

# CITY OF COCONUT CREEK CHARTER REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

Government Center 4800 West Copans Road Coconut Creek, FL 33063 Date: March 26, 2025

Time: 5:00 p.m.

**Location: Public Meeting Room Adjacent to Commission Chambers** 

#### 1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chair Craig Valvo at 5:06 p.m.

#### 2. PRESENT UPON ROLL CALL:

Chair Craig Valvo - District E
Vice Chair Alex Escoriaza - District D
Jonathan Ahlbum - District A
David Mintzes - District B
Mohammed Razib - District C

Also present: City Clerk Joseph J. Kavanagh, Deputy City Attorney Kathy Mehaffey, and City Attorney Terrill C. Pyburn.

City Attorney Pyburn noted that the meeting was being conducted live with a quorum physically present and explained the procedures for the meeting.

#### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

3. A MOTION APPROVING THE MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS CHARTER REVIEW BOARD MEETING(S). (2025-0226 AND 2025-0306)

**MOTION:** Mintzes/Ahlbum – To approve the Minutes of the February 26, 2025, and

March 6, 2025, Charter Review Board Meetings, as presented.

The Motion passed by a unanimous voice vote.

# 4. REVIEW OF CHARTER SECTIONS

Deputy City Attorney Mehaffey reviewed materials provided by staff for the Board's discussion of Single Member Districts. She stated staff had provided a map of the Commission Districts A-E and the voting precincts. She noted voting precincts were established by the Supervisor of Elections Office, and the City had no say in changes. She explained there had been changes between 2021 and 2023, which included a reduction from fourteen (14) precincts to nine (9). She stated that because of the precinct changes, data was provided on the 2023 and 2025 elections, to include a summary of voter turnout and associated data analysis.

City Attorney Pyburn highlighted Senate Bill 1416, which proposed a change for all municipal elections to November. She stated she would provide updates as available. Discussion ensued regarding the potential timeline for implementation of the legislation if

# Charter Review Board Minutes March 26, 2025 Page 2

passed and the associated impacts.

The Board reviewed and discussed the voting data provided and the impact of districts, precincts, and voter turnout. Chair Valvo outlined a hypothetical example in which a single district or precinct sought to elect candidates based on pushing a single issue through. He pointed out candidates in the past had told him that support from Wynmoor was a must, and he was interested in whether this was supported by data. He stated that, in reviewing the data, it appeared in the past two (2) elections, Precinct 4 saw the election the same as the rest of Coconut Creek, but his concern would be in the event that they did not.

Board Member David Mintzes commented on the communication within Wynmoor, noting that with close to 8,000 people on an email list, it was easier to campaign to a more cohesive group. Discussion continued. Mr. Mintzes stated he was interested in exploring each district electing its own Commissioner rather having at-large District Commissioners.

Chair Valvo advised that he had been discussing the idea in the community, and the only consistent negative feedback he had received was that if a single district elected a Commissioner, that Commissioner would be less incentivized to serve the whole City. He stated he could see that as a potential downside but personally saw it as each district being well represented by an individual Commissioner and the Mayor.

City Attorney Pyburn noted that the Redistricting Board would be charged in 2026 with reducing the districts from five (5) to four (4). Chair Valvo commented that in his experience serving on that board, instructions included consideration of where existing Commissioners lived to avoid two (2) in a single district and added that it would be a complicated job. Discussion continued. Chair Valvo stated another potential downside was a district with low turnout.

Vice Chair Alex Escoriaza commented that Precinct 4 could be divided. Chair Valvo stated that was something the Redistricting Board could look at, but it would conflict with some of the guidelines. Discussion continued regarding the potential for Single Member Districts, voter turnout, and voter disenfranchisement. City Clerk Kavanagh provided additional details on voter turnout.

Chair Valvo stated he had also received feedback on the cost of running a City Commission campaign. City Clerk Kavanagh reviewed fundraising figures for the most recent elections and clarified what happens to remaining funds.

Chair Valvo asked when the Commission last did not include a resident of Wynmoor. Discussion continued.

Board Member Mohammed Razib asked what district MainStreet would be part of. City Attorney Pyburn pointed out the development on the map and reiterated that this decision would be made by the Redistricting Board in 2026.

Deputy City Attorney Mehaffey stated the Board was discussing three (3) options, including the existing identified district/at-large voting system, single member voting districts, and at-large candidate/voting. Consensus was to take the third option off the table and continue discussion.

Chair Valvo pointed out that the Board was not making a decision on what to do but making a recommendation to the voters. He stated his view was that the issue would need to be stronger and easier to understand in order to get voters to turn out. Mr. Mintzes

stated that he believed with enough communication, there would be interest. Discussion continued. Consensus was to propose a change. City Attorney Pyburn stated staff would bring forward language at the next meeting.

Deputy City Attorney Mehaffey continued the Charter review with draft language for Section 802, as follows:

#### Section 802. - Commencement of Proceedings; Petitioner's Committee; Affidavit.

- a. Any fifty (50) qualified voters may commence initiative or repeal proceedings by filing with the City Clerk an affidavit stating their names and addresses and specifying the address to which all notices to the committee are to be sent, and setting out in full the proposed initiative ordinance or citing the ordinance sought to be repealed.
- The proposed initiative ordinance or ordinance sought to be repealed shall be reviewed by the City Attorney or designee within fifteen (15) days of submittal for consistency with the City Charter, Comprehensive Plan, City Code of Ordinances and applicable City, County, State, and Federal laws and requirements. If the City Attorney determines the proposed amendment is facially invalid, inconsistent, or creates conflicts with any other applicable legal authority, the petition shall be returned to the Petitioner, together with a notice of deficiency specifying the deficiencies or conflicts. The Petitioner will thereafter have a period of thirty (30) days from the date of the notice of deficiency within which to submit a revised petition addressing such deficiencies. The City Attorney shall review any subsequent resubmissions pursuant to this paragraph and provide a finding of consistency or deficiency within fifteen (15) days of any resubmission. Petitioner may submit a revised petition addressing identified deficiencies no more than three (3) times after the initial submittal. If the petition is determined deficient after the third (3<sup>rd</sup>) resubmittal, the petition shall be deemed withdrawn. Petitioner may initiate a new petition pursuant to this Section 802, with new affidavits pursuant to Section 802(a), no sooner than thirty 30 days after a prior petition is deemed withdrawn.
- c. If the City Attorney determines the petition is consistent, Promptly after the affidavit of the petitioner's committee is filed, the City Clerk shall promptly issue the appropriate blank petition forms to the petitioner's committee.

Discussion ensued regarding the language, including distinction between sufficiency and consistency with the City and State requirements, and the number of times a petition could be resubmitted. Chair Valvo stated with reasonable effort, this was possible, as the process would provide the petitioner with thousands of dollars of legal guidance. Deputy City Attorney Mehaffey advised that this change would trigger a need to amend 803 to match the language, as follows:

# Section 803. – General Authority.

c. Time for Filing Petition to Initiate or Repeal an Ordinance. Initiative and Repeal Petitions signed by a minimum of five (5) percent of the total number of registered voters as of the preceding election must be filed within ninety (90) days after the affidavit of the petitioner's committee is filed with the City Clerk blank petition forms are provided by the petitioner to the City Clerk.

Chair Valvo asked if the forms would be marked in such a way that the same signatures could not be resubmitted. City Clerk Kavanagh advised that signatures were dated and

# Charter Review Board Minutes March 26, 2025 Page 4

verified by the Clerk, so they would have records of previous submissions, and signatures would not be counted if they did not meet the requirements.

Consensus was to approve the changes to Section 802 and Section 803.

Deputy City Attorney Mehaffey continued the Charter review with draft language for Section 806, as follows:

### Section 806. – Action by Petitions.

- a. Action by Commission. When an initiative or repeal petition has been finally determined sufficient, the Commission shall promptly consider the proposed initiative ordinance or repeal of the referred ordinance in the manner provided in Section 311 of this Charter. If the Commission fails to adopt a proposed initiative ordinance without any change in substance within sixty (60) days or fails to repeal the referred ordinance within thirty (30) sixty (60) days after the date the petition was finally determined sufficient, it shall submit the proposed or referred ordinance to the voters of the City, unless same would violate state or federal law.
- b. Submission to Voters. The vote of the <u>qualified voters of the</u> City on an ordinance proposed for adoption or for repeal shall be held not less than thirty (30) days and not later than one (1) year from the date of the final Commission vote thereon and shall be noticed in accordance with state law. If no <u>general election or regular City election is to be held within the period prescribed in the subsection, the Commission shall provide for a special election otherwise, the vote shall be held at the same time as such regular election, except that the Commission may in its discretion provide for a special election at an earlier date within the prescribed period. Copies of the ordinance proposed for adoption or for repeal shall be made available at the polls.</u>

Deputy City Attorney Mehaffey explained that the proposed changes stemmed from conversation of the Board at its previous meeting. Consensus was to move forward with the changes to Section 806.

Deputy City Attorney Mehaffey reviewed draft changes to Section 907 to address concerns of conflicting amendments, including possible scenarios. Discussion ensued regarding simplification of the language and ballot language.

Consensus was to approve the addition of subsection (b) to Section 907 as follows:

#### Section 907. – Charter Review; Charter Review Board.

b. Conflicting Charter Amendments. In the event that a Charter Amendment proposed pursuant to Article VIII, Initiative, Referendum, and Recall, or by the Charter Review Board or City Commission, is on the ballot at the same election in which another Charter Amendment is proposed pursuant to Article VIII, Initiative, Referendum, and Recall, or by the Charter Review Board or City Commission, and the results of the election on those Charter Amendments creates a conflict between the two, then in that event they shall go into effect in respect to their provisions that are not in conflict and the one receiving the highest affirmative vote shall prevail as to the provisions in conflict.

Consensus was to approve the concept of the changes to Section 907, as discussed, with

Charter Review	<b>Board</b>	<b>Minutes</b>
March 26, 2025		
Page 5		

a request that staff revisit Section 907 to see if language could be further simplified.

# 5. CONFIRMATION OF UPCOMING APRIL MEETING DATES

Chair Valvo stated the next meeting was scheduled for April 2, 2025 at 5 p.m.

ŝ.	ADJOURNMENT	
	The meeting was adjourned at 6:28 p.m.	
	Joseph J. Kavanagh, MMC City Clerk	Date