

**City of Longwood**  
**2019 Charter Advisory Committee**  
Longwood City Commission Chambers  
175 West Warren Avenue  
Longwood, Florida 32750

**MINUTES**  
**October 24, 2019**  
**6:00 P.M.**

**Present:** Chair Matthew McMillan  
Vice-Chair Johnnie Richardson  
Member Deborah Poulalion  
Member Rex Anderson Sr.  
Member Kate Crockett  
Dan Langley, City Attorney  
Michelle Longo, City Clerk  
David Dowda, Police Chief  
Lisa Snead, Finance Director

**Absent:** J.D. Cox, City Manager

1. **CALL TO ORDER.** Chair McMillan called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.
2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES – September 26, 2019**

Vice-Chair Richardson moved to approve the minutes of September 26, 2019, as presented. Seconded by Member Anderson and carried by a unanimous voice vote.

3. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.** None.
4. **REVIEW OF CHARTER**
  - A. **ARTICLE X. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS**

Section 10.01 – Charter amendments

Member Anderson asked about 10.01(c) Charter review and whether the member had to be from the Commission District. He also asked what the cost would be to add these changes to the ballot.

Mr. Langley said if the Commission agrees to the proposed Charter change the cost is minimal to add additional ballot questions.

Vice-Chair Richardson said if the Commissioner does not find anyone in their district that wants or has asked to be a Board Member, then I

believe he or she has the right to appoint anyone he or she sees wants to. They should try and find someone in their district who is willing to accept being a board member but have the ability to appoint outside their district if needed.

Chair McMillan asked if the Commissioner had multiple applicants, one from their district and another outside of their district, should the Commissioner have the freedom to pick the one outside the district, or should they be required to pick the one within the district.

Vice-Chair Richardson said he believes if the Commissioner has the authority to appoint someone within his district then that should be his or her first choice. If not, they should have the ability to appoint someone from any district.

Discussion ensued on how the Commissioners should appoint Board Members.

Mr. Langley pointed out that the City Code states how the Commissioners appoint Board Members.

Member Anderson made a motion to add language that says a Commissioner shall appoint a resident from within their Commission District and if no one from their district has applied or is interested they can then appoint from any district in the city.

Further discussion ensued on board appointments and clarification on verbiage already in the City Code was reviewed.

Member Anderson withdrew his motion.

Member Anderson made a motion to keep the language of this section as is. Seconded by Vice-Chair Richardson and carried by a unanimous voice vote.

Section 10.02 – Standards of ethics reviewed with no comments or recommendations.

Section 10.03 – Prohibitions

Chair McMillan asked for clarification on Section 10.03 (a)(4).

Mr. Langley said this is not a typical Charter provision. It is unusual to have a Charter provision that regulates things of this nature. If we have a provision in the Charter that is vague, it becomes difficult to enforce.

Discussion ensued on different laws and regulations against discrimination and Section 10.03 (a)(4).

Vice-Chair Richardson moved to remove Section 10.03 (a)(4) from the Charter. Seconded by Member Crockett and carried by a four-to-one (4-1) voice vote with Member Anderson voting nay.

Section 10.04 – Separability reviewed with no comments or recommendations.

**B. ARTICLE XI. TRANSITION SCHEDULE**

Section 11.01 – Continuation of former Charter provisions reviewed with no comments or recommendations.

Section 11.02 – Ordinances preserved reviewed with no comments or recommendations.

Section 11.03 – Rights of officers and employees reviewed with no comments or recommendations.

Section 11.04 – Pending matters reviewed with no comments or recommendations.

**C. ARTICLE XII. PUBLIC SAFETY**

Section 12.01 – Created reviewed with no comments or recommendations.

Section 12.02 – Department heads reviewed with no comments or recommendations.

Section 12.03 – Members

Discussion ensued on the number of officers in the police department determined by the City Commission. Chief Dowda answered questions and added as long as the Commission has the ability to adjust the staffing as necessary as demographics change he has no issue with the two and two-tenths (2.2) officers per thousand (1,000) population.

Chair McMillan suggested adding this to the list to bring back for further discussion on changing the language in this section.

Member Crockett mentioned there is a ratio for officers but not for firefighters and the language is outdated.

Discussion ensued on what the number of firefighters was on November 4, 1997 and where this number came from.

Vice-Chair Richardson suggested tabling this conversation to the next meeting in order to get the number of firefighters and change language as needed.

Member Crockett also asked to get the population at that time as well.

Section 12.04 – Responsibilities reviewed with no comments or recommendations.

Section 12.05 – Support reviewed with no comments or recommendations.

Section 12.06 – Accountability reviewed with no comments or recommendations.

## **5. OLD BUSINESS**

### **A. ARTICLE VI. FINANCIAL PROCEDURES**

Ms. Snead presented the Memorandum from the City Manager regarding the Clarification of Budget Amendments versus Line Item Transfers. She pointed out changes in Section 6.06 (c) – Transfers of Appropriations they are recommending. She said what we are asking for is the City Manager to have the ability to move monies from one program or line item within a department or fund to another, and that we then report that back to the Commission within a reasonable time period, and definitely within the fiscal year.

Chair McMillan asked what the difference was between a fund and a line item.

Ms. Snead said that a fund is a bucket of money. Within a fund, you have different departments, and within each of those departments, there are different line items. Currently, we can only move money within a specific budget through a budget transfer that goes to the City Manager. If we wanted to move money from one department to another, it would have to come back to the City Commission for approval through a resolution. We are asking to be able to move money from one program within the same fund without having to bring it back before the Commission for approval.

Discussion ensued on transfers of funds, the budget, and issuance and limitation of debt. Ms. Snead answered questions.

Mr. Langley noted the numbers in Section 6.10 (b) - Debt restrictions were established in 2014 in a Charter Amendment.

Vice-Chair Richardson moved to change Section 6.06 per City Manager's recommendations. Seconded by Member Crockett and carried by unanimous voice vote.

**B. ARTICLE III, SECTION 3.03 (a). ELECTION OF MAYOR**

Vice-Chair Richardson spoke about the form of government as it relates to a strong Mayor and Council-Manager. He said that having a strong Mayor and City Council puts the Mayor at the head, giving the City a political leadership that is very visible. Having a single voice in office places the Mayor in a position to articulate a vision and act on it. It makes it easy to understand who is in charge and gives the City a single focal point person to handle constituencies and groups that increase as the City grows. He said the current structure of Council-Manager has certain advantages to offer as well. Since the Council makes the decisions there is less risk of political influence driving those decisions. He also mentioned the turnover of staff is usually lower. He then listed examples of the pros and cons of both Council-Manager and strong Mayor forms of government as it would apply to a smaller City like Longwood. He stated that no matter which form of government structure Longwood residents choose to accept neither is completely perfect. What really matters is that the government is working for the people, because in the end, it is really about them. Therefore, after weighing the pros and cons of both forms of government, I have come to a conclusion and can see no reasons why the current form of Council-Manager government should change. However, he recommends that this be reconsidered by the Charter Committee once the City of Longwood grows its population to over 30,000 residents.

Chair McMillan thanked Vice-Chair Richardson for his contribution. He said in reviewing the Charter of other cities, there is the Hybrid form of government where you have an elected Mayor who does not carry on the administrative tasks of the City Manager. He said he would like to discuss this form of government later on. He agrees with Vice-Chair Richardson in that the City of Longwood is too small to have a strong Mayor form of government. However, he believes there should be an accountability factor in which people know who the Mayor is and that he or she be their spokesperson.

Discussion ensued on how the language of Charter would change and forms of government in surrounding Seminole County cities.

Member Anderson suggested thinking about giving the mayor veto power, as it can cause political issues.

Discussion ensued on veto power.

