

# Orange County Government

*Orange County Administration Center  
201 S Rosalind Ave.  
Orlando, FL 32802-1393*



## Draft Meeting Minutes

**Monday, April 15, 2024**

**6:00 PM**

**County Commission Chambers**

## **Charter Review Commission**

***CRC Members:***

***Homer Hartage, Chair***

***Lee Chira, Vice Chair***

***Mark Arias-Rishi Bagga-Dick Batchelor-Tom Callan-***

***Eric R. Grimmer-Erica Jackson-Chuck O'Neal-***

***Angel de la Portilla-Alisia Adamson Profit- Cornita A. Riley- Eugene Stoccardo-***

***Beverly Winesburgh-Dotti Wynn***

**Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 6:01 p.m.

**Present:** 13 - Member Alisia Adamson Profit, Member Angel de la Portilla, Member Eric R. Grimmer, Member Erica Jackson, Member Homer Hartage, Member Lee Chira, Member Mark Arias, Member Rishi Bagga, Member Tom Callan, Member Dotti Wynn, Member Eugene Stoccardo, Member Chuck O'Neal, and Member Beverly Winesburgh

**Absent:** 2 - Member Dick Batchelor, and Member Cornita A. Riley

Others present:

Deputy Clerk David Rooney  
Assistant Deputy Clerk Jennifer Lara-Klimetz  
CRC General Counsel Wade Vose  
CRC Administrative Assistant Jessica Vaupel  
Minutes Supervisor Craig Stopyra  
Minutes Coordinator Terrell Hightower

**Pledge of Allegiance****I. Roll Call**

Members Present: Member Jackson, Member de la Portilla, Member Winesburgh, Member Arias, Member Bagga, Member Wynn, Chair Hartage, Member Grimmer, Member O'Neal, Member Stoccardo, and Member Adamson Profit. A quorum was established and the meeting was called to order.

CRC Chair Hartage acknowledged Member Callan joined the meeting, after roll call.

**II. Chair / Vice Chair Comments**

CRC Chair Hartage thanked all of the committees for their hard work. CRC Chair Hartage coordinated with CRC Staff to schedule two additional CRC meetings for May 8 and May 30, 2024. CRC Staff proposed the last regular business meeting would be May 30, 2024, at 6 p.m. CRC Chair Hartage requested CRC members check their calendars for May 8, and May 30, 2024, at 6 p.m.

CRC Chair Hartage addressed the CRC regarding tonight's proceedings and indicated the Committee Chairs will present their final reports and recommendations. He added if the Committee reports are accepted by the full CRC, the first of two Committee recommendation public hearings would occur later tonight. If the CRC rejects the report and recommendation from the Committee Chair the topic will not proceed any further.

CRC Chair Hartage requested CRC Staff contact the CRC members to confirm their availability for the two additional meetings. He addressed the difficulties scheduling additional meetings in order to accommodate the CRC members schedule with the availability of the BCC Chambers

scheduled in May. General Counsel Vose contributed to the discussion. Member Adamson Profit indicated she is unavailable on May 8, 2024, and Member Callan indicated he is unavailable on May 30, 2024. CRC Chair Hartage requested when CRC members are contacted by CRC Staff that they respond immediately.

### III. Public Comment

The following persons addressed the CRC during public comment:

- Mark Bender
- Kayleigh Watkins

CRC Chair Hartage encouraged Committee Chairs to reach out to the County Commissioners for dialogue. He invited all elected officials to attend the upcoming full CRC meetings.

CRC Chair Hartage acknowledged Vice Chair Chira joined the meeting.

The following person addressed the CRC during public comment (continued): Samuel Vilchez.

### IV. Consent Item

- A. **CRC-24-102** Approval and execution of the minutes of the March 18, 2024 meeting of the Charter Review Commission (CRC).

A motion was made by Member Wynn, seconded by Member Winesburgh, to approve the minutes of March 18, 2024. The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye:** 13 - Member Adamson Profit, Member de la Portilla, Member Grimmer, Member Jackson, Member Hartage, Member Chira, Member Arias, Member Bagga, Member Callan, Member Wynn, Member Stoccardo, Member O'Neal, and Member Winesburgh

**Absent:** 2 - Member Batchelor, and Member Riley

### V. Committee Meeting Updates

- A. **CRC-24-103** Governmental Structure Committee Meeting Held on April 5, 2024 (Committee Chair de la Portilla)

Committee Chair de la Portilla thanked District 5 Commissioner Bonilla for her letter provided by her office. He indicated he spoke with Commissioner Wilson, Commissioner Moore, Commissioner Uribe, Commissioner Gomez Cordero, and Commissioner Scott to obtain their perspective on the seven (7) topics reviewed during the course of the Governmental Structure Committee meetings. Committee Chair de la Portilla provided an update of the meeting held on April 15, 2024, at which the committee voted unanimously to recommend language restoring the Office of the County Attorney in the Charter. Furthermore, the committee voted against extending the term limits thus, the action of the committee kept the term limits to two (2) four year terms as it currently stands. Committee Chair de la Portilla provided a brief overview of non-partisan elections, proposed by Member O'Neal and that the current election system allows a candidate to

qualify by write-in. If two (2) candidates are running, the election is decided in November. If the write-in candidate can qualify, it will trigger an election in August. Committee Chair de la Portilla announced on Friday, April 19, 2024, the committee will hold their final committee meeting. At that committee meeting, CRC General Counsel Vose will present proposed ballot language concerning the qualification of the write-in candidate. If the proposal is approved by the committee, the committee will present the recommendation to the full CRC for a vote.

**B. CRC-24-104 Sustainable Growth & Charter Clean Up Committee Meeting Held on April 5, 2024 (Committee Chair Grimmer)**

Committee Chair Grimmer provided an update of the Sustainable Growth and Charter Clean Up Committee meeting held on April 5, 2024. He reported that the committee voted unanimously to recommend incorporating the Affordable Housing Trust Fund into the County Charter with its existence and funding source in perpetuity. He expects the committee's recommendation will come before the full CRC at an upcoming meeting. Committee Chair Grimmer added the committee continues to discuss other topics within the committee's purview such as the rural boundary, conservation of parks lands and conversation lands, and the financial feasibility tool. Committee Chair Grimmer announced the next committee meeting is scheduled for Friday, April 19, 2024, at 11:00 a.m.

**VI. Acceptance of Committee Final Reports**

**A. CRC-24-106 Governmental Structure Committee - County Attorney**

Committee Chair de la Portilla provided the history of the County Charter, with regards to the creation of the office of the County Attorney, and previous amendments voted by the citizens. The committee heard testimony from former Orange County Mayors, Linda Chapin and Teresa Jacobs, current Orange County Mayor Jerry Demings, former Orange County Attorney Tom Wilkes, and current County Attorney Jeff Newton. He added that the committee has proposed ballot language recommending the full CRC restore Section 403, creating the Charter Office of the County Attorney. Committee Chair de la Portilla went on record stating that County Attorney Jeff Newton is in agreement with the proposed amendment. Committee Chair de la Portilla read the proposed ballot language as follows:

Exhibit "A"

Ballot Proposal: The ballot title and ballot summary for this question are as follows:

**ORANGE COUNTY CHARTER AMENDMENT ESTABLISHING CHARTER OFFICE OF COUNTY ATTORNEY**

Amending the Orange County Charter to establish an office of the County Attorney, who shall be the County's chief legal counsel, appointed by the County Mayor and confirmed by a majority of the full County Commission, and removed by either the County Mayor or a majority of the full County Commission.

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes  
\_\_\_\_\_ No

Text Revisions: Upon approval of this question at referendum, the following portions of the Orange County Charter are amended to read as follows:

Sec. 402. Initial divisions and administrative regulations.

A. [Initial divisions.] The following initial divisions are hereby established:

1. Community rehabilitative services.
2. Fire and rescue services.
3. Public utilities.
4. Administrative Support.
5. Health and human services.
6. Public works and development.
7. Civil facilities.
8. ~~Legal services.~~

Committee Chair de la Portilla recommended the full CRC accept the proposed language in the committee's final report.

CRC General Counsel Vose indicated that the final report was put together at the direction of the committee by Committee Chair de la Portilla and himself. General Counsel Vose explained that the final report lays out legal implications and noted that the proposed amendment is in affect a revival of the Section 403 from the original 1986 County Charter with minor revisions. One of the revisions is that the County Attorney would be appointed by the County Mayor and confirmed by majority of the full County Commission and with the authority to remove, vested in both, the County Mayor and the Board of County Commissioners. He added that new Section 403 explains the primary duty of the County Attorney. The committee included in this section to provide clarification to the County Commissioners who raised concerns about the County Attorney's Office and who the County Attorney provides legal advice to. CRC Chair Hartage requested further clarification from CRC General Counsel Vose regarding the removal of the County Attorney. CRC General Counsel Vose explained that currently, as the County Attorney as a department head, the position is appointed by the County Mayor, and then confirmed, annually, by the Board of County Commissioners, which means, yearly upon confirmation time, the Board of County Commissioners could choose to withhold the confirmation. CRC General Counsel added that the proposed amendment appoints the County Mayor and the Board of County Commissioners confirms the appointment, but the power to terminate resides, at any time, with either the Mayor or the Board of County Commissioners. CRC Chair Hartage requested additional clarification on how the Mayor or Board of County Commissioners could terminate the County Attorney. CRC General Counsel provided further clarification stating that termination could occur one of two ways. Either the Mayor alone could remove the County Attorney or a majority vote of the full Board of County Commissioners, at a Board meeting, could vote to remove the County Attorney from their position. One other important issue raised by CRC General Counsel was regarding the Commissioners'

concerns for legal representation from the County Attorney's Office, the revival of Section 403 states that the County Attorney and all assistant county attorneys shall represent the whole county government and all of its components and not solely the County Mayor. Discussion ensued. CRC General Counsel Vose contributed to the discussion.

A motion was made by Committee Chair de la Portilla, seconded by Member Stoccardo, that the full Charter Review Commission adopt the language as written "Amending the Orange County Charter to establish an office of the County Attorney, who shall be the County Attorney's chief legal counsel, appointed by the County Mayor and confirmed by a majority vote of the full County Commission, and removed by either the County Mayor or a majority of the full County Commission"; and further, strike Section 402, #8 Legal Services. CRC Chair Hartage restated the motion as follows: to accept the Final Report of the Governmental Structure Committee; and further, move the topic to the first public hearing. The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye:** 13 - Member Jackson, Member de la Portilla, Member Winesburgh, Member Callan, Member Arias, Member Wynn, Member Hartage, Member Chira, Member Grimmer, Member Bagga, Member O'Neal, Member Stoccardo, and Member Adamson Profit

**Absent:** 2 - Member Batchelor, and Member Riley

Committee Chair de la Portilla asked if the motion the CRC voted on was the first public hearing. CRC Chair Hartage indicated the motion was only to accept the report of the committee and stated there will be two public hearings held to consider and vote on the recommendation. CRC General Counsel Vose explained this recommendation of the Governmental Structure Committee will hold the first of two public hearings later in tonight's agenda. CRC Chair Hartage explained the adopted bylaws allows the CRC to hold the public hearing and acceptance of the final report at the same meeting. CRC Chair Hartage stated that tonight's scheduled public hearings were properly noticed. Discussion ensued.

**B. CRC-24-107 Transportation Committee**

Committee Chair Callan thanked CRC Members Rishi Bagga, Eric Grimmer, Chuck O'Neal, and Eugene Stoccardo for serving on the committee. He also thanked County Staff who attended the committee meetings and participated in drafting the language to the proposed amendment. Committee Chair Callan provided a brief overview of the committee's work over the past several months. Committee Chair Callan explained the concept behind the Transportation Mobility Advisory Commission ("TransMAC"), is to review public transportation and consider new innovative transportation technologies and emerging markets. He added the purpose is to have a procedure in place, that any expenditure on transportation for an upcoming budget, must first be reviewed, publicly, in an open setting, by the Transportation Mobility Advisory Commission. Committee Chair Callan informed that the committee voted unanimously to advance this topic to the full CRC for consideration. Committee Chair Callan highlighted some of the functions and duties of the TransMAC such as Transportation Expenditure Review and Recommendation, Mobility Evolution and Enhancement, Mandatory Review of Transportation Funding, Membership Number and Composition, Appointment, Nomination, and Term Reappointments, Staffing and Staff assistance. Discussion ensued amongst the CRC members regarding the definition of

transportation, monitoring projects until their completion, the transportation sales tax initiative, transportation impact fees, sustainability of the County's transportation system, the difference between TransMAC and Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC), and a transparent transportation commission for the citizens.

A motion was made by Committee Chair Callan, seconded by CRC Chair Hartage, to accept the Final Report of the Transportation Committee; and further, move the item to the first reading public hearing. The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye:** 12 - Member Adamson Profit, Member de la Portilla, Member Grimmer, Member Jackson, Member Hartage, Member Chira, Member Bagga, Member Callan, Member Wynn, Member Stoccardo, Member O'Neal, and Member Winesburgh

**Absent:** 3 - Member Batchelor, Member Arias, and Member Riley

## **VII. Committee Recommendation Public Hearings**

CRC Chair Hartage opened the first of three public hearings scheduled for tonight.

- A. CRC-24-108** Transportation Committee - Consideration of the proposed amendment creating the Transportation Mobility Advisory Commission (First of Two Public Hearings / Votes)
1. Public Comment
  2. CRC Discussion and First Vote

The following persons addressed the CRC:

- Ed Williams
- Sonya Stevenson

Discussion ensued amongst CRC members regarding representation of municipalities on: TransMAC, setting up a better structure in order for the public to determine their transportation needs and further, communicating those needs to the Board of County Commissioners, changing the membership number and composition of TransMAC, a countywide transportation system analysis, and the purpose of TransMAC. Discussion ensued regarding changing the amount of members to the TransMAC Committee. CRC General Counsel Vose recommended any further changes to the Charter amendments brought forward by the Committees should be consistent and precise in order for these changes to be incorporated at the first reading public hearing in order to allow for these changes to be considered and voted on at the second and final public hearing.

A motion was made by Member Callan, seconded by Member Grimmer, to approve the TransMAC Charter Amendment, the Charter language, and Staff Report for the first public hearing; and further, advance to the second public hearing. The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye:** 12 - Member Adamson Profit, Member de la Portilla, Member Grimmer, Member Jackson, Member Hartage, Member Chira, Member Bagga, Member Callan, Member Wynn, Member Stoccardo, Member O'Neal, and Member Winesburgh

**Absent:** 3 - Member Batchelor, Member Arias, and Member Riley

- B. CRC-24-109** Governmental Structure Committee - Consideration of the proposed amendment establishing the charter office of County Attorney (First of Two Public Hearings / Votes)
1. Public Comment
  2. CRC Discussion and First Vote

Committee Chair de la Portilla presented the proposed Charter amendment to re-establish the Office of the County Attorney in the Orange County Charter as it was first established in 1986, and then deleted in 1988. Committee Chair de la Portilla reviewed the proposed ballot language as follows:

Exhibit "A"

Ballot Proposal: The ballot title and ballot summary for this question are as follows:

ORANGE COUNTY CHARTER AMENDMENT ESTABLISHING CHARTER OFFICE OF  
COUNTY ATTORNEY

Amending the Orange County Charter to establish an office of the County Attorney, who shall be the County's chief legal counsel, appointed by the County Mayor and confirmed by a majority of the full County Commission, and removed by either the County Mayor or a majority of the full County Commission.

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes  
\_\_\_\_\_ No

Text Revisions: Upon approval of this question at referendum, the following portions of the Orange County Charter are amended to read as follows:

Sec. 402. Initial divisions and administrative regulations.

A. [Initial divisions.] The following initial divisions are hereby established:

1. Community rehabilitative services.
2. Fire and rescue services.
3. Public utilities.
4. Administrative Support.
5. Health and human services.
6. Public works and development.
7. Civil facilities.
8. ~~Legal services.~~

The following person addressed the CRC: Ed Williams.

Discussion ensued amongst the CRC members relating to feedback from the County Commissioners following the drafting of the proposed ballot language, the concerns of the County Commissioners' for adequate legal representation, attorney-client privilege, budget funding for a special legal counsel, and an assigned attorney exclusively for the Board. CRC General Counsel Vose contributed to the discussion; and further, clarified the proposed charter amendment identifying the County's client as the County Government.

CRC Chair Hartage asked for clarification on who or what constitutes the County, which, the county attorney is representing. Member Callan explained that the Charter has an executive and legislative body. He added that if a County Commissioner speaks with the County Attorney about an executive matter, under the Charter, the Mayor is the authoritative figure to make the decisions. When it's a legislative matter, the Mayor is equal to the other six (6) Board of County Commissioners. Discussion ensued.

Member O'Neal called the question to end discussion, however, CRC Chair Hartage requested holding off calling of question.

Discussion ensued amongst CRC members whether the proposed language fixes the problem of providing legal representation to Board members.

A motion was made by Member O'Neal, seconded by CRC Chair Hartage, to call the question to end discussion. The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye:** 12- Member Jackson, Member de la Portilla, Member Winesburgh, Member Callan, Member Wynn, Member Hartage, Member Chira, Member Grimmer, Member Bagga, Member O'Neal, Member Stoccardo, and Member Adamson Profit

**Absent:** 3 - Member Batchelor, Member Arias, and Member Riley

A motion was made by Committee Chair de la Portilla, seconded by Member Callan, to accept the language by amending the Orange County Charter to establish an Office of the County Attorney who shall be the County Attorney's Chief Legal Counsel appointed by the County Mayor and confirmed by the majority of the full County Commission and removed by either the County Mayor or majority of the full Commission; and further, strike Section 402, A.8. Legal Services. The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye:** 11 - Member Adamson Profit, Member de la Portilla, Member Grimmer, Member Jackson, Member Chira, Member Bagga, Member Callan, Member Wynn, Member Stoccardo, Member O'Neal, and Member Winesburgh

**Nay:** 1 - Member Hartage

**Absent:** 3 - Member Batchelor, Member Arias, and Member Riley

**C. CRC-24-110** Initiative Petitions Committee - Consideration of the proposed amendment revising the Orange County Charter Initiative Petition process which includes revised ballot language to include the financial impact summary (Second of Two Public Hearings / Votes)

1. Public Comment
2. CRC Discussion and Second Vote

CRC Chair Hartage recognized Initiative Petitions Committee Chair Dottie Wynn; and further, stated CRC General Counsel Vose will present the Initiative Petitions Committee's final recommendation report. CRC Chair Hartage advised the CRC that this is the second public hearing. This topic passed at the first public hearing and if the CRC passes the topic through the second public hearing, this means that the CRC is recommending this item be placed on the ballot.

CRC Chair Hartage explained that the Initiative Petition is to clarify and simplify the language in the Charter that allows citizens to campaign, advertise, and bring issues to the ballot for the voters to approve.

Committee Chair Wynn thanked the members of the committee and also CRC General Counsel Vose for all of their hard work during the process. She recommended CRC General Counsel Vose present the proposed ballot language to the full CRC.

CRC General Counsel Vose confirmed CRC Chair Hartage's statement that this is the second vote to place this Charter amendment onto the ballot. CRC General Counsel Vose briefly highlighted the major points in the proposed Charter amendment. He added that the only revision to the ballot summary language is the addition of a summary of the estimated financial impact provided by the Comptroller's Office as required by the Charter.

CRC General Counsel Vose provided a brief overview of the provisions of the amendment are as follows:

Exhibit "A"

Ballot Proposal: The ballot title and ballot summary for this question are as follows:

#### AMENDMENT REVISING ORANGE COUNTY CHARTER INITIATIVE PETITION PROCESS

Revising the charter initiative petition process by lowering petition requirements for charter amendments from 10 percent of registered voters in each commission district to 5 percent in a majority of districts, and for ordinances from 7 percent in each district to 3 percent in a majority of districts; removing signature withdrawal procedures; and revising financial impact statement, public hearing, legal review, and petition affidavit requirements. Estimated financial impact: \$7,000 savings per proposed ballot question.

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes  
\_\_\_\_\_ No

Text Revisions: Upon approval of this question at referendum, the following portions of the Orange County Charter are amended to read as follows:

Sec. 601. Initiative and referendum.

The power to propose amendment or repeal of this Charter, or to propose enactment, amendment or repeal of any county ordinance by initiative is reserved to the people of the county.

A. *Charter*. A petition seeking to amend or repeal the Charter of Orange County shall be signed by five (5) ten (10) percent of the county electors in a majority of commission districts ~~each commission district~~ as of January 1 of the year in which the petition is initiated. ~~No less than seventy five (75) percent of the minimum number of required signatures shall be on petition forms approved by the supervisor of elections containing the comptroller's financial impact statement pursuant to section 602.E.3.~~

B. *Ordinance*. A petition seeking to enact, amend or repeal an ordinance shall be signed by three (3) seven (7) percent of the county electors in a majority of commission districts ~~each commission district~~ as of January 1 of the year in which the petition is initiated. ~~No less than seventy five (75) percent of the minimum number of required signatures shall be on petition forms approved by the supervisor of elections containing the comptroller's financial impact statement pursuant to section 602.E.3.~~

In addition to the reduction of numerical requirements, CRC General Counsel Vosed indicated there were a number of revisions relating to Legal Review, Petition Affidavit Requirements, Financial Impact Statement, and Public Hearings.

Regarding the revisions to Legal Review, CRC General Counsel Vose explained that the existing Legal Review Panel would be removed and replaced by letters from three (3) attorneys of the Florida Bar Association completed by the petition sponsor stating that the Charter amendment or ordinance by initiative is not inconsistent with general law or the prohibitions of the Charter.

The financial impact statement will still be prepared by the Comptroller's Office with regards to a proposed Charter amendment or ordinance by initiative, however, there is no requirement that it needs to be placed on the ballot.

As to the Petition Affidavit Requirements, the proposed amendment reduces the affidavit requirements that are incorporated into the petitions that are collected. This is contrary to what is currently in the Charter, which requires both volunteer and paid petition gatherers to fill out an affidavit and sign them under oath. The amendment is different from State law that applies only to paid petition gatherers.

The proposed amendment also removes the signature withdrawal procedures that were put into the County Charter by the 2016 Charter Review Initiative Petitions Amendment.

Finally, as to the additional language in the ballot summary, the estimated financial impact is a \$7,000 savings per proposed ballot question. In 2016, the estimated financial impact summary was a \$7,000 increase per ballot question.

Discussion ensued amongst CRC members regarding the procedure of placing amendments on the ballot, the initiative petition process, the difference of placing an amendment on the ballot by Charter or Ordinance, volunteer petition gatherers, the percentage of petition gathering, frivolous petitions, State law constitutional amendments, general election turnout, amendments on the ballot, signature withdrawals and majority of districts. CRC General Counsel Vose contributed to the discussion.

Member de la Portilla suggested a change to the language in the ballot summary regarding the majority districts. He indicated that a petition gatherer could gather petition signatures in four of the six commission districts, thus excluding two commission districts from the process. Member de la Portilla suggested striking "in a majority of districts" from the proposed amendment. Discussion ensued. General Counsel Vose contributed to the discussion. Based upon Member de la Portilla's suggestion, General Counsel Vose recommended changing the ballot summary and text revisions to reflect the striking of "in a majority of districts" and replaced by "in each commission district." CRC Chair Hartage agreed with the recommendation.

The proposed changes to the ballot summary and text revisions, Section 601. Initiative and referendum. A. Charter and B. Ordinance are shown as presented:

Exhibit "A"

Ballot Proposal: The ballot title and ballot summary for this question are as follows:

**AMENDMENT REVISING ORANGE COUNTY CHARTER INITIATIVE PETITION PROCESS**

Revising the charter initiative petition process by lowering petition requirements for charter amendments from 10 percent of registered voters in each commission district to 5 percent ~~in a majority of districts~~ in each commission district, and for ordinances from 7 percent in each district to 3 percent ~~in a majority of districts~~ in each commission district; removing signature withdrawal procedures; and revising financial impact statement, public hearing, legal review, and petition affidavit requirements. Estimated financial impact: \$7,000 savings per proposed ballot question.

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes

\_\_\_\_\_ No

Text Revisions: Upon approval of this question at referendum, the following portions of the Orange County Charter are amended to read as follows:

Sec. 601. Initiative and referendum.

The power to propose amendment or repeal of this Charter, or to propose enactment, amendment or repeal of any county ordinance by initiative is reserved to the people of the county.

A. *Charter.* A petition seeking to amend or repeal the Charter of Orange County shall be signed

by ~~five (5) ten (10)~~ percent of the county electors ~~in a majority of commission districts in each commission district~~ each commission district as of January 1 of the year in which the petition is initiated. ~~No less than seventy five (75) percent of the minimum number of required signatures shall be on petition forms approved by the supervisor of elections containing the comptroller's financial impact statement pursuant to section 602.E.3.~~

B. *Ordinance*. A petition seeking to enact, amend or repeal an ordinance shall be signed by three (3) seven (7) percent of the county electors ~~in a majority of commission districts in each commission district~~ each commission district as of January 1 of the year in which the petition is initiated. ~~No less than seventy five (75) percent of the minimum number of required signatures shall be on petition forms approved by the supervisor of elections containing the comptroller's financial impact statement pursuant to section 602.E.3.~~

A motion was made by CRC Chair Hartage, seconded by Vice Chair Chira, to accept the recommendation of the Initiative Petitions Committee; and further, strike the language which states "in a majority of commission districts" and replace with "in each commission district" in the ballot summary and text revisions, Section 601. Initiative and referendum, A. Charter and B. Ordinance, as presented. No vote taken. Discussion ensued. CRC General Counsel contributed to the discussion.

A motion was made by Member O'Neal, seconded by Member Wynn, to call the question to end discussion. The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye:** 12 - Member Jackson, Member de la Portilla, Member Winesburgh, Member Callan, Member Wynn, Member Hartage, Member Chira, Member Grimmer, Member Bagga, Member O'Neal, Member Stoccardo, and Member Adamson Profit

**Absent:** 3 - Member Batchelor, Member Arias, and Member Riley

A motion was made by CRC Chair Hartage, seconded by Vice Chair Chira, to accept the recommendation of the Initiative Petitions Committee; and further, strike the language which states "in a majority of commission districts" and replace with "in each commission district" in the ballot summary and text revisions, Section 601. Initiative and referendum, A. Charter and B. Ordinance, as presented. The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye:** 10 - Member Adamson Profit, Member de la Portilla, Member Grimmer, Member Jackson, Member Hartage, Member Bagga, Member Callan, Member Wynn, Member Stoccardo, and Member O'Neal

**Nay:** 2 - Member Chira, and Member Winesburgh

**Absent:** 3 - Member Batchelor, Member Arias, and Member Riley

### VIII. Member Comments

CRC Chair Hartage proposed additional CRC meetings on May 8, and May 30, 2024. He requested scheduling the final meeting on May 30, 2024, at 5:30 p.m., for reflection, celebration, and recognition of the committee chairs. CRC Chair Hartage confirmed that the CRC will have a meeting on May 20, 2024.

CRC General Counsel Vose announced the upcoming CRC meeting schedule as follows: Monday, April 29, Wednesday, May 8, Monday, May 20, and Thursday, May 30, 2024. CRC Staff expects approval of the final report to occur on Thursday, May 30, 2024.

CRC Chair Hartage recommended against CRC members appearing by video at full CRC meetings. CRC Staff will contact CRC members regarding the upcoming CRC meeting schedule and CRC Chair Hartage requested the CRC members respond to CRC Staff immediately with their availability.

### **IX. Adjournment**

A motion was made by CRC Chair Hartage, seconded by Member Wynn, to adjourn the meeting. No vote taken.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:03 p.m.

---

Homer Hartage, Chair  
2024 Charter Review Commission