

**CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 18, 2010**

A meeting of the Charter Review Commission was held at the Administration Complex, 18500 Murdock Circle, Room 106-B.

Call to Order

The meeting was called order at 4:02 p.m. EST by *Chairman Doherty*

Roll Call

The following members were present:

Ken Doherty (Chairman), Kevin Russell (Vice-Chairman, Andy Dodd, Bill Dryburgh, Bill Folchi, Maureen Garrard, Suzanne Graham, Michael Grant, Joseph Goggin, John Hitzel, Julie Mathis, Tom Rice, Frank Weikel

Alternates present: *Patricia Kelly*

Absent members: *Paula Hess, Johnny Vernon*

Absent alternates: *Connie Kantor, Bill Weller*

The meeting was also attended by Robert Berntsson, Esq., counsel for the Charter Review Commission

Agenda Items:

1. Approval of Minutes. *Chairman Doherty* confirmed that the members had received copies of the Minutes of the meeting on January 21, 2010, and there being no deletions nor additions a motion was made and seconded and those Minutes were approved unanimously

2. Approval of Expenses. *Chairman Doherty* referred to the invoice from Robert Berntsson, Esq., for services rendered the CRC during January. This invoice had been previously distributed to membership for their review and a copy of this invoice is attached to these Minutes as Attachment "A". A motion was made and seconded to approve payment of the invoice. *Chairman Doherty* also referred to an updated list of expenses from the last meeting ,also previously distributed to membership, a copy of which is attached to these Minutes as Attachment "B". *Mr. Doherty* stated that these expenses would be furnished to membership every month, and assured them that he would be monitoring expenses as CRC activities accelerate.

3. Discussion of Critical Charter Review Commission Dates. *Chairman Doherty* had prepared a list of critical dates/deadlines associated with the Charter Review Commission completing its duties

in a timely manner, which had been previously distributed to membership and a copy of which is attached to these Minutes as Attachment "C". *Chairman Doherty* indicated that in drawing up this list he had worked backwards from November 2, 2010 (Election Day) to when he needed to present the final Amendments and Report to the Board of County Commissioners. *Mr. Doherty* stated that date is July 27, 2010 and there is no leeway. *Mr. Doherty* informed the membership that prior to that there needs to be three (3) Public Hearings and also Mr. Berntsson needs time to prepare the ballot language for any proposed Amendments. The first Public Hearing will need to occur on June 3, 2010, and *Chairman Doherty* further indicated that there are limitations on the timing of those hearings. He advised the membership that the dates shown in bold lettering on the list are dates that have not yet appeared on their schedules. *Mr. Doherty* also emphasized the date of July 15, 2010 as being the deadline for staff submissions to Administration to be placed on the Agenda for July 27th. In further reviewing the dates with membership *Mr. Doherty* said the Board of County Commissioners sub-Committee had completed their interviews and would submit their final report to the full membership at the next meeting on March 18, 2010. There are also some "housekeeping" items in Article IV of the Charter that the CRC can review and discuss at the March meeting. At the general meeting on April 15, 2010 the full membership will vote on both the BCC sub-Committee proposed Amendments and those housekeeping issues. *Chairman Doherty* then drew attention to a special general membership meeting which he proposed for May 13, 2010. It is at this meeting that the rest of the sub-Committees will present their final reports, to be voted on at the regular monthly meeting the following week, May 20, 2010. *Frank Weikel* inquired if all of these meetings will be held at 4:00 p.m. and *Chairman Doherty* confirmed that they would. *Mr. Doherty* also indicated that it will be important to know in advance who cannot attend. *Tom Rice* asked if the previous public meeting/general membership meeting held on January 21, 2010 qualified as one of the Public Hearings. *Chairman Doherty* and Robert Berntsson, Esq. replied that it did not and Mr. Berntsson elaborated that had been a public input meeting. He stated that Public Hearing does not take place until there are specific items to present. *Andy Dodd* inquired if a quorum is required at the Public Hearings. Mr. Berntsson responded that one is required, and business must be adjourned to the next meeting if there is no quorum. *Chairman Doherty* reiterated that it will be important to know in advance if members will be absent. *Tom Rice* inquired if all of the Public Meetings will be at the same location, and *Chairman Doherty* replied that in the past they have held one in West County, one in the Murdock Administration Center and one in South County. *Andy Dodd* moved to hold the special meeting on May 13, 2010 and accept the other dates as set forth and this motion was seconded and accepted unanimously. *Maureen Garrard* asked her Constitutional Officers sub-committee members if they could stay for extra time after the last interview meeting on April 29, 2010 in order to develop their report, and all responded that they would. *Bill Folchi* said that his Other Boards and Agencies sub-Committee would try to conclude their interviews by the end of March. *Julie Mathis* said that her Administration Staff sub-Committee was going to try and set aside a Friday to do multiple interviews.

4. Sub-Committee Reports.

Constitutional Officers: *Maureen Garrard, Chairman*, reported that all of her interviews were Scheduled and that they had just concluded the first one with Vickie Potts, Charlotte County Tax Collector. *Ms. Garrard* stated that the next official scheduled for interview was Honorable Paul Stamoulis, Supervisor of Elections.

Administration Staff: *Julie Mathis, Chairman*, said that she will be having her next meeting on March 9, 2010. This will be for the purpose of developing the list of interview questions.

Other Boards and Agencies: *Bill Folchi, Chairman*, stated that interviews had already been scheduled with the three Chambers of Commerce and the Mayor and City Manager of the City of Punta Gorda. *Mr. Folchi* is waiting for responses from other invitations that have been issued. *Mr. Folchi* asked *Kevin Russell* about Enterprise Charlotte, of which *Mr. Russell* is a member. *Mr. Russell* responded that it would be appropriate to speak with Don Root of that organization, and said that he too would be happy to talk to the sub-Committee. At this time *Mr. Russell* asked *Mr. Folchi* if his sub-Committee was planning on interviewing the School Board and *Mr. Folchi* replied that he hoped to do so. *Kevin Russell* said that he had been specifically contacted by Michael McKinley, Esq. who had asked that this invitation be issued as there were topics of discussion that the School Board wished to address. *Mr. Folchi* also said that his meeting schedule may accelerate once responses are received.

Board of County Commissioners: *Tom Rice*, as acting Chairman, stated that the sub-Committee had met on January 28, 2010 and interviewed each Commissioner from a list of prepared questions. There had been a non-quorum meeting on February 4, 2010 and a meeting on February 17, 2010 to formulate their preliminary report. *Mr. Rice* explained that this report goes through each of the interview questions and presents what the sub-Committee heard from the Commissioners and what the sub-Committee recommends on each issue. (NOTE: A copy of this report is attached to these Minutes as Attachment "D"). *Mr. Rice* further advised that the complete text of the meeting can be reviewed in the Minutes of that meeting of February 17, 2010. In regard to Question 8 on that report, *Mr. Rice* advised that a meeting has been scheduled for Wednesday, March 3, 2010, 11:00 a.m. EST to accommodate further discussion and obtain further input. An invitation was issued to the general membership to attend. *Chairman Doherty* congratulated the sub-Committee on their work, remarking that he had attended the BCC interview meeting and the questions were thoughtful and well handled. *Chairman Doherty* also referred to the possible overlapping of issues among the sub-Committees, specifically referring to the Board of County Commissioners sub-Committee pursuing the question of an elected Administrator, an area which will also be handled by the Administration Staff sub-Committee. *Chairman Doherty* then asked *Mr. Rice* if his sub-Committee had determined that as far as the Legislative branch, their recommendation would be to leave things as they currently exist. *Mr. Rice* responded that was not entirely correct, as the issue of term limits had been presented and they would make a recommendation on that. Regarding that issue of term limits, Robert Berntsson, Esq. inquired if the proposed three (3) term limit meant consecutive or total. *Mr. Rice* responded that they had not yet

examined that. *Mr. Rice* elaborated that it was his opinion (not that of the sub-Committee) that the purpose of setting term limits was to get it in front of the full Commission for discussion and clarification. *Chairman Doherty* confirmed that is how it has been done in the past, explaining that all sub-Committee recommendations are subject to the vote of the full Commission and at times they are not approved as a result. In response to *Mr. Berntsson's* question about consecutive or total time for term limits, *Michael Grant* stated that with most term limits an individual has to sit out for two to four years, so he would not be opposed to a fourth term under those conditions if three consecutive terms had already been served. *Chairman Doherty* observed that it would be exactly this type of discussion that takes place during the meeting on April 15, 2010, the results of which will determine how *Mr. Berntsson* crafts his ballot language.

5. Commission Comments: *John Hitzel* said that he would recommend that future Charter Review Commission amendments be worded with more "teeth" to aid in enforcement. He said this was in reference to the debt and reserve policy Amendments that were passed as a result of the 2004 CRC session, implementation of which did not take place until September 2009. *Chairman Doherty* agreed and said that he had mentioned his concern about this to each Commissioner during the interviews on January 28, 2010 and he had specifically requested Commissioner Starr to look into it. He referred to a Memorandum from the County Administrator to *Mr. Starr* addressing that issue, confirming with administrative support that this Memo had been circulated among the membership. *Chairman Doherty* indicated that this should be one of the housekeeping issues that the Charter Review Commission handles at the next meeting. *Maureen Garrard* said that in the past when she worked on writing laws they would include an implementation date, and she asked *Robert Berntsson, Esq.* if the Commission could include such language when writing any proposed Amendments. *Mr. Berntsson* replied that implementation is included in the law when it passes, but suggested that "if you fail to do so..." wording be used. *Mr. Berntsson* also suggested that whatever committee is looking at that debts and reserve policy issue also examine the financial impact statements that are required. *Chairman Doherty* observed that the expectation when this was being recommended included a financial impact estimate, further saying that what has been now done may be legally sufficient but certainly not what he had expected it to be. *Mr. Doherty* also said that there was not actually a committee looking into that issue, but it will be a part of the housekeeping issues that will be submitted for a vote.

Michael Grant urged the membership to read the Minutes of the meeting of January 28, 2010 and he also referred to the ideas of *Chairman Doherty* presented at said meeting regarding possible alternate structures of government. *Mr. Grant* further described the level of municipal services offered by Charlotte County, noting that there was actually only one municipality in the County. *Mr. Grant* stated that most municipalities have some form of elected Administrator to help oversee provision of services. He stated that this question was presented to the County Commissioners during interview and most indicated that they would not want the power removed from them. *Mr. Grant* emphasized that these suggestions are not about power but about a more efficient way of providing municipal services in a accountable manner. *Mr. Grant* referred to the City Charters of Tampa and St. Petersburg, respectively, and instructed administrative support to send copies of these Charters to the rest of the membership for review. *Mr. Grant* said he had chosen those particular cities because although they are larger than Charlotte County they are providing very similar sets of services. *Mr. Grant* said that as far as he knew those cities were probably very effectively governed, as is Orange County and Duval County. *Mr. Grant* said that he is not an advocate of an elected County Administrator either one way or another, but he

remarked that he thinks it is time to seriously review our form of government and have it be more accountable to the taxpayers and business community. *Chairman Doherty* observed that it was interesting during the interview meeting to hear two Commissioners admit that they thought the BCC organization is dysfunctional. To define that, *Chairman Doherty* said that the problem appears to hover around the separation of powers/non-interference clause in the County Charter. *Mr. Doherty* said that the citizens think that the elected Commissioners have the authority to get things done, but actually they do not. *Chairman Doherty* explained that clause was built into the Charter years ago before becoming a Charter County. He further said that some of the Commissioners feel their hands are tied, observing that this has been felt by the construction and other industries in the County. *Mr. Doherty* said that he has actually heard County staff members be very disrespectful of the County Commission. *Frank Weikel* responded with his opinion that more education is needed on the issue, and referred to *Mr. Doherty's* comments made during the BCC interview meeting that these proposed changes may be premature, that perhaps this will be examined by the next session of the Charter Review Commission in six years. *Mr. Weikel* said that he had agreed if his sub-Committee wanted to study it for two years, but at this point he does not know enough about the issue to support it. *Chairman Doherty* agreed that a lot more study is required and it needs to be looked at in the context of the evolution of the community. *Mr. Weikel* agreed that eventually change will be necessary but at this time with so little information it would be hard to sell it to the voters in November. *Maureen Garrard* asked *Mr. Grant* if he was referring to an elected Executive or a strong Mayor. *Mr. Grant* responded that either option can be considered, stating that is why he is urging examination of the two aforementioned City Charters. *Mr. Grant* said that he thought that the critical point was to have an elected Executive that had the ability to hire the day to day persons to administer the various Departments, so that if those Department heads were not doing their jobs it would reflect on the elected official who would make them do their jobs properly. *Mr. Grant* stated that he thought that accountability is what is missing in most counties that do not have an elected official. He further said that he thought because of Sunshine laws and separation of powers the result is un-elected people making decisions that affect the citizens as far as taxes, development, etc. *Mr. Grant* referred to a statement made by Commissioner Skidmore that said he thought the Commissioners should have the ability and authority to deal directly with Department heads. *Mr. Grant* then said that *Chairman Doherty* had rightly responded to that by pointing out that he (Mr. Doherty) had been in the County when the Commissioners had that authority and it had resulted in chaos. *Mr. Grant* concluded by saying that he thought that for too long this County as well as others have allowed non-elected officials to be subservient to the will of the people. He said that the only way to counter that is to have an elected Executive who implements what the Board of County Commissioners suggest.

William Dryburgh remarked that he thought a hired County Administrator spends his or her time keeping the Board of County Commissioners happy, rather than setting an Agenda that would be good for all the people in the County. *Chairman Doherty* observed that the current system worked in the past when Charlotte County was more rural but said that as it has become more urbanized he wonders if more municipalities are an answer or if the County needs a government structure which would allow it to function like a large City.

Chairman Doherty confirmed with administrative support that the web site is under construction and although it will not be interactive it will allow citizen input.


Chairman Doherty brought up an issue raised by Administration that the Charter Review Minutes being produced did not contain enough information. None of the membership voiced any concern to support that complaint.

Chairman Doherty referred to the fact that he has been to some speaking engagements throughout the County, which have led to further invitations. As there are other members of the Charter Review Commission who have volunteered to speak at those times when *Mr. Doherty* is not available, *Mr. Doherty* suggested a brief meeting with himself and those volunteers to coordinate the substance of the speeches. He referred to the PowerPoint™ presentation which he had used, and indicated that he would send that through administrative support for distribution to the volunteer speakers. Administrative support was instructed to set up a meeting for the following week.

Frank Weikel suggested that future Agendas put Public Input ahead of Commission Comments, and this met with the approval of membership.

6. Public Input. Mr. Park Pellekian was in attendance and he commented that he had attended a previous CRC meeting. Mr. Pellekian observed that he thought the Commission had good intentions and it was his understanding that they could make Amendments to the Charter. *Chairman Doherty* pointed out that the Charter Review Commission could recommend, but it is actually the voters who make the decision. Mr. Pellekian said he had most of his questions answered while listening to the meeting, and said that he thought the prominent issues for discussion would be term limits and an elected Administrator. *Chairman Doherty* urged him to attend more monthly meetings, as the next meetings will contain the suggestions coming forth from the sub-Committees. In response to a question by Mr. Pellekian, *Chairman Doherty* briefly outlined the three (3) ways the Charter can be amended, ie., by an ordinance of the Board of County Commissioners, an initiative, or this Charter Review Commission. Mr. Pellekian said he thought the purpose of this Commission was to look throughout the County and try to make improvements, and *Chairman Doherty* agreed. There was no further public input.

7. Adjournment. A motion was made and seconded and the meeting was adjourned at 4:54 p.m. EST



Kenneth W. Doherty, Chairman

ATTACHMENT "A"

BERNTSSON, ITTERSAGEN, GUNDERSON, WAKSLER & WIDEIKIS, LLP

18401 MURDOCK CIRCLE, SUITE C
PORT CHARLOTTE, FLORIDA 33948
(941) 627-1000
TAX ID#: 26-2501255

1861 PLACIDA ROAD, SUITE 204
ENGLEWOOD, FLORIDA 34223-4949
(941) 474-7713
TAX ID#: 26-2501255

February 2, 2010

Charlotte County Charter Review Commission
Attn: W. Kevin Russell, Esq.
14295 S. Tamiami Trail
North Port, FL 34287

Bill Number 5174
Billed through 01/31/2010
Reply to: Port Charlotte

General

017298 1729801 RHB

FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES RENDERED

01/04/10	RHB	Review e-mail message(s) to and from Ms. Pinder; Review Announcement of Public Input Meeting; Review e-mail message(s) to and from Ms. Knowlton regarding Charter on Website; Telephone conference with Ms. Knowlton; Review e-mail message(s) to and from Mr. Doherty regarding Alternates.	1.00 hrs	200 00
01/05/10	RHB	Review e-mail message(s) to and from Ms. Pinder; Review e-mail message(s) to and from Ms. Knowlton regarding Alternate Vacancy; Telephone conference with Ms. Knowlton.	0.50 hrs	100 00
01/07/10	RHB	Attend Committee Chair meeting; Review BCC agenda	1.00 hrs	200 00
01/11/10	RHB	Review e-mail message(s) to and from Ms. Pinder regarding expenses and subcommittee meetings.	0.25 hrs	50 00
01/12/10	RHB	Review handout; Review e-mail message(s) to and from Ms. Pinder regarding January 21st meeting.	0.25 hrs	50 00
01/13/10	RHB	Telephone conference with Mr. Doherty regarding Subcommittee and Municipal Ordinances; Review Code.	0.50 hrs	100 00
01/14/10	RHB	Review e-mail message(s) to and from Ms. Pinder; Review Commission Materials on Alternate Appointment.	0.50 hrs	100 00
01/15/10	RHB	Review e-mail message(s) to and from Ms. Pinder; Review Special Meeting Minutes	0.25 hrs	50 00
01/21/10	RHB	Attend Charter Review Commission meeting; Conference with Ms. Kelly regarding Sunshine Law.	1.00 hrs	200 00
01/22/10	RHB	Telephone conference with Mr. Doherty; Review e-mail message(s) to and from Ms. Pinder.	0.25 hrs	50 00
01/25/10	RHB	Review e-mail message(s) to and from Ms. Pinder regarding Subcommittees.	0.25 hrs	50 00

Total fees for this matter

=====
\$1,150 00

EXPENSES

=====

BILLING SUMMARY

ATTACHMENT "B"

CATEGORY	AMOUNT BUDGETED	AMOUNT SHOWN ON LAST MONTH'S SPREADSHEET	ADDITIONAL EXPENSES 01/16/2010 THROUGH 02/12/2010	BALANCE REMAINING
Administrative Support (paid through Snelling Services)	\$9,704.00	\$2,096.64	\$1,189.60	\$6,417.76
Rentals and Leases	\$664.00			\$664.00
Postage	\$55.00			\$55.00
Office supplies	\$140.00	\$66.40	\$83.00	(\$9.40)
Advertising (legal)	\$2,788.00			\$2,788.00
*Attorney fees submitted (R. Bertsson Esq)	\$21,000.00	\$700.00	\$1,150.00	\$19,150.00
TOTALS	\$34,351.00	\$2,863.04	\$2,422.60	\$29,065.36

ATTACHMENT "C"

2010 Charter Review Commission CHARLOTTE COUNTY, FLORIDA

RE: Charter Review Commission Critical Dates – February 18, 2010

The following are the critical milestone dates associated with completing the CRC's responsibilities in keeping with the timeframes established by Florida Statutes: Activity Deadline

1. CRC Reviews / Approves the Critical Dates List 2/18/2010
2. "BCC" Report and CRC OK's "Housekeeping" Revisions 3/18/2010
3. CRC Votes on "BCC" and "Housekeeping" Amendments 4/15/2010
4. **SPECIAL CRC Meeting** - Final Reports from Other Committees **5/13/2010**
5. CRC Votes on Recommendations from Other Committees 5/20/2010
6. **1st CRC Required Public Hearing 6/03/2010**
7. 2nd CRC Required Public Hearing 6/17/2010
8. **3rd CRC Required Public Hearing 7/01/2010**
9. CRC Final Vote - BCC Agenda/Documents 7/15/2010
10. **BCC Mtg. – CRC Presentation/Amendments & Report 7/27/2010**
11. CRC Regular Meeting (if needed) 8/19/2010
12. CRC Regular Meeting (if needed) 9/16/2010
13. CRC Final Regular Meeting 10/21/2010
14. Election 11/02/2010

ATTACHMENT "D"



CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION
18500 MURDOCK CIRCLE, ROOM 140
PORT CHARLOTTE, FLORIDA 33948
(941) 623-1087

CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS SUB-COMMITTEE
PRELIMINARY COMMITTEE REPORT
February 17, 2010

Members: *JOHNNY VERNON (Chairman)*
WILLIAM DRYBURGH
MICHAEL GRANT
TOM RICE
FRANK WEIKEL

The Board of County Commissioners sub-Committee was formed for the purpose of reviewing that portion of the County Charter as it relates to the Board of County Commissioners. On January 28, 2010, this Committee interviewed each of the five (5) Commissioners. The Commissioners were asked to respond to a list of questions which had been previously formulated by this Committee and submitted to them.

On February 17, 2010 this sub-Committee met to review these responses and through discussion develop their preliminary recommendations to submit to the full membership of the Charter Review Commission. These recommendations, as well as the consensus/comments of the interview responses of the Board of County Commissioners, are indicated on the attached pages. (NOTE: The full interview responses of each Commissioner are shown in their entirety in the Minutes of the meeting held January 28, 2010. Likewise, the full scope of the discussion among the sub-Committee members can be obtained from an examination of the Minutes of the meeting held February 17, 2010).

**BCC sub-Committee Preliminary Report
Page Two**

1) Should the Board of County Commissioners be structured any differently?

Consensus of the Commissioners during interview:
The majority opposed any change to the current structure

Sub-Committee Recommendation:

Unresolved, please refer to Question 9 below

2) What are your thoughts concerning single member districts plus two at-large (not to exceed five (5) total)?

Consensus of the Commissioners during interview:
The majority opposed any change

Sub-Committee Recommendation:

It is the recommendation of this sub-Committee to leave the Board of County Commissioners as it currently exists

3) Should the Board of County Commissioner elections be non-partisan?

Consensus of the Commissioners during interview:
The majority of the Board of County Commissioners opposed change

Sub-Committee Recommendation:

It is the recommendation of this sub-Committee to keep the BCC elections partisan

4) Should the Board of County Commissioners be subject to term limits?

Consensus of the Commissioners during interview:
A majority of the Commissioners were opposed to term limits, but two responded that they would be in favor of eight to twelve years (2 to 3 terms) if enacted.

Sub-Committee Recommendation:

It is the recommendation of this sub-Committee to set a limit of

three (3) elected terms, assuming that an appointed term cannot
count against the total
BCC sub-Committee Preliminary Report
Page Three

5) What are your thoughts concerning BCC election ballot rotation of names?

Consensus of the Commissioners during interview:
There was no interest in pursuing this

Sub-Committee recommendation:

This sub-Committee finds no reason to examine this

6) Is there a need to regulate BCC election financing in the Charter?

Consensus of the Commissioners during interview:
None had any interest in changing

Sub-Committee recommendation:

This sub-Committee finds no reason to regulate BCC election
financing in the County Charter

7) Would you like the Charter Review Commission to recommend any Charter
amendments relative to the Board of County Commissioners?

Comments of the Commissioners during interview:
A) Changes in the Sunshine Law provisions
B) A requirement for Directors and above to live in Charlotte County

Sub-Committee recommendation:

- A) The Sunshine Law is beyond the authority of the CRC
- B) This sub-Committee recommends that residency requirements be
handled through an ordinance of the Board of County
Commissioners and not through Charter amendment.

**BCC sub-Committee Preliminary Report
Page Four**

8) What are your thoughts concerning the County Administrator's position becoming elected?

Consensus of Commissioners during interview:

A majority of the Commissioners were opposed to an elected Administrator; however two commented that the current system is dysfunctional.

Sub-Committee Recommendation:

This sub-Committee is not resolved on this topic and recommends that another meeting be scheduled to further examine the concept of an elected Administrator. The CRC membership and Robert Bertsson, Esq., counsel for the CRC, will be encouraged to attend this meeting and invitations will be issued to specific entities in the business community. In addition, this sub-Committee recommends that Mr. Bertsson be requested to prepare a list of pros and cons relative to this issue.

9) Would you like the Charter Review Commission to recommend any Charter Amendments relative to any other portion of Charlotte County government?

Comments of the Commissioners during interview:

- A) Appointed Sheriff as opposed to elected
- B) County take back the jail so that the Sheriff's Dept. is no longer the franchisee
- C) Appointed School Board

Sub-Committee Recommendation:

- A) This sub-Committee recommends that the Sheriff remain an elected position
- B) This sub-Committee recommends that the jail franchise issue be handled by ordinance of the Board of County Commissioners if desired
- C) The School Board issue is beyond the scope of the CRC