

- 1) **Sec. 3.04** Until just a few years ago, Hallandale Beach did not have an elected Mayor. I believe 2008 was the first year that there was an elected Mayor. Other than mostly ceremonial, the only real difference between the Mayor and the Commissioners is that the Mayor presides over Commission meetings. The Mayor has no more authority than any other elected official, yet the title somehow raises him/her to a different level and can create an importance that should not exist. I propose going back to the old system, and the same one that Broward County uses in **having one of the Commissioners appointed Mayor**. I would like to see **one-year terms** for the appointed Mayor and for **no one to be Mayor twice within their term**. If they are re-elected, they can serve a second time as Mayor. And so on if they keep getting re-elected. I would not be opposed to two-year terms with a minimum of two other appointed Mayors before someone could serve as Mayor again, though I would prefer one-year terms.
- 2) **Sec 3.05** At the last Charter review, the method in electing Commissioners was changed. It went from an **open voting** where the **top two vote getters became Commissioners** to numbering seats and having candidates run for a specific seat. The stated purpose of this change was to increase the likelihood that a candidate from the west side of Hallandale Beach would get elected to the Commission. I said at the time that this change would have the exact opposite effect, and I think that has been borne out. I am wholeheartedly in favor of making it more likely that a candidate from the west side of Hallandale Beach is on the Commission, seat numbering is not the solution. I believe that a return to the old system of elected the Commission would give the best chance of someone from the west getting on the Commission. It has happened a few times in the past, and there is no reason to think it could not happen again. The other extremely negative effect of this change is the attacks on opponents. When you have one major opponent for the seat you are running for, attacking him/her would benefit you. If there are four or five strong candidates, attacking one would not be as helpful, and possibly would hurt because it could move supporters of the candidate you attack to the other candidates and not you. Increasing the chance of a Commissioner from the west and cutting down on negative campaigning are two great arguments, in my opinion, to go back to the old system.

Setting up districts would also accomplish this, but there are problems. Without adding to the number of Commissioners, the best way to set it up would be for three Commissioners by district and one at large if there is no change to the Mayor, or two at large if the Mayor becomes appointed. If we were to set up districts with equal number of residents, much of the east side would still be part of the 'West.' I know voting precincts 1 and 2 are on the beach, and 3 and 4 are Three Islands. I am guessing that precinct 5 is Golden Isles and the area west of Three Islands, either to Federal or E. 1st Ave. If we are trying to equal out the population, precinct 5 would have to be included in the west, thus defeating the purpose. I would assume we could draw boundaries for where a candidate had to reside, with one being west of Dixie highway, but that would guarantee for the people who live west of Dixie, more political representation than their numbers deserve.

- 3) Sec3.09 (3) I believe that all Commission vacancies should be by appointment of the remaining Commissioners, except, if the term of the vacant seat extends past the next general election, the remaining two years of that seat would be filled at the next election. If we go back to the old system with no numbered seats, the candidate that finishes third would get the two-year term. This provides a couple of benefits in my opinion. The present system requires a special election if the vacancy occurs more than one year from the next general election. A general election costs the city money and requires the cooperation of the Supervisor of Elections. That cooperation did not happen in the last vacancy and so our Charter was not followed. Even though the vacancy occurred more than one year from the next general election, the SOE said she was not capable of putting on a special election and so the vacancy was filled by an appointment of the sitting Commissioners. In addition, special elections have notorious poor turnout so someone voting on matters affecting the entire city would be elected by an extremely small number of voters. Probably less than 10% of the eligible voters and perhaps only 1 or 2 percent of the residents of the city.

Also, I would like to add something on selecting someone to fill a vacancy on the Commission. The last time this happened, it was done in as much secrecy as possible. There is still no evidence that the meeting to pick someone to fill the vacancy was publicly noticed, but assuming it was, the public notice was as minimal as the law allows. This is not acceptable. My suggestion is that we put into the charter that in filling a vacancy on the Commission, at the meeting before the vacancy is to be filled, but earlier if the Commission would prefer, it is announced when the vacancy will be filled and the procedure that the Commission will use to select the new Commissioner. This will make the process as open as possible.

- 4) Sec 4.03 I would like to change this to say that paper ballots must be used as long as they are consistent with the law.