
CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION

MINUTES OF JUNE 14, 2006

of the country. He reported that he will be out of town for the next public hearing and Vice Chairman van den Berg will be chairing the meeting.

Attorney Alison Yurko apologized for the late notice of this work session, but said there were so many issues from the last hearing, that she thought it was important to nail down some of the new language. She reminded the CRC that under the Charter, they are required to hold at least three public hearings on any proposed charter amendment or revision. She cautioned the Commission that from this point on, they need to be careful with the changes they make to any of the amendments so that no one can take the position that three public hearings were not held. She said that because there are so many changes from the first public hearing, she would recommend that a fourth public hearing (July 12, 2006) be held.

Ms. Yurko referred to her handout (copy received & filed) outlining the legal points as a follow-up to the June 14, 2006 work session. She reviewed the "attorney changes" outlined in the handout. With regard to Resolution #1, Section 2.2(C), Salaries and Other Compensation, she added the following language, "all in accordance with general law and the State Constitution". In Resolution #2, Section 3.1, Ms. Yurko

advised she has clarified the language regarding conforming changes for constitutional officers. She added that this occurs in all the resolutions except for Resolutions #1 and #4.

Linda Dietz entered the meeting at 6:39 p.m.

Mr. Furlong expressed his concern, with regard to Resolution #1, if the Consumer Price Index is ever done away with.

Mr. Lovestrand stated the Index is published every month by the Department of Labor and it is used by a multitude of businesses and millions of people depend on it.

Chairman Tucker stated that is an extensive "what if" and he said they would have to cross that bridge when they get to it.

Ms. Yurko suggested the language could be changed to "or other successive index".

Ms. Ohab stated the Index is so widely used that the entire country would have to change; and it is not likely that it is going to be all of a sudden not used.

Ms. Hammtree stated it could be addressed at that time. Discussion ensued.

Motion by Mr. Furlong to add the language "or equivalent index" to Section 2.2(C) of Resolution #1.

The Chairman called for a second three times without response, whereupon, the **motion died** for the lack of same.

Ms. Yurko continued with her review of "attorney changes", advising with regard to Resolution #3, she has clarified Section B of Article V, Miscellaneous Provisions, changing Chapter 112 to Chapter 122.3143. So both Resolutions #2 and #3 would be changed by defining "Relative". With regard to Resolution #4, Article V(A), the following language was added, "or a minority interest representing less than 2% of the whole". In Resolution #5, Ms. Yurko advised she changed the resolution number from 6 to 5; and under Section 2.5, County Internal Auditor has been changed to County Auditor. With regard to Resolution #6, the resolution number has been changed from 7 to 6; and under Section 2.5, language has been changed to reflect a simplified composition for the structure of the committee. Also in subparagraph C, she changed the staggering of the terms. For Resolution #7, the resolution number has been changed from 5 to 7; and Sections 2.2 and 3.1 were added to address the conforming changes for constitutional officers. Also under Article V, Section 1.5, she deleted the following, "Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 3.1 of the Charter". She asked for a motion to approve all the "attorney changes".

Motion by Ms. Ohab, seconded by Ms. Hammontree to approve all the "attorney changes" as presented.

A **roll call vote** on the motion was taken and all members in attendance voted AYE.

Ms. Yurko advised the next set of changes deal with the enforcement provision for the three ethics resolutions (#2, #3 & #4) and they have the same language. She stated she looked at the Clay County language and spoke to Wayne Holmes. She said she is proposing a blend of the Clay County language and some attempt to keep the language they had before. The new language reads as follows: "In addition to other enforcement measures available by general law, the ordinance may include provisions establishing an ethics board to hear and determine charges, and prescribing penalties within the limits outlined by law, the Board of County Commissioners deems violation of any said provisions to be a criminal violation. It will provide for criminal penalties in said ordinance and immediately following the effective date of this Charter provision, shall enter into negotiations to reimburse the State Attorney of the Eighteenth Judicial Circuit or other prosecuting attorney for costs to be associated with prosecution of any such provisions upon terms acceptable to

the State Attorney or other such prosecuting attorney. The Board of County Commissioners shall also fund any necessary investigation costs and other enforcement costs associated with the Ordinance". She said this gives the Board the option of deciding whether something should be a criminal penalty. She advised that she did speak with State Attorney, Norm Wolfinger, regarding this language and he is still asking that his title not be used in the amendment. She, therefore, recommended adopting the language as is or adopting it deleting the specific reference of the State Attorney of the Eighteenth Judicial Circuit.

Motion by Mr. Maloy, seconded by Mr. Boyko to adopt the language as presented by Ms. Yurko regarding the enforcement of Resolutions #2, #3 and #4.

Under discussion, Mr. Horan stated he would like to go through the public hearing process first before deciding on this language.

Ms. Yurko stated she has more of a comfort level if they go into the public hearing without making a lot of substantive changes so there is no question of having held three public hearings.

Mr. Horan stated he still has a problem referring to the State Attorney when he has said he does not want to be named

in the amendment. He said he would prefer to take the language out that refers specifically to the State Attorney and substitute language to the effect, "to enter into negotiations to compensate the legally appropriate prosecuting authority".

Mr. Maloy **withdrew** his motion.

Ms. Yurko offered the following language: "shall enter into negotiations to compensate the legally appropriate prosecuting authority for costs to be associated with prosecution of any such violations upon terms acceptable to any such prosecuting authority".

Motion by Mr. Horan, seconded by Mr. Maloy to approve the substitute language for Resolutions #2, #3 and #4 as offered by Ms. Yurko.

A **roll call vote** of the motion was taken with all members in attendance voting AYE.

- - -

Ms. Yurko referred to her handout and Resolution #7, advising she is recommending three changes to Article V, Section 1.5. They are: (1) Adding the language, "with respect to County funds"; (2) Deleting, "(or, if none is so designated as per the Florida Constitution by the Clerk of the Court)"; and (3) Delete the word "also".

Motion by Ms. Johnson, seconded by Ms. Hammontree to approve the three recommended changes to Article V, Section 1.5 of Resolution #7 as outlined by Ms. Yurko.

A **roll call vote** on the motion was taken with all members in attendance voting AYE.

- - -

Ms. Yurko discussed Mr. Lovestrand's concern dealing with Resolution #5, regarding the creation of the County Auditor and how it interfaces with Section 125.85(5) of the Florida Statutes. She concluded that the charter can designate someone other than the County Manager (such as the County Auditor) to be the executive officer charged with the audit function. She recommended adding an intent section to the resolution to clarify that the CRC intends the newly created County Auditor to be the "appropriate executive officer" contemplated in Chapter 125 to audit expenditures.

Mr. Lovestrand stated Ms. Yurko's recommendation addresses his concern.

Motion by Mr. Horan, seconded by Mr. Boyko to accept the recommendation by Ms. Yurko with regard to Resolution #5 and direct her to draft an "intent" section clarifying that the CRC intends the newly created County Auditor to be the "appropriate executive officer".

A **roll call vote** on the motion was taken with all members in attendance voting AYE.

- - -

Ms. Yurko discussed the tax collector prohibition in Resolution #2. Memo from Ray Valdes, Tax Collector, dated June 9, 2006 was received and filed. She advised that after review, she has determined that nothing has been revealed which would undermine the legal authority of the CRC to present this issue to the voters, although the CRC may want to consider the following issues: (1) The necessity of the provision in light of Resolution #3 which address "influencing the outcome of a matter coming before one's agency"; and (2) Possibly overbroad inclusion of term "relative" in the provision and redundancy of term within provision given that wording already addresses direct or indirect participation. She said at a minimum the CRC may want to delete the reference to "relative". She added that the decision to delete the amendment altogether is totally a policy decision for the CRC.

Mr. Maloy distributed a policy from Hillsborough County Tax Collector's Employee Handbook (copy received & filed) referencing the State Statutes as far as limitation. He said they go a step further by prohibiting the tax collector and his employees from specifically purchasing tax certificates

and tax deeds. He also distributed an editorial of the The Tampa Tribune dated September 23, 2002 (copy received & filed). He said he still thinks it is a good idea to have clarifying language in the charter that would prohibit this type of activity because he does believe it crosses the line.

Motion by Mr. Furlong, seconded by Mr. Horan to delete Section B(2) regarding the Tax Collector and employees thereof, of Resolution #2 in its entirety.

Under discussion, Mr. Furlong stated he believes this is redundant. He said this is covered by multiple sections of the Statutes.

Chairman Tucker stated he is going to vote against the motion because he believes it is one the people of Seminole County deserved to be able to vote on up or down. He added that if the voters want this and it doesn't pass the legal test, so be it.

Mr. Horan stated he will be voting against the motion also.

Ms. Ohab said she believes it is time for the CRC to take the position to be tough on ethics and, therefore, she will be voting against the motion.

A **roll call vote** on the motion was taken with Ms. Dietz, Mr. Harris, Mr. Furlong and Mr. Triplett voting AYE. Mr.

Horan, Mr. Miller, Ms. Johnson, Mr. Lovestrand, Mr. Tucker, Mr. Boyko, Mr. Maloy, Ms. Hammontree, and Ms. Ohab voted NAY, whereupon, the **motion failed for the lack of a majority vote.**

Motion by Mr. Lovestrand, seconded by Mr. Maloy to approve the language in Section B(2) of Resolution #2, as follows: "Neither the Tax Collector of Seminole County, nor any employee of the Tax Collector's office, shall be permitted directly or indirectly to bid on any Seminole County tax certificate sales".

Motion by Mr. Furlong, seconded by Mr. Triplett to amend the previous motion to include striking the following words in Section B(1) of Resolution #2: "of any municipality in Seminole County".

Under discussion Mr. Furlong stated he believes that if someone is a county commissioner, they should not be a paid lobbyist at all, either with other counties, inter-agencies, or other boards.

Chairman Tucker stated Section B(1) was something that was not changed and it was an item that was discussed. He said Mr. Furlong's motion substantially changes this provision and, therefore, ruled that the amended motion is out of order.

Upon inquiry by Mr. Furlong, the Chairman stated Mr. Furlong can challenge his ruling on the motion being out of order.

Mr. Furlong challenged the Chairman's ruling. Discussion ensued.

Ms. Yurko advised she believes it is within the Chairman's prerogative to rule a motion is out of order. She reminded the CRC that they are half an hour past the public hearing time.

Chairman Tucker clarified the motion on the floor is for Section B(2).

A **roll call vote** on the motion was taken with Mr. Horan, Ms. Dietz, Mr. Miller, Ms. Johnson, Mr. Lovestrand, Mr. Tucker, Mr. Boyko, Mr. Maloy, Ms. Hammontree, Mr. Furlong, and Ms. Ohab voting AYE. Mr. Harris and Mr. Triplett voted NAY.

The Chairman stated the CRC can take up Mr. Furlong's request at another time.

The Chairman adjourned the work session at 7:34 p.m., this same date.

CRC PUBLIC HEARING

The Chairman called the CRC Public Hearing to order at 7:43 p.m.

Jane Hammontree gave the Invocation and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

The Chairman introduced members of the CRC who were in attendance. He also announced the next public hearing dates are June 29 and July 12, 2006 at 7:00 p.m.

Proof of publication for the CRC public hearing was received and filed.

RESOLUTION #1

The Chairman opened the public hearing on Resolution #1 - Amendment of Article II of the Seminole County Home Rule Charter to provide: A method of setting salaries of County Commissioners and to set limits on increases.

Ms. Yurko read the pertinent language of Resolution #1 into the Record.

Bob Webster, 3435 Holliday Avenue, addressed the Board to ask if he could ask some questions of the members of the CRC. Whereupon, the Chairman advised this is a public hearing for public input and it is not a public debate.

Mr. Webster asked if the CRC has read Florida Statutes 125.80 thru 125.89 and if they have reviewed any document other than the County Charter. He said it appears he and the CRC are looking at the County Charter through two different perspectives. He stated he does not believe the CRC can amend

the charter as it exists in a lawful fashion. He also said the current charter does not even allow for a CRC. With regard to Resolution #1, Mr. Webster stated the CRC is not abiding by the law.

Rocky Harrelson, Geneva, addressed the Board to state he would like to address some issues that he wants the CRC to consider.

The Chairman advised Mr. Harrelson needs to address his comments specifically to Resolution #1; and will have time at the end of the meeting to address his other concerns.

Mr. Harrelson stated he agrees with setting the Commissioners' salaries.

No one else spoke with regard to Resolution #1.

The Chairman closed the public input portion of the hearing.

There was no additional discussion by the CRC, therefore, the Chairman closed the public hearing on Resolution #1.

RESOLUTION #2

The Chairman opened the public hearing on Resolution #2 - Amendment of Article V of the Seminole County Home Rule Charter to include provisions which prohibit: (1) Certain Lobbying by Seminole County Commissioners; (2) Bidding by the Seminole County Tax Collector or his or her employees on tax

certificate sales; and, (3) Certain officials and their employees from accepting compensation for working in others' election campaigns.

Ms. Yurko read the pertinent language of Resolution #2 into the Record.

Bob Webster, 3435 Holliday Avenue, stated that there has never been a commissioner elected in Seminole County pursuant to 125.80 thru 125.89; therefore, any ordinance passed by them has no standing. He said they are charter commissioners and have to be elected pursuant to the charter. He further said the executive branch of government in the County is the county manager. The executive responsibilities and powers have never been invested in the county manager. Instead, this position functions under a contract at the pleasure of three of the commissioners. A separation must exist between the executive and legislative bodies. He stated that an attempt to assume the constitutional responsibility from the Florida constitutional officers such as the Clerk of the Court to audit the other constitutional officers and charter officers and grant this part of the Charter Commission, to him, is absurd - it's unconstitutional. The constitutional officers have never been a part of the Charter. He stated that it is a

shame the CRC is not looking at checks and balances in the government.

Rocky Harrelson, Geneva, stated the county manager should not be subservient to the BCC. Having a county manager that serves at the pleasure of the BCC (with three votes) insures that he remains impotent. He added that removal of the county manager should require public concurrence.

No one else spoke with regard to Resolution #2.

The Chairman closed the public input portion of the hearing.

Ms. Yurko stated that in the course of doing final research on some of these issues, she came across a section in the Election Code, Section 104.31 which specifically addresses the political activity of State, County and Municipal officers and employees. She said at the end of that section it says the following: "Nothing contained in this section or in any County or Municipal Charter shall be deemed to prohibit any public employee from expressing his or her opinions on any candidate or issue, or from participating in any political campaign during the employee's off-duty hours so long as such activities are not in conflict with the provisions of subsection 1 or section 110.233". She advised that in addition to that Statute, an Attorney General's opinion (75-

195) construes this section broadly as, "an expressed legislative prohibition or preemption of the municipal regulations of the political activities of all municipal officers and employees and as an impediment to the exercise and municipal legislative power to regulate such activities". She reviewed two cases that are somewhat relevant.

Mr. Horan stated this is likely to be challenged and the cases on political speech do not seem to draw too much of a line between compensation and non-compensation. He questioned if there is any way to fix this to insulate it from the Statute.

Ms. Yurko said that she could not think of a way.

Mr. Tucker stated the action itself is very controversial just like a lot of the things they are talking about regarding commissioners. He said if this doesn't conform to a legal challenge, then so be it. He added he believes the Seminole County voters have a right to vote on this.

Mr. Horan stated they are going beyond prohibiting a public official from doing something. They are prohibiting employees from participating under the Statute. He said the Statute doesn't say for pay or not for pay.

Mr. Lovestrand stated he believes what an employee does on his time is his own business.

Motion by Mr. Lovestrand, seconded by Mr. Triplett to strike paragraph 3 of Article V, Section 1.3(B) of Resolution #2, dealing with compensation to aid in the election of a person who is running for office.

Under discussion, Mr. Horan said the CRC needs to keep in mind what they are really swooping up under this provision is the young man who works in the sanitation department of the county who only makes \$6 an hour. He said he would like to keep this provision limited to the officials only.

Mr. Maloy said he would not want to delete the entire provision and would rather have Mr. van den Berg present because this was his concept.

Mr. Horan said he thought the motion was to just take employees out of it. Whereupon, Mr. Lovestrand stated his motion was to kill the entire provision, but he would be agreeable to an amendment to limit it to just officials.

Mr. Horan said that when they go beyond the public official and limit an employee's ability to participate in the political process, whether for compensation or not, there will be a legal challenge.

Mr. Triplett and Mr. Lovestrand **withdrew** their motion.

Motion by Mr. Horan, seconded by Mr. Triplett to delete the words "and no employee" in paragraph 3 of Article V, Section 1.3(B) of Resolution #2.

Under discussion, Ms. Johnson stated that if the CRC limits this to officials, it will not have any real effect. She said they are basically covering an ethical situation that should be covered by the ethical polices, both by the County and the Constitutional Officers.

Mr. Triplett said he does not believe the CRC can limit him on his extracurricular activities, whether it the First Amendment or working after hours on a street corner for an official he wants to get elected.

A **roll call vote** on the motion was taken with Mr. Horan, Ms. Dietz, Mr. Miller, Mr. Lovestrand, Mr. Harris and Mr. Triplett voting AYE; and Ms. Johnson, Mr. Tucker, Mr. Boyko, Mr. Maloy, Ms. Hammontree, Mr. Furlong and Ms. Ohab voting NAY. Whereupon, the **motion failed for the lack of a majority vote.**

There was no additional discussion by the CRC, therefore, the Chairman closed the public hearing for Resolution #2.

RESOLUTION #3

The Chairman opened the public hearing on Resolution #3 - Amendment of Article V of the Seminole County Home Rule

Charter to add new provisions: (1) prohibit certain gifts to officials (or any of their relatives); (2) prohibit attempts by officials to influence actions coming before their agency which could result in private gain to the officials or their relatives and providing for enforcement.

Ms. Yurko read the pertinent language of Resolution #3 into the Record.

Bob Webster, 3435 Holliday Ave., reiterated his objection to anyone attempting to do anything with any of the Constitutional Officers. He added that the only officer in the County that has the authority to prosecute is the State Attorney and the State Attorney has already established that he does not want anything to do with this.

No one else spoke with regard to Resolution #3.

The Chairman closed the public input portion of the hearing.

Mr. Horan stated he thought the CRC had decided to change the word "personal" to "private" in paragraph C under Article V, Section 1.4. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Furlong stated he believes the word that deals with this is "special" private gain.

Ms. Yurko said she does not recall anyone changing that.

The Chairman suggested Ms. Yurko research the minutes; but that the consensus of the CRC is that the word be changed to "special private".

Motion by Mr. Horan, seconded by Mr. Furlong to amend paragraph C of Article V, Section 1.4 of Resolution #3 by changing the word "personal" to "special private".

The Chairman clarified that since there is a motion, Ms. Yurko does not need to research the minutes.

A **roll call vote** on the motion was taken with all members in attendance voting AYE.

There was no additional discussion by the CRC, therefore, the Chairman closed the public hearing on Resolution #3.

RESOLUTION #4

The Chairman opened the public hearing on Resolution #4 - Amendment of Article V of the Seminole County Home Rule Charter to provide: new requirements of full disclosure of ownership of property which is the subject of land use approvals in Seminole County, Florida.

Ms. Yurko read the pertinent language regarding Resolution #4 into the Record.

No one spoke with regard to Resolution #4.

The Chairman closed the public input portion of the hearing.

Mr. Furlong pointed out in paragraph A of Article V, Section 1.5, that land use amendments have been left out and those should have been included. He said these are different from rezonings.

Chairman Tucker agreed that land use amendments or comp plan amendments should be included in the listing.

Ms. Yurko stated she will add the phrase, "comprehensive plan amendment". She said that is within the scope of notice.

Motion by Mr. Furlong, seconded by Mr. Miller to include "comprehensive plan amendments" in paragraph A, Article V, Section 1.5 of Resolution #4; and to follow the same language on the last line of the paragraph.

A **roll call vote** on the motion was taken with all members in attendance voting AYE.

There was no additional discussion by the CRC, therefore, the Chairman closed the public hearing for Resolution #4.

The Chairman recessed the meeting at 8:50 p.m., reconvening it at 9:00 p.m.

RESOLUTION #5

The Chairman opened the public hearing on Resolution #5 - Amendment of Article II of the Seminole County Home Rule Charter by adding new sections to provide: that the functions

and duties now prescribed by the Florida Constitution to the Clerk of the Circuit Court which relate to Clerk's duties as Auditor of County funds be transferred to a newly created auditor position serving at the pleasure of the Board of County Commissioners; for powers, duties and qualifications of said auditor; and for the Clerk's duties which relate to custodian of County funds to be transferred to the County Manager.

Mr. Yurko read the pertinent language regarding Resolution #5 into the Record.

Rocky Harrelson, Geneva, expressed his concern with making the auditor responsible to the BCC and, therefore, having no checks and balances. He said an independent overseer is needed over County funds. He stated the commissioners' expense reports need to be scrutinized. He further stated that policies regarding travel need to be established because he, as a taxpayer, is not happy with the way his money is being spent. He added someone needs to oversee the BCC.

No one else spoke with regard to Resolution #5.

The Chairman closed the public input portion of the hearing.

The Chairman stated that there were a number of alternatives, including an elected comptroller, but the majority of the CRC went with this recommendation. He said, in his opinion, this was a compromise and to him this is an improvement.

Mr. Furlong stated he is not sure that this is an improvement.

Ms. Johnson said that she does not believe that the separation of the county auditor was necessarily meant to address Mr. Harrelson's concerns. She further said it was meant to highlight and emphasize the role of internal audit and the function of audit is not necessarily to create the policies but to make sure the policies already in place are enforced.

There was no additional discussion by the CRC, therefore, the Chairman closed the public hearing for Resolution #5.

RESOLUTION #6

The Chairman opened the public hearing on Resolution #6 - Amendment of Article II of the Seminole County Home Rule Charter to provide for: adding a new section to create providing for a volunteer advisory audit committee; for setting forth the powers, duties, terms and qualifications of

said audit committee; and for conforming changes to Sections 2.2(3) and 3.1 of the Charter.

Ms. Yurko read the pertinent language for Resolution #6 into the Record.

Rocky Harrelson, Geneva, advised he applied to be on the CRC and was told by his Commissioner that people who apply for this committee has an agenda. He questioned why the County goes to the expense of printing the application forms and have people fill them out if they are going to be told that they can't be on the committee. He said it shouldn't be called an application, but be called a disqualification form. With regard to the proposed audit committee, he said that only people who apply for the job, should be appointed.

No one else spoke with regard to Resolution #6.

The Chairman closed the public input portion of the hearing.

Mr. Horan stated the proposed amendments empower the BCC to create two boards - one is an ethics board and the other is an audit committee. He said that he thinks they will see the opportunity for people who want to participate in government expanded by this.

Mr. Harris stated that in looking at this, he does not see any establishment of standards. He questioned what

specific oversight does the CRC want the audit committee to exercise.

Ms. Johnson said they thought the audit committee should set its own charter that would delineate the standards of expectations of the audit committee. She said the intent of the CRC was to create an audit committee charter similar to the one suggested by the AICPA.

Upon inquiry by Mr. Harris, Ms. Yurko advised she believes this is a perfect example of where intent language would come in very handy. She said she would suggest Ms. Johnson draft some intent language to be brought back to the CRC. The CRC voiced **no objections** to same.

There was no additional discussion by the CRC, therefore, the Chairman closed the public hearing on Resolution #6.

RESOLUTION #7

The Chairman opened the public hearing on Resolution #7 - Amendment of Article V of the Seminole County Home Rule Charter to provide for: adding a new section which includes the Sheriff, Property Appraiser, Tax Collector, Clerk of the Circuit Court and Supervisor of Elections within the scope of internal audits conducted by the person designated by the Charter to perform audits for conforming changes to Section 2.2.(E) and 3.1 of the Charter.

Ms. Yurko read the pertinent language for Resolution #7 into the Record. She advised of additional language "or entity" after the word "person" in Section 1.5.

Motion by Mr. Horan, seconded by Ms. Dietz to add "or entity" after the word "person" under Article V, Section 1.5 of Resolution #7.

A **roll call vote** on the motion was taken with all members in attendance voting AYE.

No one spoke with regard to Resolution #7.

The Chairman closed the public input portion of the hearing.

There was no additional discussion by the CRC, therefore, the Chairman closed the public hearing on Resolution #7.

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION/NEW ISSUES

Rocky Harrelson, Geneva, expressed his appreciation to the CRC for letting him speak. He discussed some of the commissioners' travel vouchers and said he is against the county audit position not being independent of the BCC. He said he attended a budget meeting of the County and feels like it was a farce. He suggested the proposed budget be posted on the County's web site at least six weeks before being voted upon. He also suggested the numbers be posted on the big screens in the chambers and that staff should not use acronyms

when discussing the budget. He stated any money that is going to a corporation or company should be highlighted so that it stands out to the public; and it should be voted upon as a separate issue. He further stated that he does not believe the BCC should buy land with public dollars and then lease it without any public oversight. Also, the BCC should not have the right to sell public land without the citizens voting on it. He said that he is unhappy that the BCC ignored a public request for information; and if they do, a method needs to be provided so that they can be impeached. He added the BCC owes the public answers to questions posed to them by formal letter. He stated he would also like to see English as the official language of Seminole County and would like to see it on the ballot in November.

Mr. Maloy stated he appreciates Mr. Harrelson's input; and advised in the beginning, the CRC asked for public input but was disappointed only a couple of people showed up. He added that he wished the CRC had more input early on.

Mr. Lovestrand thanked Mr. Harrelson for his comments and explained he was not in the process at the beginning. In particular, he liked his comments relative to corporate welfare.

Mr. Miller commented on Mr. Harrelson's perspective that if someone had a personal agenda, he or she would be disqualified from being on the CRC; and said that statement is not accurate.

Speaker Request/Written Comment Forms were received and filed.

The Chairman announced the next public hearing of the CRC is scheduled for June 29, 2006 at 7:00 p.m., and the last hearing will be held on July 12, 2006.

There being no further business to come before the CRC at this time, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 9:36 p.m.