              (The following proceedings were held.)
2
             CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Okay. Good morning,
 3
         everybody and welcome to the meeting of January
 5
         16th -- Thursday, January 16th meeting of the
         City of Coral Gables Charter Review Committee.
 6
 7
             Madam Clerk, will you call the roll,
         please?
8
             THE CLERK: Board Member Betancourt?
 9
             MS. BETANCOURT: Here.
10
             THE CLERK: Board Member Moscowitz?
11
             MS. MOSCOWITZ: Here.
12
             THE CLERK: Board Member Pardo?
13
             MR. PARDO: Here.
14
             THE CLERK: Vice Chair Wells?
15
             MR. WELLS: Here.
16
             THE CLERK: And Chairman Slesnick?
17
             CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Here. Thank you.
18
             I'd like to welcome everybody, and I'd like
19
         to thank the City and the City Manager, who's
20
         here, for our 100th Birthday pin. Thank you,
21
         Madam City Attorney.
22
23
             MS. SUAREZ: Well, it's the Manager's
         Office for that.
24
             CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Where is your office
25
```

1	now?
2	MS. SUAREZ: My office is at City Hall.
3	CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Okay. You're still
4	there?
5	MS. SUAREZ: Yes.
6	CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: And where's The
7	Manager's office?
8	Here in this building? Okay.
9	THE CITY MANAGER: In this building. Yes.
10	CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: And the Clerk's Office?
11	THE CLERK: City Hall.
12	CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: City Hall. Okay.
13	Good. You've got to know where the players
14	are.
15	MS. MOSCOWITZ: So people are still in City
16	Hall?
17	CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: The Clerk and the City
18	Attorney.
19	MS. SUAREZ: And the Mayor's Office is
20	still there. At least several of the
21	Commissioners still have their offices there.
22	I know, some of them, sometimes they're meeting
23	at different places, but their offices are
24	still there.
25	CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Have we taken out extra

1 insurance? Good luck. Anyways, so Mr. Manager, we would like to 2 welcome you, visiting us today. If there's 3 anything you'd like to offer, any observations? MR. CITY MANAGER: No, sir. I won't take 5 up the time of this important Committee. 6 CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Well, no, but we obviously are informed -- I think we're 8 informed citizens, so we know that you have 9 offered your resignation and you've done your 10 year of service that you pledged, and that 11 you're departing later this month, and so I'd 12 like to, on behalf of our Committee, thank you 13 for your support and your interaction with us 14 during this last year, as we got our Committee 15 started. So thank you. Thank you to you and 16 your office. 17 THE CITY MANAGER: Thank you very much. 18 CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: And we wish you the 19 best. Are you off to somewhere special 20 after --21 THE CITY MANAGER: The mountains of North 22 23 Carolina. MR. PARDO: No WiFi. 24 CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: The mountains that are 25

```
1
         left, right.
             THE CITY MANAGER: Sir?
2
             CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: The mountains that are
 3
         left. We hope that your area was --
 5
             THE CITY MANAGER: Yes, my area was fine.
         The lake's there. The dam didn't break.
 6
         Unfortunately, Asheville --
             CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Didn't fare as well.
8
             THE CITY MANAGER: -- didn't fare well.
 9
             CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Well, we wish you the
10
11
         best.
             THE CITY MANAGER: Thank you, sir.
12
             CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: And hope that -- we
13
         won't be meeting again before your departure,
14
         but we hope we see you again, and hope we will
15
16
         see you between now and then.
             THE CITY MANAGER: Yes, sir.
17
             CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Okay. We have Old
18
         Business, and we have Vice Chair Wells'
19
20
         proposed amendment to Section 2, Term
         Limitations to the City Charter.
21
             Mr. Vice Chair, do you want to make a
22
23
         presentation? And I think we have what is in
         front of us.
24
             MS. THROCKMORTON: Mr. Chair, for the
25
```

record, I provided you all with physical -Stephanie Throckmorton, Deputy City Attorney.

I provided you all with physical copies of the information that was on the agenda, which included the proposal that's before you today.

And, then, alongside there's some of the information that you had requested at a previous meeting, term limits, manner of appointment of City Manager from other municipalities, along with the Civility Code provisions that was requested. So that's all in front of you and was provided electronically.

And, then, Mr. Chair, I'm happy to summarize Mr. Wells' proposal and kick the discussion off. As I understand the proposal, it's to allow for a maximum of twelve consecutive years of service, whether they be as Mayor or Commissioner, and before any such service is resumed, either appointed or elected, a four-year cooling off period in between positions.

So that would be three Commission terms or two Commission terms and two Mayoral terms to get to twelve years, and after that, you would need to take a four-year cooling off period, before being elected or appointed.

There may be a few -- should the Charter
Review Committee approve this to the
Commission, there may be a few tweaks that we
make, especially concerning the calculation of
terms, if you're appointed, whether or not
those calculate as full terms, but that's the
proposal before you today. And we provided
background information about term limits in
other municipalities in Miami-Dade, as well.

And I'll turn it over to the Vice Chair, whose proposal it is.

MR. WELLS: So we didn't really go on terms. We went on years. So we went on the preceding twelve years. So that would handle an appointment or for an election. The two issues you have to consider here is, the term limit, how long that is, and the cooling off period. Those are separate decisions.

Right now, we have it that the Mayor has a term limit of eight years and that the Commissioners have a term limit of twelve years. My issue was that the Mayor could then, after eight years, become a Commissioner, and

```
1
         then become a Mayor two years later, because
         there's no -- Key Biscayne has a lifetime
2
         limit. And so in order to write this, we
 3
         looked at the different -- the
         different provisions of other jurisdictions in
 5
 6
         our community. And what is similar is, Key
         Biscayne has an eight-year limitation.
         chose twelve, randomly, and that's up to the
8
         Committee to decide what it wants to do.
 9
         Gardens has a sixteen-year cap. Palmetto Bay
10
         has a twelve-year combined cap. And so if you
11
12
         want to accept term limits and a cooling
         period, you need to make those two decisions.
13
             The last thing is that this was a
14
15
         recommendation from the Town Hall Meeting, and
         the reason why this was recommended was to make
16
         sure that we turn over our leaders in Coral
17
         Gables, so that nobody becomes that entrenched
18
         and that powerful, and we also encourage other
19
         citizens to take leadership roles, so we have a
20
         more inclusive community.
21
             That's all I have to say, Chair.
22
23
             CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Thank you.
             MS. BETANCOURT: Mr. Chair --
24
25
             MS. THROCKMORTON: Just bringing it up on
```

1 the screen, in case it's easier for any of the public watching. 2 CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Ms. Bentancourt. 3 I'm sorry, what? MS. THROCKMORTON: Just bringing it up on 5 6 the screen. CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Oh. Ms. Betancourt. 8 MS. BETANCOURT: I want to commend you with 9 this idea, because I am familiar with 10 individuals in the Legislature that keep coming 11 back, from the Senate to the House, from the 12 House to the Senate. And, then, service on the 13 School Board, it seems to be for life, and I 14 have a problem with that, because I think the 15 opportunity is to have new blood and people 16 with fresh ideas, and it seems reasonable to 17 18 me. CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: You know, Tom, I'm not 19 in favor of the proposal as it's written. 20 Number One, you know, I know we've adopted term 21 limits, so we've had term limits, and I'm not 22 23 familiar with any Mayors that have come back and run for the Commission, so we're addressing 24

an issue that doesn't exist, Number One.

25

And Number Two, if we have a Commissioner that has served well and long and wants to rise to Mayor, I think that's a good thing.

You know, Annie, I have to say, and I think you'll agree with this, the terms limits in the Legislature have caused the people that run the Legislature not to be our elected officials, but the staffs. The staffs are now the people who are continuously there in continuous service, and for those who go to the Legislature and work with Legislators, we know the power of the staffs, and it has increased since term limits have set in, because they are the one consistency there, instead of the Legislators themselves.

We have term limits. I've always been troubled, since we adopted term limits, that the poor Mayor is limited to eight years, while the Commissioners can stay twelve years. It seems to me, Tom, that if we wanted to do anything, we might limit the Commissioners to two four-year terms, to equalize out what we have. It never made much sense to me to have two different term limits for the two different positions.

1 But, anyways, I am troubled with the concept of restricting people artificially from 2 being able to run for offices they seek, and 3 the elections are always open to people to jump 5 in, and in this City, entrenchment is not really an issue. In the last ten years, 6 entrenchment is, in fact, less of an issue than anything else. 8 Anyways, I'm bothered by the proposal. 9 MR. WELLS: Chair, may I reply to a couple 10 of your comments? 11 CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Sure. You can take me 12 to task and you can excoriate me and --13 MR. WELLS: We don't do that, and so I'm 14 not doing that. 15 CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: I'm just teasing. 16 MR. WELLS: However, to say that the issue 17 does not exist, I believe is incorrect, based 18 on what our Charter provision provides right 19 It does allow a Mayor to become a 20 Commissioner and a Commissioner to become a 21 Mayor, back and forth. So there's a 22 23 possibility it could happen. The second thing is that, if it's not an 24 25 issue, if you never see a Mayor becoming a

Commissioner, because that would be, perhaps, a step down, because they're not chairing the meeting, then I take it this term limit is not a problem, because if you don't think a Mayor is really going to become a Commissioner, and only going to be a Mayor for eight consecutive years, sit out two years, and then run again, this would never apply. So if this doesn't apply, I don't see a problem in adopting it into the Charter.

Lastly is, understand, we don't make

Charter Amendments, as you know. We only

propose Charter Amendments to the Commission,

and it's up to the Commission to decide what

they want. So we work for the Commission's

direction. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Well, and thank you, and I appreciate that. I mean, and even though I understand your purpose and I read it, I don't really quite understand it, to be honest with you, when we get down to at least -- if they've held the office for at least four consecutive years, prior to such appointment or election, and that differs from the words in the first sentence about the preceding twelve

consecutive years.

I mean, to be honest, I get -- I understand your purpose, but I get confused over the actual wording of how it's worded and how it will be applied.

MS. THROCKMORTON: Mr. Chair, my understanding -- and Mr. Wells, correct me if I'm wrong -- is that additional languages says that you cannot be appointed, elected or serve as Mayor, Commissioner, if you have held either of those positions in the preceding twelve consecutive years. So you're no longer eligible, if you've served in any of those roles for each of the preceding twelve consecutive years.

And, then, if you have served those two twelve years, you cannot be appointed, elected. That prohibition expires after there have been four consecutive years without an appointment or election.

MR. WELLS: Correct.

CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Okay. And so if you've held office for four years and then you decide to come back a couple of years later and run for office, that's within the twelve-year. I

1	don't understand
2	MS. SUAREZ: You could
3	MR. WELLS: No, consecutive
4	MS. THROCKMORTON: It would reset the
5	twelve-year maximum.
6	MR. WELLS: Right.
7	CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Well, thank you, but
8	that doesn't say that, and I don't see how that
9	applies.
10	MS. SUAREZ: So if I can
11	CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: And now we've got this
12	thing that Tom doesn't want, that the person
13	runs for four years, then sits, comes back, it
14	resets twelve years, and so you end up with the
15	same issues.
16	And besides that, the Mayor, who has now
17	been serving two-year terms and has to run
18	every two years, has to sit out four years?
19	MS. THROCKMORTON: That's as written.
20	CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Yes, as written. And I
21	don't understand how
22	MS. THROCKMORTON: If you've reached the
23	maximum, twelve.
24	CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: four years applies
25	to the Mayor, when, in fact, his or her term

1 has only been two years. Oh, well. MS. BETANCOURT: Well, Mr. Chair, would it 2 be possible to offer a friendly amendment or 3 something --CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Absolutely. 5 6 MS. BETANCOURT: -- to clarify or streamline the meaning. In my opinion, the term limits are set by the voters. The voters 8 have the final word. 9 CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Yes. 10 MS. BETANCOURT: But if this is something 11 worth debating and discussing, maybe we can 12 streamline, to clarify the language. 13 MS. THROCKMORTON: We're happy to edit the 14 15 language. MS. SUAREZ: If I can offer a suggestion. 16 If the Board, in concept -- if this Committee, 17 in concept, feels like this is something that 18 is worthy of a recommendation to the City 19 Commission, our office can certainly work on 20 the language, to make sure it says whatever the 21 Committee would like for it to say, but I think 22 23 the proposal, and Mr. Wells -- I think the gist of the proposal is that an individual can serve 24 for a maximum of twelve years --25

1	MR. WELLS: Consecutive years.
2	MS. SUAREZ: consecutive years, in
3	either office. So, you know, it could be a
4	combination of Commissioner or Mayor, up to
5	twelve years, and at that point, if they want
6	to serve again, they need at least a
7	four-year
8	MR. WELLS: Cooling off
9	MS. SUAREZ: cooling off period, so to
10	speak.
11	CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: So now you're saying
12	that the Mayor can run for Commission after
13	eight years.
14	MS. SUAREZ: Correct.
15	CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: And then serve up to
16	twelve years, but then has to I mean, that
17	doesn't make any sense to me at all.
18	MS. THROCKMORTON: It may be you know,
19	as a suggestion, which is not a suggestion
20	personally
21	CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: But that's not what Tom
22	wants. I mean, he doesn't want a Mayor serving
23	for eight years and then running for four years
24	for Commission. I mean and Tom, I don't
25	mean to put words in your mouth, but, I mean, I

1 think that what you stated is, you hate to see people hanging on. 2 So we've just now had an explanation. 3 Under this, we could have an eight-year Mayor and then a four-year Commissioner following, 5 for twelve years. I --6 MR. PARDO: Mr. Chairman --CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: I mean, I haven't even 8 seen that happen or even anybody wanting that 9 to happen. 10 Yes, Mr. Pardo. 11 MR. PARDO: -- being the non-lawyer --12 CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: But you have a lawyer 13 mind. 14 MR. PARDO: No, there's like a lawyer joke 15 in here somewhere. 16 So, on March 21st -- I have all of my notes 17 from our meetings here with the public and 18 including the Commissioners. On March 21st, a 19 very abled lawyer brought up the comments, and 20 she said that the terms limits on holding both, 21 a Commission seat and the Mayor seat, 22 23 discourages people from remaining; the provision 18 of the budget, and Section 23 24 about revenues, and these comments were all 25

very astute, and I think that we did have an example recently, when we had a Commissioner that had aspirations to run for the Dade County Commission, and the person that was selected to finish out his term was a past Mayor, who had never been a Commissioner.

And when I saw who was appointed, and not disparaging the person that was appointed, I found it kind of deflating, and this was before I sat on this Committee, and the reason I found it deflating is because I agree with the comments that were -- were very, very to the point, which is that holding both, a Commission seat and Mayor seat, discourages people from running, and I think that it's important that people that want to serve this community should be encouraged to do it, but it's hard to run against an incumbent, and it is a tremendous disadvantage.

So when you run against an incumbent, you have basically the administration backing them, not as an endorsement, per se, but a perception of an endorsement. I think that's an unfair advantage, but it is what it is, and that's what we have to live with.

So I understand the concept. I agree with the concept. I understand your reservations about making sure, and I think that -- that Annie is a hundred percent right, that it should be tweaked in such a way where it could make more sense, and I think, you know, you guys, the lawyers, are smart enough to come up with that, but I will say that I think that back in the day, you and I, we had people like Bill Kerdyk, Sr., who served forever.

CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Twenty years.

MR. PARDO: And the reason that he had the longest tenure was that he was -- he represented people, I think, in such a way that everybody felt comfortable with his decisions, and his decisions weren't always popular, but he had tremendous conviction.

I long for the days of politicians of that time, and the reason is, because I think they served us well here, at the County level, at the State level and the National level.

So I would hope that we do this in such a way to encourage people to run and not to encourage this kind of, you have to almost put a foot into the other side here, where you

should be encouraging people, you know, as far as the -- when the elections occur, because much has been said about PACs and things like that, that were completely foreign in this City, and it really worries me, as a citizen, and it worries many of the people that I circulate around in this City.

I have the utmost respect for every Member on this Board, but I think we have to address this, because this City is changing right before our eyes, and once you have certain groups and certain PACs and certain forces in here, we lose the City, and we've seen this happen in other cities.

And that's all I have to say.

CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Thank you, Mr. Pardo.

MS. THROCKMORTON: Mr. Chair, I just wanted to make one note, and I think this came up as part of your question. Currently, as written, there's an eight-year maximum for Mayor and a twelve-year maximum for Commission. Together, that's twenty years, which I understand.

If we're going to change it to twelve, it may be a little bit inconsistent to have two separate term limits that add up to twenty, but

you can't fulfill the maximum term limit of 1 both at once. So I'm not sure -- I don't want 2 to make a suggestion of twenty years, but I do 3 see that as the more natural maximum, before a 5 cooling off period, if we remain with two separate maximum term limits for each position, 6 because then you're prohibiting someone from running for the maximum number of terms for a 8 particular position. 9 CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: I appreciate your 10 11 efforts. I don't understand your comment at all. 12 MS. THROCKMORTON: Right now, the max is 13 twenty years --14 CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: No, I heard you. 15 Ι understand the words. I just don't --16 MS. THROCKMORTON: Yeah. Yeah. 17 I just see a little bit of a difference 18 between right now, an eight-year and twelve is 19 20 twenty. CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: But the maximum of the 21 twenty years doesn't apply in this amendment, 22 23 because the person can't run after serving the maximum. 24 MS. THROCKMORTON: That's my point. 25 If you said, no more than twenty consecutive years, and then a four-year cooling off, the term limits add up, together, to twenty. So you do the max of Mayor and the max of Commissioner, and then a cooling off period. This shortens the maximum of the two terms added together to twelve.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chair, when you have a chance --

CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Okay. No, let me call Ms. Moscowitz first.

MS. MOSCOWITZ: Yeah. I've always been opposed to term limits. Mostly, I think, because of how they were born. They were born from groups that were not the groups that I valued. But I see this, and I think I'm okay with the language, because of the word consecutive, but I don't mind if somebody wants to refine it.

But a separate point is, I think we want to encourage turnover, because not only is it good for the City, but we're grooming people to go to other offices in the State, and I think that the turnover -- permitting more turnover -- twelve years and twenty years, is not a huge

turnover, but it still allows, you know, younger people to get into office, and then, perhaps, go on to other offices in the State, because this is where they become known.

CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Okay. Let me just -- okay. Tom, first, you.

MR. WELLS: Thank you.

And so a couple of things is, the reason we chose -- well, like Mr. Pardo said, I consulted with the person who made those comments at the Town Hall Meeting, who I know very, very well, my wife, Dianne.

The second thing is, the reason we chose twelve versus twenty is because that's the maximum term limit of either the Commissioner or the Mayor. So we took the maximum amount of twelve years and applied it aggregately, combined, because right now it's not combined, it's either or. It's either eight for Mayor, twelve for Commissioner, and you can go back and forth.

The last thing is that, Chair, I am not against a Mayor serving eight years and a Commissioner serving four years. That's what this provision provides. And so it's a

misstatement to say that that's against what I want to do. This provision reflects what I would like to do. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Let me just address a couple of things that have been said.

Number One, Felix, in the appointment of
Mayor Cason to sit in a Commission seat, there
was not going to be an election. It was just a
filling in, until the next election. And I
think the Commission chose someone they knew
that wasn't going to run, so that, in fact,
there would be an open seat, so it would
encourage people to jump in and run.

So I think that that kind of fits in to what you had desired.

MR. PARDO: Thank you for the explanation.

CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: And, then, also as a -I can speak from personal experience, I was a
ten-year incumbent when I lost an election
here. So incumbents do get beaten and maybe
people get tired of people after ten years, so
there you go.

And Jane, I don't know anyone on our

Commission or any Mayor in the last thirty

years that's gone on to any other office in the

1 State. MS. MOSCOWITZ: Well, I know that, but I --2 CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: I mean, so I don't 3 think we're training. I mean --MS. MOSCOWITZ: But we could. 5 6 CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Well, we could. could and one of -- Felix referred to this, one Commissioner that tried to go to the County 8 Commission, didn't make it. But, you know, 9 I -- the people that I'm around, including the 10 people sitting at this table, who I've known 11 for many years, love this City, and those who 12 want to serve this City, want to serve it 13 for -- when I finished ten years, I was asked 14 why wasn't I running for the State Legislature, 15 County Commission, and, you know, we've had 16 great Legislators and they haven't served on 17 the Commission, but I said, you know, that my 18 desire was to serve the City, not to move up 19 politically. It had nothing to do with my 20 desire to serve the City, and I'm not sure, you 21 know, moving to the County Commission is a move 22 up, to be honest. I'm not sure of that. 23 So, anyways, okay, I still have my 24 25 concerns, but -- so how do we want to approach

```
1
         this?
                Tom, do you want to make a motion?
                                                     It's
         your proposal.
2
             MR. WELLS: First, were there any
 3
         amendments -- well, let me first make the
 5
         motion. Yes, I move that this be adopted by
         the Committee to be proposed to the Commission
 6
         to see if they accept it and send it to a
         decision of our voters.
8
             CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: In this current form?
9
             MR. WELLS: In it's current form, yes, sir.
10
11
             CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Okay. Is there a
         second?
12
             MS. MOSCOWITZ: I'll second.
13
             MS. SUAREZ: Can I just add, Mr. Wells, if
14
         the Committee does approve it, that our office
15
16
         will take another closer look and perhaps make
         stylistic tweaks or any necessary tweaks, but
17
         the substance would, of course, remain the
18
         same?
19
             MR. WELLS: I want the motion first, before
20
         we amend the motion.
21
             MS. SUAREZ: Understood. Understood.
22
             MR. WELLS: So we're now going to --
23
             MS. SUAREZ: Understood.
24
             MS. BETANCOURT: You mean, as written now?
25
```

1 MR. WELLS: My motion was as written, but now that we made a motion, we can amend that 2 motion however you'd like. So if you want to 3 make amendments -- sorry, Chair, it's your meeting. 5 CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: No, it's okay. 6 MS. MOSCOWITZ: Well, no. I mean, if we need to move to amend to allow the City 8 Attorney to make the language clearer, then I 9 so move. 10 MR. WELLS: That's good. Yes. 11 MS. THROCKMORTON: Just in deference to 12 Mr. Wells, I think he was saying, if there was 13 any amendments to the substance of it, you want 14 to discuss those. 15 CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Ms. Moscowitz has 16 actually moved an amendment to the motion, 17 saying that the City Attorney has asked to 18 provide some guidance in the final 19 transcription of this proposal, to make it --20 and I guess bring it back to this Committee to 21 see the final version that the --22 23 MS. SUAREZ: We could do that, yeah. CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Okay. That's a 24 friendly amendment. And do you accept that 25

1 amendment? MR. WELLS: Yes. 2 CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Okay. The amendment's 3 been made and accepted. So we don't need to 5 vote on the amendment. So does the Committee understand the 6 proposal? The proposal is to adopt the thing that the Vice Chair has presented on terms 8 limits, and it's been amended to send it to the 9 City Attorney's Office for further scrivener's 10 11 adjustments to the language. MR. PARDO: Mr. Chairman --12 CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Yes. 13 MR. PARDO: -- may I suggest something 14 that's consistent with what the City Attorney 15 does? 16 CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Yes. 17 MR. PARDO: You know, understanding and 18 reviewing the transcripts of the discussion 19 that we've had this morning, if you have 20 another idea of how we could still do what we 21 wanted to do, that unless I'm mistaken, I think 22 23 everybody agrees that, as I had quoted before -- and I didn't want to embarass you, 24 Tom, I was going to say, you know, as quoted 25

1 from Tom's better half. CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Diane Wells. 2 MR. WELLS: Mr. Pardo, she's the smartest 3 one in my family. That's fine. MR. PARDO: Okay. So the thing is that --5 6 the point was that -- conceptually, was that in order to promote -- in order to encourage people to run, you know -- in other words, that 8 that -- conceptually, I think that's what I'm 9 trying to do, and the question -- and this is 10 not an amendment, this is just part of the 11 discussion of the motion that's on the floor, 12 and the whole point is, if the legal beagles 13 can figure it out, you know, and come up with a 14 suggestion, I'm all ears. 15 MS. SUAREZ: So I think what's important 16 for the Board to discuss is the substance of 17 the proposal, and so if you all -- you know, we 18 understand what this proposal currently says. 19 You know, we understand it and I think we've 20 discussed it and I think you all understand 21

And absolutely, before it's finalized and

what it would do, and so if there's something

different that you want to change, we can

certainly take that in.

22

23

24

25

sent to the Commission, we would make sure it's, you know, completely legally sufficient. Any clarity that needs to be added, you know, any kind of shifting of words or anything, we would go through that process, as we will any of your, you know, proposed amendments, of course.

But we need to understand from you all what substantively you would want the proposed amendment to included.

MS. THROCKMORTON: And I understand that to be a twelve-year maximum, with a four-year cooling off period, being the crux of the amendment.

MS. SUAREZ: And so just, perhaps, to kind of illustrate how that could be, so someone could serve twelve years as Commissioner, and then they'd have to wait four years before serving either as Commissioner or Mayor again. Someone can serve eight years as Mayor, and four years as Commissioner, and then wait four years before serving again. So someone can serve eight years as Commissioner, four years as Mayor, and then wait four years. So there's different combinations, but it would be a

1 maximum of twelve years, in any combination of office. 2 CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Understood. 3 MS. SUAREZ: And then a required four-year cooling off period. 5 MS. THROCKMORTON: And for the record, that 6 includes appointment, also. So that may 7 prohibit someone from fulfilling the full 8 twelve years, if there's a term that would put 9 them over the years. 10 MS. SUAREZ: Correct. Right. If there's 11 12 an appointment --MS. THROCKMORTON: It's my understanding 13 that the proposal includes appointment, as 14 well. So if you're appointed one year, that 15 16 counts towards the twelve, so you may not be able to fulfill an additional term. 17 MR. WELLS: No. The way it's written, I 18 believe, is you -- the test is when you're 19 either appointed or you go for election, it's 20 the twelve consecutive years. So we're not 21 looking at what the term is going to be. 22 23 So if you're appointed for -- you served ten years, and you can then run for another 24 term of four years of Commissioner. You can't 25

1 -- after you serve twelve consecutive years, you can't go -- be appointed or elected, but it 2 doesn't -- this doesn't stop somebody who 3 served ten years from being elected for a 5 four-year term. It looks at the consecutive service --6 MS. SUAREZ: Okay. Understood. MS. THROCKMORTON: Okay. So that's a 8 little bit different than I understood, but I 9 understand that now. 10 So, as a threshold matter, you're not 11 qualified to run if you have served twelve 12 consecutive years. It's different than you 13 cannot serve for more than twelve consecutive 14 15 years. Yeah. CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Now we're getting into 16 the crux of, this is kind of crazy. I mean, 17 now we can serve fourteen years. 18 MS. THROCKMORTON: That's my understanding 19 of --20 CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: I mean, it doesn't --21 okay. I've said my piece. 22 23 But, you know, we have an open seat now in the Commission and only three people have 24 expressed interest in running for it. So I'm 25

not sure who we're trying to encourage to run for office, but I think that the people who are encouraged to run for office are people that we can almost see in our mind's eye as being active people in the City, interested in the City, and opening up the gates is not going to bring in a flood of people. I mean, they can hardly go out to vote, much less run for office.

And you're absolutely right, Mr. Pardo has hit the nail on the head when he says, "One of the greatest threats to our democracy, both, nationally, statewide and the city, are these PACs, these black PACs that hide their money and you can't identify them, but this doesn't resolve that at all. This doesn't speak to it at all, and, in fact, if you think about, if you encourage a whole bunch of people to get into the races, there may be more PACs.

But I don't see who we're encouraging to get in the race. I think the people who get into races are people that don't surprise us at all. Anyways.

MR. PARDO: Let me explain mathematically to the Chairman, I beat 94 by the time I was

1	done.
2	MS. BETANCOURT: Only the right kind ones
3	are more
4	MS. SUAREZ: Yeah, I just need to
5	understand.
6	CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Okay. I think we've
7	discussed it.
8	MS. THROCKMORTON: So, again, as clarified,
9	my understanding is, it's not a limit on the
10	maximum number of terms. It's a limit of the
11	qualification to run. If you have served
12	twelve years, you cannot run for a four-year
13	period. If you have served ten years, you may
14	run for a four-year period, even if that takes
15	you over twelve years. It's more a threshold
16	qualification question, is a way to think of
17	it, rather than a maximum number of years you
18	can serve.
19	MR. WELLS: Qualification or appointment,
20	correct.
21	MS. THROCKMORTON: Okay.
22	MR. PARDO: Okay. Got it.
23	MS. SUAREZ: So then
24	CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Okay. Are we ready for
25	a vote, Madam Clerk?

```
1
             THE CLERK: Yes, sir.
             Committee Member Betancourt?
2
             MS. BETANCOURT:
 3
                              No.
             THE CLERK: Committee Member Betancourt?
 5
             MS. SUAREZ: I don't think she heard your
         vote. I don't think she heard it.
 6
             MS. BETANCOURT: I vote no.
             MS. CLERK: Yes?
8
             CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: She said, "No."
 9
             MS. SUAREZ: She said, "No."
10
             THE CLERK: Committee Member Moscowitz?
11
             MS. MOSCOWITZ:
                             Yes.
12
             THE CLERK: Committee Member Pardo?
13
             MR. PARDO: Yes.
14
             THE CLERK: Vice Chairman Wells?
15
             MR. WELLS: One question only. Are we
16
17
         voting on directing this to the City's Attorney
         Office?
18
             MR. PARDO: Yes.
19
             MS. THROCKMORTON: The motion is to move to
20
         send it, in its current form, as written, with
21
         the City Attorney's Office having the
22
23
         flexibility to amend as needed and bring it
         back to this Board.
24
             MR. WELLS: Yes.
25
```

```
1
             THE CLERK:
                          Okay. And Chairman Slesnick?
             CHAIRMAN SLESNICK:
                                No.
2
             The motion passes -- the amended motion
 3
 4
         passes three-two.
 5
             Now, ready for New Business.
         Congratulations to the Vice Chair for ramming
 6
         through his suggestion.
 7
             MS. THROCKMORTON:
                                Thank you.
8
             MR. WELLS: Wait. Wait. Wait.
9
         Wait. Wait. Stop. No. No. No.
10
             So I know that it's not Roberts --
11
             CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Tom, there's always a
12
         bar fight --
13
             MR. WELLS: Come on. Our Board has made a
14
         collective decision.
15
             CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: I know that.
16
17
             MR. WELLS: We're all part of the same
         family.
18
19
             CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: I'm admiring your
         political agility. You can't take a
20
21
         compliment.
             MR. WELLS: I cannot take that compliment.
22
23
         Thank you very much.
             CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Okay. I withdraw my
24
         compliment.
25
```

MR. PARDO: Is civility next?

CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Now I'll think of an insult.

MS. THROCKMORTON: As far as that, I did not put that on Old Business, as it was not directed to be brought back. I did provide you with that information, and, of course, if you'd like to bring that up now, we do have on the schedule for our February meeting a sort of catch-all of all Old Business, so we can also bring it up then, if you'd like.

But for now, we'll go to New Business. We have what looks like a large number of sections of the Code, but I promise, not all of them should take much time. The meatier ones are here at the beginning. We have our City Manager here today, so maybe you want to chime in on some of these.

But Section 11 is Appointment, Term,

Removal, Absence or Disability. There have

been no recent changes to this provision. It's

part of the consolidated Charter. There were

suggestions made at the Town Hall requiring a

supermajority for the selection and/or

clarification of a process for the selection.

1 As requested at the last meeting, I provided you all with about ten different 2 municipalities' charters, many of which address 3 the appointment of those appointed officials, 5 including the City Manager's Office -- the 6 Office of the City Manager, excuse me, and that was provided to you. But we did receive some suggestions, and this is the provision as 8 currently written. 9 CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: So are you waiting for 10 us to comment --11 MS. THROCKMORTON: Yeah. I'm happy to take 12 any suggestions. Our office has no legal edits 13 to make to this provision, but that's as 14 written and --15 CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Why don't you just keep 16 on, and, then, I think, the Members of the 17 Committee will jump in, if they have a 18 suggestion. 19 MS. THROCKMORTON: Certainly. 20 If we could go to the next slide. 21 Section 12, which has to do with the City 22 23 Manager's responsibilities. At the Town Hall -- sorry, Desiree -- at the Town Hall, we 24 did receive suggestions regarding making 25

specific job duties clearer. This is how it exists at the moment.

Section 13 is the Trial Board section. It has to do with the ability of the City Manager -- well, that's the shortened version of it, but it has to do with the City Manager's ability to hire, fire, remove, suspend, lay off or reduce in grade and what processes are available to those employees.

I want to note that this process doesn't apply to those employees covered by Collective Bargaining Units. They have their own separate processes. So this is for the general employees not covered by any bargaining units.

This item went to the voters twice, most recently in 2015, for removal, and that amendment to remove this failed. So the referendum failed.

The last amendment to this provision that was adopted was in 1975. Again, this went to the voters in 2015 and the voters did not remove this from the Charter.

MS. SUAREZ: And it was to remove the Trial Board, was the amendment that was put to the voters then.

1 MR. PARDO: Which lost in the election? MS. SUAREZ: Correct. Correct. 2 MS. THROCKMORTON: It did. 3 MR. PARDO: Right. MS. THROCKMORTON: 5 Yes. Section 14 is the Lines of Authority 6 Between the Manager and the City Commission. There have been no recent changes. I believe, 8 in the memo Mr. Wells provided, there was some 9 suggestions associated with this, regarding 10 Boards as liaisons between the Commission and 11 the Boards (sic). I'm not sure if that's the 12 appropriate location for those suggestions, but 13 these are the lines of authority and direction 14 between the Manager and the City Commission. 15 Section 15 are specific powers and duties 16 of the City Manager's Office. There have been 17 no recent changes to this provision, and as a 18 threshold matter, we received a couple of 19 comments that were associated with this 20 provision, although, again, I don't know if 21 that would be the appropriate place, having to 22 23 do with certain employee benefits and whether or not those should be incorporated into the 24 Charter. 25

Section 16 is Participation in City

Commission Meetings, that the City Manager and other officers, including the City Clerk, City

Attorney, may participate but not vote in the City Commission. Again, no recent changes to this provision.

Section 17 is the Authority of the

Commission over departments. There were some

suggestions regarding the creation of an Office

of the Inspector General. We have that on our

schedule to address at the next meeting, but

that was associated here. Generally, the City

Commission may establish via Ordinance creation

or a consolidation of the departments of the

City.

MR. PARDO: I have a quick question about that.

MS. THROCKMORTON: Uh-huh.

MR. PARDO: So the description of the Inspector General has really never been discussed in any type of detail. It's very difficult to say, well, you know, we're for this, when we don't know what the job description is.

MS. THROCKMORTON: Understood. So we have

1 -- our office prepared, at the Commission's direction previously, two questions to go to 2 the voters, which provided some outline and 3 details for how that office would be set up, 5 what the duties would be, whether they'd be a department or a separate office. So we have 6 some details about that. We've done extensive research into how it 8 operates in other locations, and we're happy to 9 send that to you all in advance of that 10 February meeting, where we have slated to 11 discuss that, at the direction at the 12 Commission. 13 MS. SUAREZ: We've scheduled that for its 14 own discussion for the February meeting. 15 MS. THROCKMORTON: Yeah. 16 MS. SUAREZ: We're happy to hear from you 17 today, if you want to, so we can prepare 18 perhaps any information you would like for the 19 20 next meeting. MS. THROCKMORTON: Yeah. 21 MR. PARDO: One of the things that I --22 23 MS. THROCKMORTON; Could we use the microphone, I'm sorry, just for the Zoom? 24 MR. PARDO: I'm sorry? 25

MS. THROCKMORTON: Just can we speak into the microphone for the Zoom.

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. PARDO: Sorry. I was reprimanded last night the same way.

So one of the issues that I see is that the concept of the Inspector General is always a great concept, until you make it into a bureaucratic mess. If you're talking about a position that's, you know, kind of lean and does whatever it's supposed to do, I'm all for The problem I see, you know, with present company excluded, is that, you know, I agree with the Chair that what happens up in Tallahassee -- in other words, that the departments start to -- basically, they've created their own fiefdom and they just have to make the elected official smile during that term, to be able to stay in that position. most of the time, those departments just grow and grow and grow, and then they become this bureaucratic nightmare. It could be a Building Department, it could be the Finance Department, and it could possibly then be the Inspector General.

The way I've always seen or, conceptually,

in my mind, the way I've seen an Inspector

General, is more of a watch dog, a person that

oversees and makes sure that the Is are dotted

and Ts are crossed financially and that

everything is doing, you know, just great.

I found, with my own experience recently in going through parts of the budget -- in other words, it was specifics. I was reviewing six five-year programs of a specific thing in the budget. I noticed something very curious, that these items that were here were all of a sudden called something else, which allowed then those budgetary items to be moved here. I found that highly unusual. And the funny part is that, today, the same as back then, no one can do that, except for the City Manager, and for me, I find that disturbing.

I hope you, in preparing this for the City Commission, come up with a couple of examples, you know, not just the words, of putting together and assembling this type of new part of the administration. In other words, there should be a function specifically that the City Manager should be able to do certain things, but it should be, also, in the open, where the

Inspector General can see that. It's not necessarily that the Inspector General, at least in my mind, should be just looking for, you know, fraud or efficiencies or things like that. I don't think that's the effect.

Maybe I'm not explaining myself clearly,
but I think that when you're writing this
section of the Inspector General, you should
really be looking at it more as a watch dog,
and, also, as a person that would help the City
Manager in the implementation of the budget and
making sure that everything is, you know, very,
very clear.

MS. THROCKMORTON: Mr. Pardo, we're not planning to write a provision of the Inspector General. What I'm happy to provide you with, before the February meeting, is the way Miami Beach has their Inspector General's Office set up, the way the County has their Inspector General's Office set up and the two proposals that the Commissioners brought forward earlier this year for the actual questions -- ballot questions about the Inspector General, and the associated Charter provisions.

We also have a draft Ordinance setting up

an office of the Inspector General. It does not need to be done via Charter amendment. So we have all of those different drafts we can provide to you in advance of the February meeting, which are what various Commissioners and other cities have come up with. Our office takes no position as to what that office should look like, but I'm happy to provide you with all of those drafts, and other municipalities, in advance of February, so that you all can discuss what you think the best proposal is for the Commission.

MR. PARDO: The reason I think this is so important is that, when this goes to the voters -- actually, it's the Commissioners, and if they approve it, to the voters, is the perception that people have of this particular -- you know, what I think of an Inspector General could be different than what Don thinks or Annie thinks or Tom or Jane.

MS. THROCKMORTON: Understood. And the voter referendum questions that we previously wrote, as you all know, are very limited in the number of words that can be in them.

MR. PARDO: Exactly.

MS. THROCKMORTON: So there's only so much that can be included in the actual question, but we also drafted, at various Commissioners' requests, Charter language, which I think flushes it out perhaps a little bit more, but as you know, the Charter is not the place for the very detailed step-by-step. We assume there would be an Ordinance associated with any of these changes in the Charter, as well.

So I think it may be helpful and instructive for us to send you all that information in advance of that February meeting, and if there's anything else you guys would request before then, we're happy to pull any other comparative.

CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Ms. Moscowitz.

MS. MOSCOWITZ: So I have some things I'd like to know, which is how much it would cost to establish this new position, which also would require, you know, staff support, et cetera. So not just, you know, the salary of whoever the Inspector General is.

I don't picture the need myself for a full-time Inspector General. I think it comes out of people worried about corruption, and I

don't -- I think that, hopefully, there would be a person sitting in an office not doing a lot, until something happened.

So I wonder, are we able to use County services? Are we also able -- you know, Federally, there are Inspector Generals, but there are also Special Counsels, and Special Counsels are appropriate -- are appointed ad hoc when something needs to be investigated, and that might be more efficient, and certainly have a better flavor, smell to it.

MS. THROCKMORTON: We looked into that, and we're happy to provide you all with the information we've received about that so far.

And that was a proposal that one of the Commissioners brought forward related to either/or, contract with or establish.

MS. SUAREZ: And so the County -- the

County Inspector General can -- you know, is

authorized to provide services to the

municipalities, but it must be approved by the

Board of County Commissioners, but there's a

practical challange to that. The County, as

you know, is large and has many departments and

employees, so there's one Inspector General for

the County, and so I think there is a challange in resources.

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

They do currently provide services to the School Board, which is also -- you know, they have an intralocal agreement for that. And the Manager and I -- Manager Rojas and I did meet with the Inspector General from the County, and he -- you know, he wants to help, but he expressed the challenge, and ultimately it would be up to the Board of County Commissioners anyway, but that was, as Stephanie mentioned, one of the kind of alternative proposals and one of the resolutions that one of the Commissioners sponsored, that went to a meeting several months ago, and it was basically to amend the Charter to require either a contract with Miami-Dade County for Inspector General services or for the City to appoint its own.

CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: And I can -- yes, Mr. Manager, please.

THE CITY MANAGER: I wasn't intending to come in and participate like this. I think there's two questions here. Number One is, is there a need for an Inspector General? So to

answer that question, at least in my short time here, I can tell you that the way we have our system set up, which is that the audit functions of the City report directly to the City Manager, so at any given time, if I suspect or any City Manager suspects some nefarious activity going on within one of our departments, then I can have our Budget Officer contract out, or we can do it ourselves, a company to come and do an audit. If criminal violations are discovered, clearly we would turn that over to the State Attorney's Office for prosecution. The issue with -- so, in my opinion, my humble opinion, I think the system we have will work and will continue to work, using our existing audit, as long as they report to the City Manager.

Creation of an Inspector General for the City of Coral Gables comes to a couple of issues, volume of work.

MS. MOSCOWITZ: Yeah.

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE CITY MANAGER: I don't think it's there. Number Two is, if it's the will of the Commission to have an Inspector General's Office, it's going to be very costly, because

it's got to be staffed. You have to do the recruiting. It has to be independent. And talking about independent, then it needs to, in my opinion, sort of mirror what the County does, that the County Inspector can only be terminated, correct me if I'm wrong, Cristina, by -- it's in the Charter, and by the majority of the Commissioners.

They have to have the power to do what they need to do and not have the fear of being terminated by a three-two vote or a four -- you know, a majority vote.

So I haven't seen it. I mean, there are some processes that needed to be tighten up, that we've tightened up, but to spend the kind of money, half a million dollars, roughly, a million dollars, I just don't see that currently in the City, with our City employees.

We do have some very dedicated professional folks. And, again, keeping that function of audit under the City Manager's sole discretion, I think it's the right way to go, but that's my humble opinion.

MS. MOSCOWITZ: Unless it's the City

Manager, but -- just a random comment. But I

agree with you a hundred percent, which is why
I asked the questions I asked. It sounds
great, but it's usually expensive, and God
willing, it's not needed on a day-to-day basis.
If it is, in this small City, then we've got a
lot more problems than we think we do.

THE CITY MANAGER: Well, thank you for at least one person agreeing with me.

MS. MOSCOWITZ: You earned that.

CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Yes, Annie.

MS. BETANCOURT: Well, but I think we repeatedly heard during the public comment the issue of increased transparency. Obviously, that was a recurring theme of the speakers that we heard, increased transparency.

THE CITY MANAGER: That is correct.

Normally what we do in the City now is, we look at those high risk areas. So I sit down with Paula, who's my auditor, and we look at what are the high risk areas where things could go sideways, and then we decide, okay, we're going to audit these two departments. And we'll hire a company to come out, an independent company, to come out and do the audit and so on.

Now, I'm sure we could improve on the

1 transparency, in the sense of, once those audits are done, to report to the Commission, 2 so that the public knows that we've audited 3 Finance and Accounting or Public Works, and these were the findings. And the findings of 5 our auditors are public records. So maybe we 6 should do a better job of presenting that to the Commission. 8 MS. MOSCOWITZ: And would that be something 9 we would deal with, Don? Do you know? 10 that is the issue, transparency, not 11 necessarily needing a \$500,000 Inspector 12 General. 13 Do we have a role in promoting transparency 14 in those areas? 15 CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Well, as citizens, I 16 would guess we have a role and I'm trying to --17 MS. MOSCOWITZ: No, I understand. 18 CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: As a Committee? 19 MS. MOSCOWITZ: Yeah. 20 CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: I'd ask the City 21 Attorney. If during our look at the Charter, 22 23 if they find a place where something about transparency would be appropriate, we could 24 certainly consider that. 25

1	MS. THROCKMORTON: I would say, as we
2	continue on with our sections this morning, we
3	have a lot about budget and revenues. So there
4	may be an appropriate area there. But we can
5	also continue this conversation in our
6	Inspector General discussion at the next
7	meeting, to see if there's another proposal
8	that you all want to make about increasing
9	transparency at some point in the Charter.
10	CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: You know, it's
11	interesting that the City Manager came up with
12	the exact figure. I was going to answer your
13	question, Jane, is that I assumed that this is
14	a half a million dollar cost.
15	MS. MOSCOWITZ: Why I raised it.
16	CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Yeah, when you talk
17	about salary, support, office space, systems
18	and so forth.
19	And I Chair the Miami-Dade County Public
20	Schools Ethics Advisory Committee, which
21	doesn't count toward my twelve years, Tom,
22	and
23	MS. MOSCOWITZ: I was on that Committee
24	when it first started.
25	CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Yes, I know, with the

```
1
         Chief Justice.
             MS. MOSCOWITZ: Yes.
2
             CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Yes. May he rest in
 3
         peace.
 5
             And we use the Inspector General from the
         County, as was stated by the City Attorney, and
 6
         the way that works is that we actually -- the
         School Board pays for an Inspector General
8
         employee at the School Board to handle School
 9
         Board cases, but the support -- I mean, it's a
10
11
         limited cost, because -- it's still expensive,
         but that one employee, and then his staff
12
         support and other support and legal support,
13
         comes from the Downtown Inspector General.
14
             So they have someone on the ground doing
15
16
         the investigations and so forth, but the
17
         support element comes from the main office.
                                                       So
         it's under contract. And there's a cost.
18
         There's still a cost, but --
19
             MS. MOSCOWITZ: Yeah.
20
             MR. PARDO: Mr. Chairman, can I ask one
21
         question --
22
23
             CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Absolutely.
             MR. PARDO: -- since we have the Manager
24
         here?
25
```

Mr. Manager, when -- based on you looking at this with fresh eyes this past year, my concern, and I think most citizens' concerns, have to do with, we adopt a budget, which has a million line items. Then, all of a sudden, the monies are used differently. You know, you write in your checkbook -- the check for the lawn guy, the check for the this and the that, things move. I understand that.

But can the public ask for an up-to-date balance sheet of the budget, which has all of these line items, and where we are and how monies have been moved from one side to the other? I think that would accommodate a lot of the transparency issues that Jane is talking about, and that wouldn't cost anything, based -- which the Chair has rightfully said, that he agrees that we're talking about something north of half a million dollars?

THE CITY MANAGER: To answer your question,
I'm sure that's possible. Honestly, I'm not
sure, though, that I've seen massive transfers
of money from line items that we've already
budgeted, that's been approved.

For example, road construction, that we

1 take road construction money and put it on Parks and Recreations. I have not seen that. 2 And maybe that's something one of your Budget 3 folks not here, but --5 MR. PARDO: And sometimes, in capital improvement -- and I'm sorry to interrupt you, 6 in some capital improvement projects, there are cost overruns. 8 THE CITY MANAGER: Correct. 9 MR. PARDO: And, then, some money, let's 10 say, for sidewalks, have to be used for these 11 capital improvement projects that are 12 buildings, let's say. You know, there's an 13 expectation that the citizens are getting 14 sidewalks, because they've gone through all of 15 these budget hearings, and all of a sudden, 16 they don't have sidewalks year after year after 17 year, because that's where the money gets 18 funded. 19 THE CITY MANAGER: Understood. 20 MR. PARDO: And I think a lot of the 21 perception of needing the Inspector General has 22 23 to do with that. THE CITY MANAGER: Understood, but I have 24 not seen that type of transfer. 25

MR. PARDO: Okay.

THE CITY MANAGER: What I find -- and, again, in my short time, is that the way we do projects, for example, City Hall, we'll budget five million dollars this year. The next year, another five, maybe another seven depending on where the budget is, until we have the total amount of money to fix City Hall.

The problem with that is that, as we're saving money so we can do a cash payment and pay it off, the cost of the construction keeps going up. So what happens is, we get to the point where we are today, where we need to fix it, we have -- and I'll throw this figure out. I'm not sure of the exact amount -- we have twenty million dollars set aside, but it's going to cost us fifty million dollars.

So that I see as, us spending more money than we have to. So what I would do would be -- is, how much money do we have, that we can finish a project within a year or two, that we can fund it and pay it off? And, then, on the other side, for big projects like the City Hall restoration and some of the others, then we ask for a letter of intent and we look at

1 other financing, and then use that money that we've saved up, those twenty million dollars, 2 to pay the interest of the loan that's borrowed 3 to fix it. But I haven't seen a transfer -- a big 5 6 transfer, but I do believe the City Manager needs to have the authority to -- and maybe the Commission can set a limit, to say, okay, I'm 8 taking this project, Phillips Park, has seven 9 million dollars, but we need it now, because we 10 have a sewer pipeline that broke or whatever, 11 and I'm sorry, we're going to have to borrow 12 So the City Manager needs to have that 13 authority, again, in discussion with the 14 Commission, to move that money and get the work 15 done. 16 I don't know if that answers your question. 17 MS. MOSCOWITZ: Isn't all of this amenable 18 to a public records request? 19 THE CITY MANAGER: Yes. 20 MS. SUAREZ: If there's a record that shows 21 any of that, absolutely, yes. If there's an 22 23 existing record, yes. MS. MOSCOWITZ: Say, what? I'm sorry. 24 MS. SUAREZ: Certainly, if there are such 25

1 records, they would be public records. THE CITY MANAGER: And any amendments to 2 the budget, correct me if I'm wrong, we'll 3 bring to the Commission for a vote. MS. SUAREZ: I'd defer to you, Mr. Manager 5 6 on that. I know that there's certain things --THE CITY MANAGER: And I'm asking you. don't know the answer. 8 MS. SUAREZ: So I think your Budget staff 9 would probably be able to kind of give you the 10 finer points on that, but there are certain --11 I think there is some flexibility that the 12 Manager has, to a certain extent. 13 THE CITY MANAGER: Right. 14 CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Thank you. 15 Thank you, Mr. Manager. 16 MS. THROCKMORTON: I'm happy to provide 17 early next week all of that information about 18 the Inspector General that we discussed here, 19 so that you all can have time to digest it 20 before our next meeting, and if there's any 21 other information you want to request, I'm 22 23 happy to provide that, but it is scheduled -that specific request for the Commission was 24 made via Resolution for this Board to consider, 25

and that is scheduled for our next meeting, the Inspector General question.

Mr. Chair, do you want to go back to the -- CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Please.

MS. THROCKMORTON: So, again, Section 17 is generally about the creation, combination and discontinuance of any departments in the City.

Section 18 has to do with budget estimates. There was a referendum in 1967 which required the City Manager to prepare for the City Commission a budget three months prior to the fiscal year end. This had to do with the change between July 1st and an October 1st fiscal year. So that's why that amendment was waived to this Charter provision.

We did have a few suggestions at the Town
Hall regarding publishing the proposed final
budgets prior to any vote. There are some
State law provisions regarding the publication
and notice periods of the budget. So there is
some publication, and the budget is made
available online. I'm not sure if that request
had to do with specific line items or specific
details, but we do have a lot of State law
provisions to comply with, with budget

1 estimates and notice. So that's Section 18. Section 19 has to do with appropriation 2 balances and transfer between items. 3 know if this is what you were discussing, Mr. Pardo. There have been no updates to this 5 6 provision of the Charter recently. Section 20 has to do with unappropriated accruing revenue. Again, Section 19, 20, 21 8 and 22, if you want to go through those, 9 Desiree, all have to do with accounting 10 procedures and appropriation requests. None of 11 these have been amended in recent years. 12 They're all part of our compiled Charter. 13 CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Ms. Moscowitz. 14 MS. MOSCOWITZ: So going back to Section 15 19, do we want to add something that if amounts 16 are transferred, you know, because they're 17 needed from one place to another, that they 18 should be, I don't know, published someplace, 19 done something with, so that people are aware 20 of it? 21 MS. BETANCOURT: Well, they're public 22 23 record. MR. PARDO: Mr. Chairman, this is really 24 the crux of -- the most important part of what 25

the City Manager does.

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. THROCKMORTON: Mr. Pardo --

MS. SUAREZ: You need to speak into your microphone.

MR. PARDO: This is the crux of the -- of what the City Manager does, and the last thing you want to do is have the City Manager driving the car from the back seat. I think that we shouldn't get into the weeds of, you know, restricting, trying of figure this out. think it all has to do with the transparency of the concept of the Inspector General, which would be, sometimes, instead of the clumsiness of a public records request -- 'cause you could request records and not get what you're asking for, because -- especially when it comes to the budget, and then the citizens get frustrated, and then the first thing they think, after the second time they don't get to see what they want to see, is that they're trying to hide something at City Hall. That's not what we should be doing.

Maybe, sometimes, a simple portal, you know, on the website, where you could send the questions directly and find out exactly what's

happening or almost a real time how the budget is going throughout the year, and -- you know, the same as what you get from your accountant every month and every quarter, and I think that would be very, very helpful, because then everybody sees exactly what it is.

There's no cost. We have a great IT

Department, you know, and the Manager's got

everything at his fingertips, and making it

accessible in such a way where people are

seeing, you know, over the shoulder, instead of

getting in the way, you know, of the City

Manager, because it's a strong Manager system

that we have. The last thing I want to do is

trip the Manager.

MS. MOSCOWITZ: No. I think it would be easy enough to have a provision that said, if money that was allocated for "X" is going to be used for "Y," and it's a significant sum, 500,000, 750,000, that there be some sort of public notice about it, and people can either look at it or not, but it just gets -- it's out there.

Because he's right, if you don't phrase your public records request right, you don't

1 get it. CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Yeah, but that may be 2 more of a Commission Ordinance than a 3 Charter --5 MS. SUAREZ: Yeah. 6 MS. THROCKMORTON: That was going to be my suggestion, Mr. Slesnick. I don't think that it's not within this Board's purview to make 8 suggestions like that. I understand that it 9 may not be appropriate for a Charter Review 10 11 provision or a Charter provision, but if you all have additional suggestions like that, that 12 may be adopted via Ordinance or Resolution, 13 we've had, in recent years, the Commission 14 execute Resolutions requesting certain 15 16 appendices be added to the budget or certain updates, et cetera. 17 I don't think that suggestion for an 18 Ordinance would be unwelcomed by the 19 Commission. 20 MS. SUAREZ: Or even a direction -- a 21 Resolution with direction to Staff. 22 THE CITY MANAGER: I wanted to ask 23 Stephanie, do we not -- and I don't remember 24 We publish the budget --25 now.

1 MS. SUAREZ: Yes. THE CITY MANAGER: -- the final budget and 2 put it online, correct? 3 MS. THROCKMORTON: The proposed budgets and 5 the budget, as finally amended, are all available online and are attached to the 6 Ordinance, each time it's discussed, as well. THE CITY MANAGER: Then I would suggest --8 MS. SUAREZ: There is a financial 9 transparency page on our City web page, that 10 has a lot of information. I don't know 11 specifically what this Committee is discussing, 12 but I think it's something that perhaps can be 13 supplemented with additional --14 THE CITY MANAGER: Maybe what I would 15 16 suggest for the future City Manager and for the 17 City is -- maybe, on a quarterly basis, is publish where we're at with the budget at the 18 time, and it would be up to the resident to 19 20 look, "Okay. This is the first quarter and now here's where we're at with the second quarter." 21 I think putting that online is not really a 22 23 heavy lift, but I'll have to check with Staff to make sure that can be done. 24 MR. PARDO: Mr. Chairman, the reason that I 25

brought all of this up is, because the

Inspector General creation would be in the

Charter, and that's what I was trying to get

away from, once we get this around.

CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: But I think, though, that now that we've heard both, you and Ms. Moscowitz, we may want to make a suggestion to the City Commission in our report that they should consider adopting a system, and now the Manager has suggested a system that might be helpful.

MR. PARDO: Right. And Mr. Chairman, that's the reason that I wanted to make sure that the concept of the Inspector General simply doesn't go away, that the Commission understands that not only have we reviewed it, we've come up with something -- a suggestion for them to look at, that will create the concept of the Inspector General, without having to --

MS. THROCKMORTON: I'm happy to draft a Resolution to that effect for you all to consider at the next meeting or take a motion from you all today, if that's something that the Committee, as a whole, wishes to suggest to

1 the --

CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: I think most of us that have served on Boards, that, you know, the Board sits like quarterly, and the CEO presents the proposed budget and the actual expenditures, and -- so that you get to compare, on a quarterly or monthly or semi-annually, whatever basis, how the budget is playing out and what's been happening, and that way you can ask questions. "Well, wait a minute. We were saying that we were going to spend this much, but we spent this much," and there's usually a column that shows percentage below or above budget, and it's very helpful.

Okay. So we don't do that now? We don't have like quarterly reviews of the budget --

THE CITY MANAGER: We do it internally, but we don't publish it.

CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Okay.

THE CITY MANAGER: And I sit with my Budget Director. As a matter of fact, I have a budget meeting after lunch today, just to go over where we're at in the budget and those issues, but we don't publish it.

CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Okay.

THE CITY MANAGER: So that may be something we do biannually.

CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Yeah.

MR. PARDO: Easy lift.

MS. MOSCOWITZ: I'm happy to defer to you all's, you know, ability to write it clearly.

MS. THROCKMORTON: I'm happy to bring back a Resolution for your consideration.

CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Mr. Wells.

MR. WELLS: Yes, one comment. On Section 18, as the budget, 18-G says, "An itemization of anticipated revenue from other sources," I'd gotten a request that we should have an itemization of anticipated revenue from other sources and corresponding expenses related to other services -- yes, other sources.

And the reason why was because, when we went through the renovation of Burger Bob's, initially it was a \$570,000 increase, that became 650, and the numbers just kept moving. So, as part of the transparency, it would be good, if we're doing quarterly estimates, as cost figures change during the year, we should publish them to residents, so they know what's going on. So they don't yell to the Commission

for stuff that's outside of the Commission's control. That's one thing.

The other thing was, at the end of Section 18, it says, "The budget estimates shall also be posted on the City's website." It should probably say, the budget estimate and all amendments thereto. Now, you're probably already doing that, but the Charter doesn't say, "Budget estimates and all amendments thereto."

And Mr. City Manager, that's what you just referenced, that, you know, we have amendments to the budget. It's posted. I would just add, as part of our Constitution, that it's not only budget estimates, but it's also all amendments thereto. It's just words mean things.

MS. THROCKMORTON: Understood. I may need to clarify with Staff. I think budget estimate may be a term of art, which is what we use before the budget is adopted, and amendments to the budget, after the budget is adopted, may not be budget estimates, in the same way that they're contemplated in this section, but we can certainly get back to you, once we talk to Staff about that.

1 I think that budget estimate is prior to the adoption of the budget, amendments after 2 the budget is adopted. 3 MR. WELLS: Okay. MS. THROCKMORTON: My layman's 5 understanding of those terms. 6 MR. WELLS: So this would be amendments to the estimate. And I understand that once the 8 budget is adopted, that's the budget. I got 9 that. 10 MS. THROCKMORTON: Yeah. The budget 11 estimates are done much prior to the start of 12 each fiscal year. They're based on estimated 13 revenues. And those change, as we get new 14 information from the Property Appraiser, the 15 Tax Collector, et cetera. Those numbers change 16 and are updated to the Commission as we receive 17 those. 18 So when the budget comes for adoption, the 19 budget estimate may have changed substantially, 20 based on what the initial budget estimate was 21 months before that. 22 23 CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: But, Tom, there's also changes to the final budget during the year. 24

So, I mean, if you're talking about doing that,

25

you need to make it clear that you want to see
the amendments to the budget as it goes through
the year.
MR. WELLS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: I mean, the budget is
not a stagnant document.
MS. THROCKMORTON: And I understand
Mr. Pardo's suggestion to address that concern,
about amendments throughout the year, with a
quarterly update.
MS. SUAREZ: So I think we can discuss it
with Staff and kind of figure out bring
something back next meeting, after we discuss
it with them, and kind of learn from them more
what would be helpful.
MR. WELLS: Do we have a budget page, as
far as our website?
MS. THROCKMORTON: Yes.
MS. SUAREZ: Yes.
MR. WELLS: So all of the amendments,
everything, will be right there
MS. THROCKMORTON: The last, I think, five
to ten years, the budgets are all posted there,
as well as a bunch of different details.
MR. PARDO: Yeah, but I think the concept

that the Chair was discussing about, you know, the quarterly reports, just like every private sector corporation works, and just have it accessible to -- you know, we have the website. We're not creating anything. We're just showing another part of the information that the public needs to feel comfortable that everything is working the right way.

If, for example, on the Burger Bob issue, it would have been posted there, everybody's seeing this thing is spinning out of control, and, you know, you could hone in on that, and then make your own inquiries, as a citizen, and address the Commission, if you think it has to be addressed. And I think that's what it's all about. It's not a question of, you know, finding people stealing money from the City internally or something like that, although that is another function that the Manager has said, that they look at the areas where that can happen, and, unfortunately, it does happen, every once in a blue moon.

But, here, the key is that concept of, in my opinion, listening to the residents that came before us and listening to residents that

we know, is that the whole thing about the Inspector General is for the transparency, to make sure that monies are there, that were allocated during the budget time, the final budget, but during the year, so people know what's going on in the City, because that's their tax dollars.

MS. THROCKMORTON: Understood. So I take a consensus from you all that we will bring back a draft Resolution for you at the next meeting regarding those quarterly updates or whatever it may be.

CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: You know, I presume that our report, if it's like many reports, would be a report saying, this section, we suggest this, this section, we suggest this.

So it seems to me that it might be, in response to what's been said here, in response to what some of the citizens that have come before us, that separate out transparency issues and give a transparency section, where we say, these are the following suggestions that we believe would increase transparency, and with these Resolutions and/or amendments to this thing, we think that we have addressed that issue.

1 MS. THROCKMORTON: I'm happy to take any direction as to the final report of this 2 Committee. 3 MS. MOSCOWITZ: That's a great idea. CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Thanks. 5 (Inaudible.) 6 MS. THROCKMORTON: If we could pull back up the provisions. 8 CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: I'd like to say most of 9 us here are not architects. 10 MS. THROCKMORTON: Thank you. 11 So 20 and 21 have to do with Appropriations 12 for Withdrawals, Notice to the Manager, 13 Revision of Unencumbered Balances. Again, 14 these are old provisions. They have not been 15 amended recently. They're all part of the 16 consolidated Charter. 17 Section 22 also has to do with Accounting 18 Procedure and Financial Reports. They have to 19 be prepared each quarter and fiscal year and 20 for other periods, as the City Manager may 21 require. However, as we have discussed, there 22 23 may be some public facing requirements that you all want to suggest, but these are just the 24 accounting procedures. 25

MS. MOSCOWITZ: Right, but here's another place where they could be made available, you know, where it could say -- or maybe it doesn't belong in the Charter, but made available to the public.

MS. THROCKMORTON: The City Manager shall make reports of the City's financial transactions and financial condition as may be required by Ordinance or Resolution. An Ordinance or a Resolution directing certain time or procedures for those reports would certainly fall in line with this Charter provision.

Section 23 -- we're moving to Taxation here
-- just the disposition of revenues. There's
only been one recent change to this, and I
guess it wasn't that recent, in 1965, amending
this from the Tax Collector to the Finance
Director. It just has to do that those funds
shall be collected by the Finance Director.

Section 24 has to do with Public Works improvements --

CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: As to the tax collector, does the election of these new five Constitutional Officers, is there any impact on

our Charter in reference to whom we deal with?
I mean, all five areas have been the County.
So we have dealt all of these years with the
County on all five areas, and now there's five
different offices to deal with.
MS. THROCKMORTON: Yeah.
CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: From Tax Collector,
Property Appraiser, Clerk of the Court
MS. BETANCOURT: Supervisor
CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Supervisor of
Elections.
MS. THROCKMORTON: I haven't come across
any specific provisions that alter that. We'll
certainly take another go through, with a
fine-tooth comb. There are certainly plenty of
alterations to our processes and who we deal
with. There's definitely a lot of changes that
we're having to incorporate into our agreements
and our processes, but I haven't found any
in the Charter, but I'll certainly look at
those again.
CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Yeah, I mean, if there
is any, maybe we should look for it.
MS. THROCKMORTON: Uh-huh. Certainly.
Section 24 has to do with Public Works

construction, as I noted. Certain processes and procedures are required when constructing Public Works projects or improvements, more than \$25,000. This amount was changed in 2005. That was the last time this section was amended and it was to do with that fiscal amount.

That amount of \$25,000 -- I'll defer to the Manager, I haven't heard any recommendations from Staff. The Manager may have comments, as to that amount, but that amount currently coordinates with our applicable Procurement Code provisions.

THE CITY MANAGER: I do have a comment on that. And that is that, currently, I think the Manager has authority for about \$25,000 for construction, \$100,000 for services; is that correct?

MS. SUAREZ: Without having to go through the formal bidding processes.

THE CITY MANAGER: Correct.

In my opinion, \$25,000 for construction projects is really too low. There's not much you can do with 25,000. I would urge either \$50,000 or I would reverse it and I would have the authority for professional services stay

1	the same, but also increase the amount that the
2	Manager can authorize for construction, prior
3	to eventually, we would go to the
4	Commission, but prior to going to the
5	Commission, in case of an emergency or some
6	other issue.
7	Cristina, you had
8	MS. SUAREZ: No. No. That's fine.
9	THE CITY MANAGER: Oh, I thought you were
10	motioning me
11	MS. SUAREZ: No. No. I was just
12	listening. Sorry.
13	THE CITY MANAGER: So 25,000, it seems like
14	a low amount, from the time that I've been
15	here. Maybe 50,000.
16	MS. MOSCOWITZ: Well, you can't renovate
17	your bathroom for that.
18	THE CITY MANAGER: What's that?
19	MS. MOSCOWITZ: You can't renovate your
20	bathroom for that.
21	THE CITY MANAGER: No, ma'am.
22	CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: I just had my trees
23	trimmed, \$5,000.
24	MR. PARDO: Did you get a permit?
25	THE CITY MANAGER: I was just going to ask

1	that question.
2	CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: I don't think you have
3	to get a permit to trim
4	MS. THROCKMORTON: Less than 25 percent and
5	a certain diameter is okay.
6	CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: The answer is, no, I
7	didn't. So there, I confess.
8	MS. THROCKMORTON: Yeah, so, again, I
9	don't you heard from the Manager as to his
10	suggestion for that provision. If you could
11	bring it back up, Desiree.
12	I just wanted to note, it's very specific
13	as to Public Works and improvements, and it has
14	to do with the public notice and some of the
15	accounting public advertising and receipt of
16	bids.
17	So we have, via Ordinance, a Procurement
18	Code that accounts for that receipt of bids, as
19	prescribed by Ordinance, but that \$25,000
20	threshold is in the Charter.
21	MR. PARDO: So I'm sorry.
22	MS. MOSCOWITZ: So we should raise it?
23	MR. PARDO: Yeah. So we should raise it.
24	MS. THROCKMORTON: I'll defer to the
25	Manager on that recommendation.

1	MR. PARDO: Can the Manager provide a memo
2	with a suggestion for the amounts? That would
3	be great.
4	MS. SUAREZ: Sure. We're happy to work
5	with the Manager's Office, so that he can
6	you know, maybe I think you're asking for
7	like more explanation.
8	MR. PARDO: Just a
9	MS. SUAREZ: The Manager's Office.
10	THE CITY MANAGER: Or the new Manager.
11	MR. PARDO: Right. Well, you know
12	CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Could we have it by
13	five o'clock today?
14	MS. THROCKMORTON: And it may be a question
15	that the Public Works staff and the
16	assistant
17	MS. SUAREZ: And Procurement.
18	MS. THROCKMORTON: and Procurement, the
19	Assistant Director for Procurement may have
20	some suggestions on it.
21	MR. PARDO: Right. As a memo from The
22	Manager's Office.
23	MS. THROCKMORTON: Certainly, we can get
24	that to you for the next meeting.
25	CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: I mean, I think Mr.

1 Pardo, maybe it's a good question, that we'd like to have some backup for what we might 2 decide, showing the expertise and the 3 experience that the Manager has. 5 MS. THROCKMORTON: Certainly. We'll make sure that that's available. 6 MS. MOSCOWITZ: And should there be a separate emergency --8 MS. THROCKMORTON: There is separate 9 emergency provisions already addressed in the 10 Code, yes. 11 I want to point out, Section 23 12 MR. WELLS: and 24, we got a comment during the Town Hall 13 Meeting that Section 23 deals with revenue and 14 24 deals with Public Works, but there is no 15 provision in the Charter right now that 16 addresses lease provisions. 17 MS. THROCKMORTON: I have that to be under 18 sort of existing -- or sort of catch-all 19 provisions for the next meeting, but I'm happy 20 to address it now, if you'd like. 21 MR. WELLS: Well, so I'll finish up and we 22 23 can address it at the next meeting, but I can tell you that we worked exclusively with the 24 City Manager, when I dealt with -- when my wife 25

dealt with Birdie Bistro and when Harald Neuweg dealt with Fritz and Franz, and it would have been very helpful for the City Commission to give input to the City Manager -- direction as to what the lease should be, should it be a concessionary agreement, should it be a tenant lease agreement, what they're looking for, for rent.

That would be helpful for the City Manager, so the City Manager would know what he's expected to return to the Commission for approval.

MS. SUAREZ: So on that point, I will -you know I'll defer to the City Manager, but
that is kind of part of the Manager's authority
to negotiate -- you know, make the business
decisions and the negotiation, because it is
still subject to Commission approval, and
throughout the process, of course, there is -typically the Manager communicates with the
Elected Officials and briefs them and updates
them, and certainly don't make decisions
outside of a meeting, but that is part of the
process, and the Staff function is that
negotiation.

And the Commission can, of course, always give direction as they're updated, right. If the Manager's updating them on what's going on, and they have a different view, they can bring it up -- put an item on the agenda and give that direction. So that could already happen, is what I'm trying to suggest.

MR. WELLS: Right. It could, but without the Commission making a determination in a public meeting as to what the direction is, the residents do not get a chance to have input.

MS. SUAREZ: Understood.

MR. WELLS: So these private meetings -the residents aren't participating in these
private meetings. That was my point.

MS. SUAREZ: No. And I just think, from the -- you know, and I don't want to speak for the Manager, but I think, sometimes, when you're in a negotiation, it is challenging to have the negotiation in public. In other words, you know, you're negotiating with a potential tenant and you -- you know, to have the public discussion about -- which is going to still be subject to Commission approval, but I think it maybe, perhaps, hinders the

negotiation, if it has the whole -- you know, if the terms are already laid out in public, and that back and forth, perhaps it becomes a little more difficult.

But, of course, you know, we're happy to take your suggestions, but -- and those processes, those are -- you know, the Commission ultimately approves it, and so the Commission doesn't have to approve, you know, terms that it doesn't agree with, and the Commission gets briefed along the way.

MS. THROCKMORTON: I will also, before our next meeting, provide all of you with -- we have certain Code provisions related to the process for the rent and sale of the City leasing, as well as City selling land, so I'll be sure to provide those, because we do have some Code provisions that are applicable to that, as well.

MS. SUAREZ: Yeah, we have procurement provisions for that.

MR. WELLS: And to answer your comment about negotiations, I strongly believe that depends on if you're positional negotiating or principal negotiating, and so if the City

1 Manager is coming in with a higher number, looking for middle ground, versus this is the 2 number the City is going to take. 3 MS. SUAREZ: Understood. MR. WELLS: And I haven't found that we've 5 done principal negotiation in the two examples 6 I talked about. But I did not participate in those negotiations, so I'm just -- it's third 8 party information. 9 MS. SUAREZ: Right. 10 MR. WELLS: Thank you. 11 MS. SUAREZ: Understood. Understood. 12 MS. THROCKMORTON: If we could go to 13 Section 25. This has to do with the bonding of 14 officers. There have been no recent changes. 15 It's a short provision. 16 Section 26 has to do with Advisory Boards. 17 In 1975, there was a referendum where the 18 question was whether the City Commission could 19 appoint Advisory Board Members without having 20 21

In 1975, there was a referendum where the question was whether the City Commission could appoint Advisory Board Members without having the request of the City Manager. So, as you all know now, with some exceptions, based on Board provisions, the City Commission appoints Advisory and Quasi-Judicial Board and Committee Members as a whole.

22

23

24

25

We did receive some suggestions from the public regarding qualifications for serving on an Advisory or Quasi-Judicial Board, that these Board Members must be U.S. citizens living in Coral Gables for three years prior to appointment on a Board, was the suggestion at There may be some issues with the Town Hall. some of those. We do have residential term requirements for some Boards, but not others, and those are set on a Board by Board basis, via Ordinance or Resolution, by the Commission. CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Is there any desire --I think I heard something from the public, that all of our Boards have residential requirements or is that something we don't care about? I think it exists there now. MR. PARDO: CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: No, just certain. MS. THROCKMORTON: So we have various provisions that addresses -- some Boards

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. THROCKMORTON: So we have various provisions that addresses -- some Boards address them specifically. Some Board require all to be residents. We do have a general waiver provision, where the City Commission can, by a four-fifth vote, waive the residency requirement, if there is one.

Some Boards have specific provisions that

require you to be -- or allow you to be a resident, a property owner or a business owner. Some allow you to be a property owner or a resident. So you may own multiple properties, but not be a resident of the City of Coral Gables, but may still want to serve on a -- the Board of Adjustment, for example, has a broader requirement like that.

Some Boards, like the Historic Preservation Board, require you to have been a resident for a certain number of years prior to serving on the Historic Preservation Board. So each Board has a unique makeup of those requirements. We do have a general catch-all waiver provision for that residency requirement which, like I said, requires a four-fifth vote of the Commission.

MR. PARDO: We have a requirement for the Board of Architects where they don't necessarily have to be residents, but they have to at least have their offices here and also practice here.

MS. THROCKMORTON: Uh-huh.

MR. PARDO: If we would change that there, we would be in the deepest world of trouble --

1 MS. THROCKMORTON: Uh-huh. MR. PARDO: -- of getting enough --2 MS. THROCKMORTON: As you all well know, we 3 have thirty -- how many Boards, 38 Boards. MS. SUAREZ: 37, 38, something like that. 5 MS. THROCKMORTON: Filling all of those 6 positions with only residents, there would certainly be some Boards, I think, like the 8 Board of Architects, for instance, that 9 Mr. Pardo mentioned, that may suffer from a 10 lack of quorum or --11 CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: With all of these 12 people that are going to run for office, we 13 should be able to fill these Boards with 14 residents. 15 But, anyways, on the Board of Architects, 16 Felix, I'm glad you said something about that, 17 it disturbs me greatly about some of the 18 decisions coming out of the Board of 19 Architects, and when people have complained, 20 they keep getting told that nobody has any 21 control over the Board of Architects, which is 22 23 crazy. I mean, the Board of Architects is still an appointed Board of this City, whether 24 25 they practice here or own property here or live

here.

And, you know, when I go through the neighborhoods and see these great, big white blocks, they're just horrible, and I just wonder, you know, what is going on here? And I'm not sure if what I'm saying has anything to do with the Charter, but it bothers me greatly.

MS. MOSCOWITZ: Yeah.

MR. PARDO: May I respond to that?

CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Yeah.

MR. PARDO: Okay. You and me, both. And our Chair on the Board does a great job, Judy Carty. She was actually here last night. We had a Planning Board meeting until, I don't know, ten o'clock or something like that, and we had about two-thirds of the Board of Architects here. There's nine of them there now.

Not only is it disturbing, I just -- it is incomprehensible that some of these single-family homes have been approved this way. And so there are two different issues that -- and I told them publicly last night, and our City Attorney was there, and I said to the Chair and the Board Members, that when --

it doesn't matter what it is, the Board of Architects always gets blamed.

So, two things, the first thing, the single-family homes, many of these what I call shoe boxes that have been built, that look like they belong somewhere else, definitely not in Coral Gables, they're completely non-compatible and out of place; they were apparently approved during the Pandemic, where a former City Architect was able to administratively approve them. That is what I have been told by the Board. That is bad.

The second thing is that, one of the things that we discussed last night had to do with a provision giving the Board Members the ability to look more at different functions and different things that they can do. In other words, we kind of put a couple of more tools in their tool box, as a recommendation to the Commission, in order to be able to adjust to compatibility with the existing neighborhoods, massing of some of these large buildings, and other things that are in there.

So I'm very much aware. I've driven that very hard, to make sure that gets done, but

1 without a doubt, you know, when you see some of these design elements in these homes, it is 2 unfortunate. You can't put the Genie back in 3 the bottle, but in my opinion, it's not the Board of Architects' fault, but there is fault 5 and we've tried to correct it. 6 CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: And Felix, you'll remember, if you go back thirty years, you and 8 I had led the fight on the Planning and Zoning 9 Board against McMansion, and so --10 MR. PARDO: That's right. 11 MS. MOSCOWITZ: Against what? 12 CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: McMansion. 13 MR. PARDO: McMansion. 14 CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: In other words, the 15 tearing down of the 1920s single story 16 Mediterranean house --17 MS. MOSCOWITZ: Microphone. 18 CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: The tearing down of the 19 1920s single story Mediterranean house and 20 ending up with a two-and-a-half story towering 21 yard, lot line to lot line, McMansion, as we 22 23 called them. MR. PARDO: Right. And that is right, and, 24 you know, that battle continues, and it's only 25

1 gotten worse, because they're coming at us in all directions. 2 MS. THROCKMORTON: Mr. Chair, would you 3 like us to go to the next --5 CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Yes, please. MS. THROCKMORTON: Section 27 has to do 6 with compensation, which should be set by Ordinance. City Manager determines the salary 8 for all under purview or his or her purview, 9 subject to approval by the City Commission. 10 11 This provision was ratified in 1997 via Ordinance as part of a cleaning up after the 12 Municipal Home Rule Powers Act. 13 We received some suggestions regarding 14 compensation of appointed officials and/or 15 16 benefits to employees. I don't know that they would fit in this subject, but I bring them up 17 now, as they related to compensation. 18 Section 28 is just a savings clause. 19 20 we -- that needs to be there, to protect the City if any provisions are found to be invalid. 21 Section 29 has to do with the name of the 22 23 City of Coral Gables, that no one else can take our name. 24

Section 30 has to do with the repealing

25

clause. Same thing, this is just repealing all of those provisions after our Municipal Home
Rule Powers Act and our consolidated and readoptioning of the Charter. So this should remain.

Section 31 has to meet with the metes and bounds of the City. The last time this was updated was in 2004, where it includes those recently annexed areas, including Kings Bay and various others. So that was the last metes and bounds description of the City.

Section 32, relatedly, says that we are not responsible in any illegally included lands and we don't have any liability for taxes for those lands that may accidentally be in our metes and bounds descriptions.

Section 32 (sic) is just a general statement that the City has available to it --33, sorry, Desiree -- has available to it all governmental, corporate and proprietary powers that the City has under Florida Constitution and the State Laws. So, again, just making it clear to the public that we have all powers available to us.

Section 34 has those additional powers, and

this just specifies those powers provided for in the Miami-Dade County Home Rule Charter, as well as the Municipal Home Rule Powers Act. So these are the specific powers and authorities. These are very broad, general powers.

We received some suggestions at the Town Hall related specifically to these powers.

You'll see, as we go through them, most of them are flushed out in Ordinance or in the Zoning Code. We received a bunch of suggestions that I will bring up at the next meeting, that may lend themselves to the same sort of suggestion that we talked about, of a Resolution or Ordinance directing the City Commission to consider some of those changes, rather than their inclusion in the Charter, as these are very broad additional power statements.

If we could go to the next slide, you'll see the power to impose local and special assessments. That's well established in State Law and there's various details to those. I don't think any additional ones should be in there.

Abatement of nuisances, we have a Nuisance Abatement procedure, a Nuisance Abatement

Board, that is set up in Code provisions.

The police powers, obviously, there's a lot of documentation, as the Manager well knows, about a City's police powers.

If you go to the next slide, the general welfare, as you know, everything the City does is to promote and maintain the general welfare of the public.

And Section 34-e, Zoning, as you can see, we have sort of a general statement about the power of zoning, most of which is established in very specific detail in the City Zoning Code.

The next slide, signage, same thing.

That's spelled out very particularly within our

Zoning Code, and we have looked at that very

recently, given recent Supreme Court cases. So

we've looked very closely at our Signage Code.

And, then, investigative power, this is also established in certain Boards, the power of the Trial Board, the power of the Commission to summon witnesses, subpoena documents. It's also come up in discussions about the Inspector General. So it may be an area that we can discuss again at the next meeting, about the

City's investigative powers.

And those are all of the provisions of the Charter, of our existing Charter.

So our plan had been, and, again, I'm happy to take any other direction, that there are various other suggestions we received at the Town Hall that haven't fit squarely within one of these provisions, or at least to my mind, have not yet fits squarely within one of those provisions. We will bring all of those back, along with the Inspector General item and all of the backup material we discussed, the memo from the City Manager's Office about the Public Works, and the Resolution about the quarterly information, and Mr. Wells' proposal, if we have any tweaks, for the next meeting, but happy to take any other suggestion or direction.

MS. BETANCOURT: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Yes, Annie.

MS. BETANCOURT: Thank you, Stephanie, for that report.

Would under Section 31 be applicable on the topic of annexation?

MS. THROCKMORTON: So that description is

just a legal description of the City. If there is a will, and I do have that on the list, to bring back next time, about certain requirements related to annexation, there are County Code provisions that set forth the process for annexation that the City must follow, that we can discuss, but if there is a direction as to that, I don't know that it would be appropriate in that section, as that's just the legal description of the City. It may be best suited in an Ordinance. MS. BETANCOURT: Right, but that was a concern that was, you know, discussed from the public. MS. THROCKMORTON: Understood.

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. SUAREZ: Is there something related to annexation that you would like us to bring back some --

MS. BETANCOURT: No. I just -- publicly, it was a topic.

MS. THROCKMORTON: Of course, and I have it on my list to bring back at the next meeting that suggestion which was made, to require City Commission approval and a referendum, prior to proceeding with an annexation, or at some point

1	in the annexation process, which is what was
2	done the last time. So I'm happy to pull any
3	information you'd like before that, but I do
4	plan on discussing that at the next meeting.
5	MS. BETANCOURT: Well, I'm only thinking
6	that it might come up again.
7	MS. THROCKMORTON: Of course.
8	MS. BETANCOURT: Our next Charter revision
9	will be ten years down the road, so
10	MS. THROCKMORTON: Uh-huh. Certainly.
11	MS. MOSCOWITZ: So I'm curious, there was
12	something sent out to residents, I believe,
13	just of the Little Gables, but I'm not sure,
14	that said, "Do you approve of annexation," and
15	it only had the ability to answer yes.
16	MS. THROCKMORTON: So there was a petition
17	process.
18	MS. MOSCOWITZ: Well, no. But I want to
19	know, was that did the City send that out?
20	MS. SUAREZ: So I don't know exactly which
21	communication you're referring to, but the
22	City, as part of the process that's required to
23	follow under the County procedures, has to
24	receive a certain number of petitions before it
25	can move forward. And so there was a petition

1 sent to the residents -- and only to the residents of the area, of course, because 2 they're the ones who would -- the petitions 3 have to come from them. 5 And basically, it was to be returned -- you return it if it's a yes, because what matters 6 is -- for the County, is that they need a certain number of petitions in support, and so 8 that's why it only had a yes option. If you 9 were not in favor, it just simply is not 10 returned. 11 MS. THROCKMORTON: The County requires a 12 13 petition, not a ballot. MS. SUAREZ: Right. 14 MS. MOSCOWITZ: The optics were terrible. 15 I would not want to see that again, because I 16 didn't understand, until you just said that, 17 that that's the point, but it looked like what 18 we call a push poll. You know, you could only 19 give one answer. 20 MS. THROCKMORTON: It may be instructive 21 for us to provide those procedures prior to the 22 23 next meeting. MS. MOSCOWITZ: I would not want to see 24

that happen again.

25

1 Yes, I would like to discuss that, and I would like to ban that. 2 MS. THROCKMORTON: So, some of that, as the 3 City Attorney said, is requirements under the 5 County Code. There's also State Law provisions related to annexation. So we're happy to 6 provide those in advance. A lot of that process is dictated by those other entities. 8 CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: I think what Jane is 9 saying is that the optics were bad. 10 MS. THROCKMORTON: Understood. 11 CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: And that it could have 12 been explained. I mean, first of all, I didn't 13 see it, so I don't know what the explanation 14 was, if it said clearly this is to determine 15 16 whether you support it -- I mean, I just don't know what it said. 17 MS. MOSCOWITZ: I don't remember exactly, 18 but it was basically, do you support the 19 annexation and all you could check off was yes. 20 MR. PARDO: It was in the form of a 21 question, but you only had one answer. 22 23 CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Yeah. Right. MS. THROCKMORTON: There's also -- as we've 24 discussed many times with the Commission 25

before, new limitations in State Law as to the City's ability to push out information about referendums and questions coming before them. It is something that will affect this process, insofar as if the City Commission chooses to send any Charter referendums to the public. The City is handcuffed in its ability, much more than it has been in the past, to provide information directly to residents about those Charter referendum questions.

There's been recent updates in State Law in the last few years that have really, like I mentioned, handcuffed the City's ability to provide information directly to the residents about.

CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Do we have any provisions for seceding from the City?

MS. MOSCOWITZ: I know there's been a lot of preemption, but I didn't realize, in terms, even, of information that you all could provide. I'd like to see the statutory reference.

MS. THROCKMORTON: I'll certainly send that to you. The City used to be able to send factual information to residents directly, so

not advocating for a position, but factual information, and that ability was taken away a few Legislature sessions ago, but we'll certainly send the provision, as well, because it does affect the work of this Committee insofar as what's put out, if the City Commission wants to even send factual information about the effect of a provision may be hampered.

And, obviously, we'll look very closely at what we are able to do when these items come up, but I did want to make you all aware of that, as well.

MR. PARDO: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Yes, Mr. Pardo.

MR. PARDO: There were a lot of concerns about zoning and development, and, obviously, none of those would be Charter issues, unless we would do something like what Miami Beach does, that sometimes, when there is a change of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan of a certain magnitude, that it has to be vetted and actually goes to a vote. This is what they do in Miami Beach. I'm not necessarily suggesting it here.

But I am expressing a huge concern that our Comprehensive Land Use Plan is -- changes almost willy-nilly. The threshold is so low, that that Comp Plan, which is the ceiling of what can be developed, changes, and the most remarkable part about it is that, conceptually, I remember many, many, many, many years ago, a very different, of what I understand was John Little, and if you needed to get anything done, as far as zoning is concerned, it was John. He was the expert's expert, and always gave the City solid advice.

And when Governor Graham came up with
the -- what basically happened, as far as
development and controlling development in the
State of Florida, and every municipality and
county was scrambling to put together a Master
Plan, it was all based on concurrency, water,
sewer, traffic, all of these things.

I went through a hearing last night, and there was a lot of concern about the width of certain public right-of-ways and the zoning that has been changed and the Comprehensive Land Use Plan that was changed. I think it's absolutely remarkable that we don't have a

comprehensive update of understanding that our infrastructure can't take the changes of development that have occurred right before our eyes.

So what used to take me five minutes, to get from my home here, took me ten minutes this morning.

CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Twenty.

MR. PARDO: Twenty for Don.

CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: From North Greenway.

MR. PARDO: From North Greenway. There's something wrong with this picture. I know that zoning is one thing, but I say that we should really look at the overall Comprehensive Land Use Plan, and that the voters of the City of Coral Gables should have some type of decision-making, when it comes to some of these things that affect the entire future of this City, from a development standpoint, and that would be in the Charter, if we would bring it up to some type of vote.

Right now, I feel totally uncomfortable with staff putting together things, with land use attorneys giving them advice or their concerns. There's no citizens there doing the

same thing. And we end up with what we end up, and that's wrong.

So I would like this Committee to think about that, and look at what the thresholds are in the City of Miami Beach, not to replicate it, but just to see how they handle certain things, and I think it's important for us to be able to give more voice to the residents at the ballot box, when it comes to what the City of Coral Gables should look like in the future.

MS. THROCKMORTON: Mr. Pardo, I'm happy to provide that information. Pinecrest also looked at something similar recently and there have been some State Law preemptions, actually, that have to do with land use and comprehensive planning and referendums. So I'm happy to provide that in advance of our next meeting, because I think it would be instructive to your discussions.

CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: And I just want to add, and before I recognize -- I want to say something about you. Representative Betancourt, and I mean that with all due respect, 'cause when our representative served in the Legislature, the Legislature was much,

much more respectful of cities' rights and
Cities' powers and cities' ability to deal with
their own issues, something that has been lost
in the Legislature since good Legislators like
Ms. Betancourt left, and that has hurt us, too,
Felix.

Some of the things you talked about have been taken away from cities, and it should never have happened, and we want you back.

MS. BETANCOURT: Thank you. No.

CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: And you're still here twelve years --

MS. BETANCOURT: I appreciate your words, but going back to our laundry list that -- on the topic, it's repeated again and again and again, referendums regarding zoning, zoning changes, development. So, again, it's a recurring theme, that is very well a part of what we're supposed to be doing here.

MS. THROCKMORTON: And I'm perfectly happy to, if you all, in the meantime, have any other direction of information you'd like to see in advance. Those topics will be on our next meeting agenda, and I do think, like Mr. Pardo mentioned, the process in Miami Beach and other

municipalities, and like I said, applicable

State Law, provisions about comprehensive

planning and/or referendums will be helpful to

look at.

CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: And I think, for the

Committee's purposes, if they don't remember, I

Committee's purposes, if they don't remember, I think, if you could dig up some report on -- we actually had a referendum on the ability of the City to lease or sell public property --

MS. THROCKMORTON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: -- that dealt with the Village of Merrick Park and it was defeated.

The citizens voted, no, that you didn't have to have a referendum.

So, I mean, I think, as a historical note, we should see that.

CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: I mean, before we think that everybody out there agrees with -- I mean, I don't know. We may all agree wholeheartedly that there needs to be some brakes put on changes to our Zoning Code and so forth, and if that's through referendum or whatever, but I guess some people don't agree with that.

1 MR. PARDO: And I just want to add one more 2 thing to that.

CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Yeah.

MR. PARDO: Is that, years ago, the save all for our City and planning was to have a Charrette.

MS. BETANCOURT: Oh, yeah.

MR. PARDO: Let me tell you, being an architect, it is very frustrating, because what happens is that you could load a Charrette with certain people, certain type, bus them in, if you want, ensue things, kind of be able to paint a broad brush across items, not even live in this City, and tell people what they should do, and then have other people justify their actions based on these Charrettes, which sometimes are Charades.

CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Okay. Well, you're absolutely right, that could happen, but let me, in defense, say that our -- and I think you participated in our 2002 Charrette, which, in fact, included many residents and even children. We had an incredible -- and I think the results of that Charrette would actually be results that you would support. I mean, if you

go back and look at the suggestions that were made, it was done in a manner and led by, at the time, Commissioner Maria Anderson, who was the one who led the fight against Merrick Park, and the Charrette was to bring attention back to the fact of what Coral Gables was and what it was meant to be, and how we could go back to a planning future that was very respective of that, and it was led by the University of Miami, and Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk did that for us.

So, I mean, it was an incredible Charrette, you know, but I think the results of the Charrette were somewhat very supportive of all of the things you believe in.

MR. PARDO: And then -- and the whole point here is that, neighbor, upon neighbor, upon neighbor in the City, since then forward, are so unhappy with what they see just looking out the windows of their kitchens, when they could see lights of developments, in the City of Coral Gables, from their kitchen windows, in their single-family home. That's a problem.

CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: But we haven't even had a Charrette that involves citizens since then.

1	I don't think. I think that was the last time
2	we asked the citizens to opine.
3	MR. PARDO: Yeah. So the whole point, I
4	think, is that when you have changes of the
5	Comprehensive Land Use Plan and also public
6	buildings, I think, you know, an ability to go
7	to a referendum is important. So it's just
8	food for thought.
9	CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: No. I loved Coral
10	Gables, and the way it was, the way it should
11	be, and
12	MR. PARDO: I know you do.
13	CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: the way it should be
14	in the future.
15	MS. MOSCOWITZ: I think this would be a
16	huge contribution that we could make, that
17	would be beyond tinker.
18	MS. BETANCOURT: Speak into the microphone.
19	MS. THROCKMORTON: Yeah. Could we use the
20	microphone, please? I'm sorry, Ms. Moscowitz.
21	MS. MOSCOWITZ: I think we should look into
22	this.
23	MR. WELLS: Chair, one point, also, is that
24	if something lost previously in front of the
25	residents, that's the position of the residents

```
1
         a while ago. That's not what the position of
         the residents --
2
             CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Twenty years ago.
 3
             MR. WELLS: Yeah, that's not the position
 5
         of the residents now. So, as a combination, I
         see our job as providing thoughtful options for
 6
         residents through referendum. Whether we might
         agree with it or not, we're still providing
8
         thoughtful positions for the residents to take
 9
         one, because we don't pass anything, as you
10
11
         know.
                The residents decide -- well, the
         Commission and then the residents.
12
13
             Thank you.
             CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Tom, you're right.
14
         Absolutely.
15
             MR. WELLS:
                          Thank you.
16
             MS. THROCKMORTON: Mr. Chair --
17
             CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: You're welcome.
18
             MS. THROCKMORTON: Mr. Chair, I did have
19
         one more matter to bring up, which is just a
20
         matter of scheduling. We have one more meeting
21
         scheduled at this time, which is a quick
22
23
         turnaround from this meeting to the next. I
         anticipate, given the amount of discussion
24
25
         today and the things that we will be bringing
```

back, that we may need at least one more final meeting to go over recommendations and to give our office the chance to consolidate all of your recommendations into a report, to get feedback from you all about how you would like that report to look and what actual language you are suggesting to the Commission.

So I'm going to ask the Deputy City Clerk if she can work with you all to find some additional dates, because I do anticipate that we may need another meeting beyond our one we have scheduled for early February, but I'll defer to you all on that scheduling and your thoughts on that.

CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: And a complication on that, of course, is that we have an election coming up in April, and we have qualifying for that election in February.

MS. THROCKMORTON: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: And I wanted to congratulate -- showing their public spirit, that there are two members of our Committee who have stated their interest in public office, and that is our Vice Chair Tom, who has stated his interest in running for the Commission, and

1	our Member Pardo, who has stated his interest.
2	So I think that they are showing, again,
3	another level of commitment to this City, to
4	its citizens and I congratulate them on putting
5	themselves out there and doing that.
6	But I think the situation will complicate
7	the matters of having the other meeting, but we
8	can see if we can come to a date.
9	MS. THROCKMORTON: Certainly, and we can
10	see how much we get done in our February 6
11	meeting. Obviously, we're happy to within
12	the bounds of our possible time, do as much as
13	we can, before the February 6th meeting. I
14	just wanted to bring that up, that I do
15	anticipate us having to I don't anticipate
16	having a final report ready for your review and
17	approval on February 6th.
18	CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Understood.
19	Is there any other business to come before
20	this Committee?
21	MS. THROCKMORTON: I think it's the 6th.
22	Yes, okay.
23	CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Jane?
24	MS. MOSCOWITZ: No.
25	CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Oh, okay. Any other

1	business?
2	MS. BETANCOURT: I simply want to thank
3	staff for providing all of the backup
4	information
5	MR. WELLS: Yes.
6	MS. BETANCOURT: that you did regarding
7	the other municipalities. That was very
8	helpful.
9	MS. THROCKMORTON: Thank you.
10	CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Well, I think,
11	actually, to thank the Clerk's Office, the City
12	Attorney's Office, the City Manager's Office,
13	for all of its support they've given us through
14	this process. And the information has been
15	extremely helpful and generous, and we thank
16	you all.
17	MS. SUAREZ: Thank you.
18	And just I do have to say, on behalf of the
19	Commission, I know that they are very
20	appreciative of the service that you are
21	providing. And, you know, so I know that they
22	would also want us to thank you.
23	CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: They can send us
24	presents.
25	MS. BETANCOURT: Pins.

```
CHAIRMAN SLESNICK:
                                  They did.
1
                                             These are
         very, very charming little buttons.
                                               Thank you.
2
              MS. SUAREZ: They're very nice.
 3
              CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Any other business?
 4
                                                        Ιf
5
         not, is there a motion to adjourn?
             MR. PARDO: So moved.
 6
             MS. BETANCOURT: So moved.
7
              CHAIRMAN SLESNICK: Okay. It's been moved
8
         by Ms. Betancourt and seconded by Mr. Pardo.
9
         Any objections? Show it unanimously adopted
10
         that we are adjourned.
11
              (Thereupon, the meeting was adjourned at
12
         11:05 a.m.)
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

<u>CERTIFICATE</u>
STATE OF FLORIDA:
SS.
COUNTY OF MIAMI-DADE:
I, NIEVES SANCHEZ, Court Reporter, and a Notary
Public for the State of Florida at Large, do hereby
certify that I was authorized to and did
stenographically report the foregoing proceedings and
that the transcript is a true and complete record of my
stenographic notes.
DATED this 30th day of January, 2025.
Λ
Min Dans
NIEVES SANCHEZ