

CHARTER REVIEW ADVISORY COMMISSION

CITY OF TAMPA, FLORIDA

Old City Hall

315 E Kennedy Blvd.

Tampa, Florida 33602

MINUTES FOR MEETING ON: May 12, 2026, AT 6:03 P.M.

The Charter Review Advisory Commission CRC of the City of Tampa, Florida convened in a regular meeting in the Sister Cities Room at Old City Hall, 315 E. Kennedy Boulevard, First Floor, at 6:03p.m. on the 12th day of May 2026. The Zoom meeting was live streamed and recorded, and available on YouTube and minutes were prepared by Dharsh Saravana, City Council/City Clerk Support Specialist, Office of the City Clerk.

Members present upon roll call: Stephen Benson, Garrett Greco, Bobby Creighton, Ashley Morrow, Rebecca Kert (virtual), Alan Cohn, Kathleen Shanahan, Bill Schifino, Ron Christaldi (virtual), and Alison Hewitt (virtual, late arrival). Alternate Sue Carlton was absent.

City Staff in attendance were Gavin Barrera, T&I Support Technician and Dharsh Saravana, City Council/City Clerk Support Specialist.

Others in attendance were CRC Facilitator Robert Hendrickson and CRC Attorney Kenneth Tinkler of Carlton Fields.

Public Comments

The following individuals appeared before the Charter Review Commission to make public comment:

Mida Martinez expressed concerns about and shared an example by which extensive delays transitioning between department directors caused avoidable delays to a Parks project important to community residents; she also reminded the CRC that the Charter exists to ensure residents are well served.

Approval of 4/28/26 Meeting Minutes

Chair Ashley Morrow asked for motion to approve minutes.

MOTION (Schifino/Creighton) to adopt the April 28, 2026, CRC Minutes. Motion carried unanimously.

Review and Discuss Potential Amendments to the Tampa City Charter (Sections 6.04, 6.05, 6.06, 6.07, 6.08, 7.01, 7.02, 7.03, 7.04, 7.05, 7.06, 7.07, 7.08, 7.09, 7.10, 7.11, 8.01, 8.02, 8.03, 8.04, 8.05, 8.06, 8.07, 9.01, 9.02, and 9.03)

The meeting recessed at 7:40 and reconvened at 7:53.

The Facilitator led the CRC through a discussion of sections 6.04, 6.05, 6.06, 6.07, 6.08, 7.01, 7.02, 7.03, 7.04, 7.05, 7.06, 7.07, 7.08, 7.09, 7.10, 7.11, 8.01, 8.02, 8.03, 8.04, 8.05, 8.06, 8.07, 9.01, 9.02, and 9.03. In summary, no changes were made regarding these sections; however, notes were taken on sections 6.08, 7.02, 9.01, and 9.02 which are attached to the minutes. The CRC with respect to section 7.02 requested an investigation on whether other charters have language improving the timely completion of approved projects, requested more information on whether the redundant language in sections 6.08 and 9.01 from prior sections is needed and requested a review of all boards to find outdated boards for discontinuation and determine if a zoning adjustment board is necessary. See Exhibits: A, B, and C.

Discussion

The members discussed and expressed their views regarding increasing accountability and timely completion of approved projects and debated whether this issue is appropriate to resolve through the city charter such as adding a penalty or time constraint. They also examined the purpose of redundant language throughout the charter and if such redundancy serves a specific purpose, recognizing the complexity of the charter may not be comprehensible to the public.

The Facilitator provided a recap regarding the charter action items, and how the CRC is progressing with its review.

New Business

Shanahan requested the CRC to consider how residents are being served by the charter since much of the CRC's discussions centered on the City Council and the Mayor's capabilities. She also requested the city consider a sole professional planner who oversees the alignment of all/ current zoning decisions with the city's long-term vision.

Greco recommended improving the readability and streamlining the City Charter for a year with little amendments to the charter.

Benson recommended reviewing whether the City Attorney should continue to serve at the sole pleasure of the mayor or be independent like the City Clerk.

Adjournment

Motion to adjourn (Shanahan/Greco): There being no further business to come before the Charter Review Commission at this time, upon no objection, CRC Chair Ashley Morrow adjourned said meeting at 8:28p.m., on this the 12th day of May 2026.

EXHIBIT A

6.04 No Δs

6.05 No Δs

6.06 No Δs

6.07 → No Δs

6.08 - Ken to look @ whether duplication/
needed; otherwise No Δs

7.01 - No Δs

7.02 B1 - ✓ B4 - ✓

B2 - ✓ B5 - ✓

B3 - ✓

Q1 → No to unilateral; yes follow process

Q2 → mayor v. council roles
how done to date
issues caused by current practices
how could impact projects

7.02 continued.

Q3 - ^{CC} What is the underlying issue/examples?

^{CFO} if CC could direct, how would that work → if they had the authority.

- ^{CFO} confirm how many BAs resulted from CC requests last FY?
- how many denied?
- how long is the BA process (CC requested)

Q4 - concerns timely completion of projects + potential cost overruns

↳ important but not constitutional

~~assess is not~~

~~7.02 overall 2.0.0.0.0.0~~

Action - Allison H to tell us more about problems + solutions

Action 2 - Ken to research other charters re this.

7.03 - NO Δs

7.04 - NO Δs

7.05 - NO Δs

7.06 - NO Δs

7.07 - NO Δs

7.08 - NO Δs

7.09 - NO Δs

7.10 - NO Δs

7.11 - NO Δs

8

8.01 - NO Δ s 8.06 - NO Δ s
 8.02 - NO Δ s 8.07 - NO Δ s
 8.03 - NO Δ s
 8.04 - NO Δ s
 8.05 - NO Δ s

9

9.01 - similar to 6.01 - NO Δ s

9.02 - ~~NO Δ s~~ Action - Find out if zoning
 adj. board exists - if not
 update this section.

9.03 - NO Δ s

NEW BUS

- 1 How are residents served by the charter? (accountability)
- 2 Need more/better zoning, planning etc \rightarrow long range planning
- 3 Recommend streamlining charter on an off year
- 4 ~~the~~ DISCUSS Δ 's city atty serve sole discretion of mayor - like the clerk