CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION MEETING

DATE: Friday, August 16, 2019

TIME: 9:02 a.m. - 11:18 a.m.

PLACE: Lynwood Roberts Room

First Floor

City Hall at St. James Building

117 West Duval Street

Jacksonville, Florida 32202

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

Lindsey Brock, Chairperson
Ann-Marie Knight, Vice Chairperson
Jessica Baker, Board Member
Charles Griggs, Board Member
Chris Hagan, Board Member
Emily Lisska, Board Member
Nelson McCoy, Board Member
Celestine Mills, Board Member
Betzy Santiago, Board Member
Hon. Matt Schellenberg, Board Member

ALSO PRESENT:

CRC STAFF:

Cheryl L. Brown, Council Secretary Carol Owens, Chief of Legislative Services

Jessica Matthews, Legislative Services Supervisor

Paige Johnston, Office of General Counsel

Louis Marino, CC IT Systems Manager Anthony Baltiero, Research Assistant

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: All right. Good
3	morning, everyone. It is August 16, 2019,
4	just a little after 9:00. And we are here
5	for the second meeting of the Charter
6	Revision Commission.
7	A couple of things housekeeping-wise:
8	Make sure you have your cell phones
9	silenced, please. Also, I was reminded
10	and I may not be doing it myself, but please
11	make sure you're speaking into the
12	microphone when you are talking so that we
13	can get all of the audio down and so that
14	it's streaming properly.
15	Louie, did I do that right?
16	MR. MARINO: (Indicating).
17	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay. So remarks
18	from the chair.
19	Our first item: We are going to try to
20	begin to set our regular Commission meetings
21	where all of us will meet together.
22	So last time I asked if folks would give
23	their unavailable dates to Carol Owens so
24	that we can add the schedule down. As some
25	some folks didn't and, unfortunately,

Scott Shine had to resign from the

Commission because those meeting dates

conflicted with dates on his calendar that

he previously had scheduled.

2.2

So, again, if there are dates that you know you're not available or certain times, please get that to Carol Owens because, as we begin to set our schedule, we want to make sure that we have as many folks here as we can.

You know, we're doing our listening and prioritizing here through the end of September. Our goal is to -- you know, by the end of September, to identify those priorities, and then we'll have our subcommittees and break up. And those subcommittees will be doing the work, bringing in folks to testify, doing the fact-finding, and making those specific recommendations on those priorities that we have.

We've had a lot of inquiries in through different folks in the media, and just so -- and I believe Commissioner Baker had mentioned this the last time.

1	Our goal is not to go back to items that
2	have been proposed by previous Charter
3	Commissions and just revamp that and spend
4	the time studying on that. As recent
5	developments have shown, those
6	recommendations are out there, and the
7	Legislature or the Council can take the
8	action that they feel appropriate as to
9	those recommendations.
10	So, again, unless, you know, we say,
11	Well, we think we're going to work on
12	this section of the Charter that they did
13	before but we're going to do something
14	different, okay, if we have a different
15	proposal.
16	But we're not going to go back and just
17	kind of underline and say, We like what they
18	did; we don't like what they did. They're
19	out there, and they're available for the

20

21

22

23

24

25

We are beginning to get legislators and some of the other electeds to come in, and we'll be sending around a schedule of those

Council and the Legislature to act on. So I

just wanted to make sure that we're all

clear on that.

that are already responding to fill up our

slots for our meetings throughout the rest

of September and our next one in two weeks.

2.2

I think Chris Hand will be coming on September 6th; and the goal is that we will all have copies of the 50th Anniversary Edition of The Quiet Revolution, which will also have certain recommendations and ideas in there for Charter revisions, some areas that could be possibly tweaked in there. So I'm looking forward to hearing him speak on those items.

COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: September -
CHAIRPERSON BROCK: That will be

September 6th. He and I spoke last on that.

I have the list from Commissioner

Schellenberg of additional people, and I've

been reaching out to a lot of those folks on

your list.

As we go into the next one of updates from commissioners -- I've spoken with the staff, and we're going to go back through the transcript from the last meeting and begin to get our list of issues that we all spoke about, that we all said were

1	priorities and things that we thought that
2	we could be looking into. So we're going to
3	develop that, and before the next meeting,
4	we're going to have that circulated.
5	But I wanted to kind of go back around
6	the room, and we'll begin here with
7	Commissioner Santiago. And two questions:
8	One, is there anyone that you think we
9	should be hearing from as we begin to
10	develop our priorities; and, two, have you
11	thought about any of the areas that we could
12	be working on that we could maybe refine
13	those issues down?
14	COMMISSIONER SANTIAGO: Okay.
15	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Does that make
16	sense?
17	And I know it's putting everybody on the
18	spot, but
19	COMMISSIONER SANTIAGO: A little bit.
20	(Pausing.)
21	You know, for me, the areas that I
22	really is my mic
23	For me, the areas that I really wanted
24	to kind of focus on was, I'd like to hear
25	more from Safety, something from the Safety

1 -- on the Safety side, I think I'd like to really revisit.

2.2

And I think this is contrary to what you just said, but I'd like to revisit those staggered terms and maybe revisit — there was a recommendation that was made to me by somebody that I spoke to this past week that said, with the issues that we're having with the General Counsel's Office, perhaps there should be three counsels that make a final recommendation. So maybe revisiting some of those issues as well.

CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay. And, you know, what I said about not revisiting, again, if we look at it and there's -- and we say, Hey, here's a different way to do staggered terms, then I think that that's something -- I think that's something good for us to -- you know, to go into, because then there are two options in dealing with that issue.

That's my main thing, is for us to -- we have an opportunity to do something different, and that was the main point on that.

1	But, yeah, I've heard some other
2	proposals on staggered terms as well that I
3	think will be coming to us.
4	All right. Commissioner Lisska.
5	COMMISSIONER LISSKA: Good morning all.
6	I haven't really thought about this, other
7	than the last well, I have, in some
8	regards, but more immediate
9	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: That's your
10	homework. You're supposed to be thinking
11	about this 24/7.
12	COMMISSIONER LISSKA: Was that my
13	homework? So often is, in public schooling
14	I forgot to write that down.
15	Anyway, what I will say, I'd like to
16	hear from as many people that the time
17	affords who have institutional knowledge.
18	And I think it would be helpful to hear
19	from both.
20	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: I'm sorry; who was
21	the first one you said?
22	COMMISSIONER LISSKA: Oh, no. Hearing
23	from individuals with institutional
24	knowledge, people who've been very close to
25	government in one way or another. I mean,

1	including the constitutional officers, I
2	think we need to hear from them. Former
3	constitutional officers as well. I think we
4	need to take a look at that. Elected
5	officials and former elected officials would
6	be helpful. Anyone close to the situation.
7	I was very pleased to see that Chris Hand
8	would likely be scheduled.
9	I think as far as you ask about
10	additional participants, as I recall,
11	Mr. Chairman, you had given us the six weeks
12	to vet that a little bit. So I guess I
13	haven't taken my six weeks yet.
14	So I'm not giving you names, but I am
15	suggesting hearing from people who really
16	have experience in government. So,
17	therefore, staff members in significant
18	positions, I'd certainly like to hear from.
19	And Chris Hand would be an example of that,
20	a former staff member.
21	I'd also like to as far as
22	refining that was the other half of your
23	question not at this point; if you can
24	give us a couple more of those six weeks, I
25	would be grateful.

1	I do think reading this it's not a
2	sequel to the Quiet Revolution, but it is an
3	update with a sequel. That's sort of it
4	that Chris Hand has just finished, will be a
5	tremendous help to this Commission, and I'll
6	look forward to everybody reading that,
7	because it will it will provide the
8	compromises that were made initially with
9	the Charter, and I think that's going to be
10	insightful. And it might even produce it
11	could produce a series of interesting
12	reactions; such as, Compromise is good;
13	compromise maybe wasn't good; and I think
14	it's going to give us a lot of room for
15	thought and reflection once we have that
16	available as well, because it gives us a lot
17	of the history dealing with the creation of
18	the original Charter.
19	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: And I agree with you
20	a hundred percent. And just so everyone
21	knows, my goal during this these meetings
22	coming up here through September is that
23	we're going to begin with this same process
24	of I'll
25	COMMISSIONER: (Inaudible.)

1	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yeah. It's going to
2	be, Who do you think we should be hearing
3	from who do you think we should be
4	hearing from, and what are some of the
5	issues as we begin to refine it down?
6	That's our goal in there. We'll be doing
7	that every meeting from here on out, so
8	COMMISSIONER LISSKA: And one more thing
9	to mention. Once Mr I believe you said
10	you're going to review the tapes and all, so
11	Mr. Schellenberg is working on the list as
12	well.
13	I know that I did write down notes from
14	the suggestions. If you would like me to
15	turn those over to staff, I will have some
16	of the names that were suggested. And I
17	think once those names are brought up again,
18	adding to that would be a little easier than
19	recreating what we did last meeting.
20	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Absolutely.
21	We're
22	COMMISSIONER LISSKA: Thank you.
23	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yeah. We're working
24	on getting those.
25	COMMISSIONER LISSKA: Thank you.

1	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Mr. Griggs.
2	COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Thank you,
3	Mr. Chairman.
4	My first question is going back to your
5	remarks. I know that you talked about
6	Mr. Shine's resignation, and my question
7	would be, given that that's going to give us
8	an even number now, do we plan on replacing
9	with a new commissioner?
10	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: The email that I saw
11	in response from Council Member Bowman is
12	that we can have up to 15. All of the
13	districts have to be represented, and they
14	are still all represented. So, according to
15	the code, we don't have to have a
16	replacement.
17	If we end up in a tiebreaker situation,
18	maybe we'll just go back to Jerry Holland's
19	method of picking numbered ping pong balls
20	and flipping a coin
21	COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: That was my
22	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: to see which way
23	the vote goes.
24	COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: That was my
25	concern.

1	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Hopefully
2	hopefully, we will not be dealing with
3	topics that are that close, because if
4	they're that close, I think our chances of
5	getting any kind of action by the City
6	Council, the Legislature, is probably slim
7	to none.
8	COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Yeah. Thank you.
9	That was my concern.
10	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: No, no. I
11	appreciate yeah. That was brought up,
12	and I'm glad that it was so that I had an
13	answer for you.
14	COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Okay. Thank you.
15	So I have been sort of I don't want
16	to say bombarded, but I've gotten a
17	significant amount of input from people in
18	the community, and so I have a list.
19	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay.
20	COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: And I'm going
21	to I've tried to condense the list, you
22	know, against the Charter versus you
23	know, try to educate be as educated as I
24	can and try to educate constituents,
25	people citizens who would have concerns

about how they can have input here.

2.2

I've tried to invite as many people to

the meetings as possible; but, you know,

9:00 is sometimes going to be not very

advantageous to the public to be here.

So the first item is in the spirit of

Downtown Investment Authority. I know the

last time we were here I talked about how we

could do things to remedy some of the

neglect that's gone on in the urban core

through consolidation.

I've had ideas about, you know, how do
we address things, maybe by standing up in
the Urban Core Investment Authority. We
have -- the Charter allows for authorities
to be put in place to address certain
issues. And so, you know, some folks
would -- recommended that we do something
like that.

It's been my experience in working for the Department of Health that we haven't had -- I don't think we've sort of operated really in the spirit of how the County Health Department function is supposed to really run.

The way it was supposed to run is that the City -- or the County was supposed to assist in funding, providing resources for the County Health Department to satisfy the state statute 154.

2.

2.2

And I was looking at the old chart, and it has the County Health Department function under judicial section. I don't know how it got there, but it just seemed kind of odd that it was there.

But there are three main areas that the County is supposed to provide for through the County Health Department, and that is clinic services, disease control, and environmental services.

In most counties those have a -- those areas are funded, dedicated, for those areas in most counties. And I was hoping that maybe we could find -- or refine or define the structure in the Charter that allows for -- because there's a lot of old language there -- that allows for dedicated funding through each administration for those basic services to be provided for through the County Health Department.

I had some questions. I saw some of these authorities that are now sort of maybe defunct, and folks asked about what happened to the Hospital Authority? What happened to the Sports Development Authority? Does that still exist? If so, what are they doing? If not, you know, what would be the -- what were some opportunity to see them, you know, maybe sort of re-stood up here?

2.

2.2

And we've had some -- you know, one of the hot topics really has been the function of the Office of General Counsel. I've had people tell me that they felt like that this process didn't allow for independent thought in here, regarding independent counsel services and the way they function. I had recommendations that maybe the independent -- the Office of General Counsel should have staggered terms, and so they would cross over between administrations.

In the Charter it says that they're supposed to be appointed; that the Mayor has the authority to appoint those general counsels, and that -- you know, that allows them to make their choice. There may be

some opportunity there to look at how that would function if those terms were staggered and maybe give us a little more autonomy -- or perceived autonomy to the public in the way the OGC operates.

2.

2.2

This one was a wild one: City Council president being an elected position for a four-year term. That person would be elected countywide -- or citywide as an at-large member of the City Council and serve a four-year term and staggered against the mayoral term, and that would give the City Council president an opportunity to plan and be strategic about how they approach City business, and not be one term and have to -- you know, have to deal with the -- by the time I get to the budget, my year is over. And that was an idea that someone gave me.

And there was some -- a lot of questions around authorities and constitutional officers and what types of options that they have regarding binding legal counsel; because someone told me that if I go to my lawyer and I don't like the advice my lawyer

Τ	is giving me, I have the option to fire that
2	lawyer and go get another one.
3	In this case, under the Charter, the
4	authorities and other constitutional
5	officers don't have an option other than to
6	seek judgment from a judge, where they have
7	to have permission from the General
8	Counsel's Office, or wait for a ruling from
9	the AGC from the Attorney General.
10	So those were those were on my list,
11	and I think that when we get into
12	subcommittees maybe we can get more
13	information about how some of these ideas
14	can be vetted out
15	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay.
16	COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: and maybe if
17	there's some opportunity to see how we can
18	make some changes around those areas.
19	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay. I'm going to
20	break from how our agenda was going because
21	I see Mayor/President Delaney is here, and I
22	had asked him to come and speak, and
23	probably right on to a perfect segue given
24	Commissioner Griggs' last topic there on the
25	Office of General Counsel.

1	So I've got a chair here so that we can
2	get the video and everything going.
3	MAYOR DELANEY: Either one?
4	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: It doesn't matter;
5	either one.
6	And so for those of you that don't know,
7	which I can't imagine, but
8	MAYOR DELANEY: You've got some young
9	people up here.
10	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Mr. Delaney has
11	served as you know, in a lot of different
12	roles in our government, from General
13	Counsel, Chief of Staff, Mayor, all through
14	the gamut.
15	So we really appreciate you being here
16	today and, you know, speaking to us about
17	your experience and where you see some
18	different things that could be tweaked.
19	MAYOR DELANEY: Sure. Well, great.
20	Well, thanks for the invitation, and
21	thanks for the time you-all are spending on
22	this. Every 10 years when these groups are
23	appointed, I don't know if everybody
24	understands how much time goes into this.
25	And there's always some good suggestions

that have come out of these, and not all are acted on. And I think most of them I would have loved to see have been acted on.

2.

2.2

First, a quick response to one of the things Mr. Griggs said, and then we can get into the General Counsel's discussion a little further.

Personally, I've always sort of resisted the idea of a dedicated funding source for an entity. Libraries often want them; fire departments, in some places, want them.

When -- in Florida the state's always going to grow. So when a governmental entity knows that every year they're going to have more money next year than the year before, and it goes up, my fear has been it isn't managed particularly well in that it doesn't allow the central government to really manage that and set some priorities.

And so I've always been hesitant on that. Every now and then there's some that you go, Hey, that makes some sense. So I just have some caution on it as sort of somebody that's sort of lived political science.

I know you've heard the history, and I

know that Ms. Lisska knows it very, very

well, that -- what led to the consolidation

of the government.

2.2

In the early 1960s, late 1950s, the

Sheriff was indicted. Early 1960s the

School Board lost its accreditation, and

then there was a wave of indictments of City

Counselors and County Commissioners.

Roughly half of the total of those were

indicted.

And the business and community leaders sort of threw their hands up and said, We want a do-over. We want to start completely over. We've got a -- the rest of Florida was starting to grow well beyond where Jacksonville was. And at the time the discussion, and kind of political science circles, was that perhaps consolidating into a central government, that maybe the idea of a city and a county separate government, or cities within a county, maybe that wasn't the most efficient way to be able to administer.

If you go to Dade County, for example,

Miami-Dade County, there's three dozen cities with their own governments in Dade County. And if you think of trying to manage economic development where you may be going to three different cities, plus having to deal with the county, there's a massive overlap.

2.

2.2

And so there was a series of concepts on why this was to merge together. A lot of it was efficiency. You've got two police departments: a city police department, a county sheriff. You've got two sets of permitting; you've got two sets of environmental regulators; et cetera. So the idea was to put them all under one umbrella.

One key premise was the idea of what was known as central services. All these various governmental entities bought their own copy machines and ordered their own paper and had their own H/R and human resource offices, their own payroll systems. I don't even know if computers were much around then, but their own computing systems or IT systems. And also had their own lawyers. They would all hire their own

1	lawyers, and outside.
2	And so you had a lot of private law
3	firms who were doing a lot of work for City
4	and County governmental entities, and it
5	wasn't particularly efficient.
6	No individual entity really had the
7	ability to have enough resources to hire an
8	array of lawyers with different experiences
9	or backgrounds to handle particular practice
10	areas.
11	So one of the key components of this was
12	to centralize purchasing and procurement.
13	The idea would be that you could get a
14	massive discount on copy machines, paper, et
15	cetera, if you had that all consolidated and

And in the early years of consolidation there was massive savings as you merged these two departments together. I mean, millions, tens and tens of millions of dollars.

the purchasing power would allow that to

really trim it up.

Well, one key threshold that the

Chairman asked me to sort of speak on is the

Office of the General Counsel. And in this

the City fathers and mothers sort of
borrowed from a couple of different places.

2.2

One was a corporate governance model where, you know, major corporations sort of have two checks and balances within their system. First you've got a board of directors and they hire the CEO. And then within that there is an internal auditor just to check to make sure things are legitimate and those processes are healthy. And also the general counsel.

Those two positions are joint reports to the CEO and also to the board. And the duty really of the general counsel and the internal auditor is to the corporate entity, the idea that it's supposed to check it and make sure laws are being followed; that there's not illegalities, that the proper processes are followed, both those functions.

Here, the internal audit function is now in the City Council Auditor. They're the ones that kind of check the Executive Branch and go through to make sure processes are followed and, you know, federal and state

1 regulations are followed, et cetera.

the Mayor who to appoint.

2.

2.2

And then it's the Office of the General Counsel. That had some reforms about four years ago. Some recommendations were to tweak that search process. The search process requires five people, all attorneys. Two have to be former general counsels for the City. Those are appointed by the Mayor. It's, of course, a public search all in the open, and then they make a recommendation to

And there may be some tweaks to that process that this group may want to consider that I can talk about a little later if you're interested in those, but the idea that you need this office to be independent.

Down the years there's often the perception that this office is more loyal to whoever happens to be Mayor. There's often that perception. And I'll go back to when I was a general counsel under Mayor Ed Austin. There, frankly, was nobody closer to Ed Austin than me. He was like a second father to me.

When I was Mayor, I appointed first Fred

Franklin and then later Rick Mullaney, who are two of my best friends -- were then and are now. But that doesn't mean that I didn't tell Mayor Austin, You can't do that; that's illegal; that's improper; that's not following the right code. And it certainly happened with Fred and Rick -- Fred Franklin and Rick Mullaney to me.

2.

2.2

Those tend to not be out in the public because they're in private discussions. And I remember pounding my fist, trying to tell them, I should be able to do this. And they say, No, the law's not there on that.

When it is the advice is given to a

School Board or the City Council, it's more
in the public where they see that the

General Counsel is sort of checking that.

So the General Counsel's Office really has two functions. One is it is the lawyer for all of the entities in the government, he or she, and they hire lawyers that -- on a permanent basis to be able to help staff those. On occasion there's either a volume or an expertise issue that the General Counsel will hire outside to be able to

1 handle a case.

2.

2.2

One example was when we passed the

Better Jacksonville Plan in the year 2000,

there was a billion-and-a-half dollars'

worth of roadwork. There was 50 million, I

think, in terms of park acquisition. And so

you needed to condemn some land.

And so there was just too much volume for the one or two lawyers that were in the office to handle that. So we hired three, four, five outside lawyers to help with the land acquisition component of that plan.

The other role that the General Counsel has -- and this is now bothered -- borrowed a little less from the corporate environment, although it's close to the way our federal government is set up and our state government. It actually -- he or she acts also as sort of the internal Supreme Court.

The idea had been, prior to consolidation, is you had these governmental entities suing each other. And they would have disputes, and it would cost a lot of money; and then maybe a court would issue

1	something some years later with a you
2	know, with a bit of finality.
3	But the idea would be that the General
4	Counsel, who has this corporate
5	responsibility to the larger entity, the
6	corporate government, is supposed to be able
7	to issue a binding, legal opinion to say,
8	Okay, no more of this; this is resolved,
9	that you don't have this stuff continued.
10	Perhaps an analogy to stick in that
11	may be the best to stick, and at least it
12	works in my mind is think of General
13	Motors, which has a number of car divisions.
14	You can't have Chevrolet suing Buick.
15	That's just not the way a corporation would
16	run. And the theory in the early years was
17	that's exactly what should happen here.
18	You can't shouldn't have the JEA
19	suing the City Council or the Airport
20	Authority suing the Mayor. The idea was
21	that those disputes would be resolved
22	internally and with some finality.
23	In the early years, there was a lot of
24	these binding, legal opinions as the
25	consolidation happened and you had to kind

1	of make some balls and strikes. And the
2	people that have served in that role,
3	there's a pretty good element of prestige
4	that's in those positions.
5	The first general counsel was a
6	well-regarded judge in town. The second
7	general counsel was later president of The
8	Florida Bar; the third later became State
9	Attorney; the fourth had been State
10	Attorney, Public Defender, later Mayor. And
11	then I'd spin ahead: Another was a judge.
12	I was probably the least qualified walking
13	in there. Several became you know, ran
14	for Mayor. And so you've had a lot of
15	quality lawyers in that position.
16	Now, are they always right? They're
17	not. They're not always right. And, I
18	mean, I've got court opinions right now that
19	I look at and I just say, That's just a
20	wrong decision by that judge. But can it
21	work out?

And in this case I think the one that's probably the hottest or the most topical would be the issue between the School Board and the setting of the election. And a

judge just ruled in Clay County that -- a different interpretation than the General Counsel has on that one. It looks like the Attorney General, my gut is, is also going to overrule it. So that process seems to have worked out down the years.

2.

2.2

I know that some want to say, Let's completely change that authority. Let's let all of the entities start hiring their lawyers again. And that's really a path, in my opinion, to some chaos; that it defeats that core premise of central services. It would become — it would be a lawyer relief act. I'm in private practice now, so maybe there's money to be made out there. I just think it's a bad policy to really be able to go that way.

And it's worked well down the years.

You know, occasional decisions people have disputed. And I argued vehemently -- Fred Franklin issued an opinion that I couldn't veto a particular action of the City Council because of the nature of the bill that the Council was doing, and I was angry at him for years. Now, looking back, I think he

1 was right and I was really wrong on it.

2.

2.2

And so I think in the end those things resolve themselves. But the importance of that office I don't really think should be diminished.

The consolidation, this structure, to my knowledge, every single political scientist that has studied this and any practitioner -- city managers, county administrators, et cetera -- point to Jacksonville to say, That's the best structure for a government; that that is the healthiest structure for a government.

Now, going back to a point Mr. Griggs was making that I do agree with, that I often say one of the things that it has not done well was address neighborhoods; that by now Arlington would be a city; Southside would be a city; the Northwest would be a city; Mandarin would be a city; the Westside would have a city government, and those city governments then would be more responsive to the immediate regional needs of that community. But overall it's healthier to be able to have this consolidated.

Τ	I don't think we would have gotten the
2	Jaguars here if we had a bunch of little
3	different cities here. It allows economic
4	development efforts to be healthier. It's
5	not always perfect. They don't always go
6	exactly where you'd like them to go, but
7	those are policy issues that I think we
8	should push on our elected officials to
9	address.
10	Well, Mr. Brock, I think I kind of ran
11	through it and am certainly willing to
12	debate, defend.
13	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Well, again, I
14	appreciate you being here. And one of the
15	main reasons was, you know, the Office of
16	General Counsel has been a topic that's come
17	up in there.
18	Does anyone have any questions?
19	COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Through the
20	Chair.
21	Mayor Delaney, a couple of questions:
22	Should the General Counsel's other than
23	Mullaney, most of them had not served a
24	lengthy time. He served the longest.
25	Should we not have some kind of four

years and we're going to try somebody new to give a better perspective about what's going on? That's one question.

2.2

And I tend to agree with you with centralized purchasing. But, you know, recently, there's a lot of stuff that's happened in the last two weeks since we last met, and the -- Central Purchasing just agreed to a single source contract for \$120,000 for somebody coming back, which leads me to the next question I have is: Is there some kind of ethics that we should look at that says if you used to work for the administration and the high level, you can't come back and lobby or work for them for a certain period of time?

MAYOR DELANEY: I'll go with the first one.

In the -- the City fathers and mothers in the '60s did envision exactly what you described for the tenure of a general counsel. The theory then was that you would take a well-established, gray-haired lawyer that would serve a couple years and then go back to his or her law firm. And that was

1 the theory in the early years.

2.

2.2

In those days lawyers were far more generalists and they tended to do whatever walked in the door. You know, they'd do a will one day, a criminal case the next; they'd do a land use thing, et cetera.

The law has gotten far more specific down the years. And I think I could make a case that having someone with a longer tenure can stabilize the office. When you're there longer, you kind of look at the weaker lawyers.

I really had two one-year stents and, at the end of a year, I had kind of gotten the sense of the lawyers, and there was a number that really shouldn't have been in that office. But I was gone before you really are able to pull the trigger. The next one comes in, takes a look at it, looks at it a little bit differently.

So I think it's -- you know, we've got a process that a committee selects, a Mayor recommends, and the City Council approves.

And so if the City Council doesn't like that performance, it doesn't necessarily have to

1	remove that it can go ahead and say,
2	We're not going to approve that individual
3	for reappointment.
4	There's been one quirk in that where
5	Cindy Laquidara's tenure she was
6	somehow issued an opinion that she could be
7	reappointed without an approval of the City
8	Council, and I think that probably was a
9	wrong way to go. But it just sort of went
LO	in the winds.
11	COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Well, just
12	to follow up on that, she opined that it was
13	okay.
L 4	MAYOR DELANEY: Correct.
15	COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Which
16	clearly was against the law at the time.
L7	MAYOR DELANEY: Well, yeah, you know,
18	lawyers get blind spots, you know. Jason, I
L9	think, has kind of got one on the School
20	Board ruling, and I've had some myself, and
21	what you hope is the process works that out.
22	I think the City Council could have done
23	something on that if they wanted to.
24	COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Well, I
25	tried. But, again, she opined that you

1	couldn't do anything.
2	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Well, all right.
3	COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: But the
4	other question
5	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: We're not here to
6	debate.
7	COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: I'm just
8	making a comment. To educate the committee
9	is what we're trying to do.
10	So how about the single source kind of
11	issues?
12	MAYOR DELANEY: I don't know enough
13	about that particular one. I mean, the
14	Executive Branch and the Mayors often have
15	some discretion within the budget on being
16	able to expend monies, you know, below
17	certain thresholds.
18	And so the single source I mean, that
19	happens on occasion. There's usually rules
20	for why what you've got to go through to
21	establish why you're going to do the single
22	source kind of a thing. You know, I tend to
23	think Mayors ought to have some discretion
24	in hiring in some of those kinds of deals.
25	I do think that you've mentioned some

1 of the ethics provisions, and there's State 2. ethics and there's a City ethics code. And 3 it's something that this Commission could certainly address on who gets hired, how 4 5 quickly after serving, and whether they've got a ban of a certain number of years. 6 7 That's certainly something that you could 8 consider. 9 Some cases -- and most states have moved 10 in that direction, and it's, I think, 11 probably a healthy way to go. 12 In some cases though the criticism of 13 that is that you take away some talent and 14 expertise that may be able to inform the 15 process. So, you know, you've always got to 16 understand the consequences of the decisions

that you make.

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

If I can go one -- one point that I meant to mention going on -- which was one of the more egregious things that I think a government entity did.

It was discovered 16, 17, 18, 19 years ago that the School Board had never bid the school bus contracts. And this was roughly a \$40-million contract that went out to a

series of bus contractors. And they just rolled them over every year and gave a little COLA, a cost of living increase.

2.2

And the General Counsel gave an opinion that you've got to follow State and City procurement laws. You've got to bid these things out. And the School Board actually voted four to three to say no.

And one of the reasons were that some of the big campaign contributors at the time were school bus contractors, and these contracts had literally been in families for generations. Some families would give the route — the bus route that they had as a wedding gift to their kids; or when they died, it was a will to go to their grandkids. And it took the General Counsel to issue an opinion.

And in that case, the School Board

sued -- much like here a volunteer lawyer

came forward -- and lost, and the Attorney

General ruled that the General Counsel's

opinion was correct, that you had to bid

those damn things out.

So if the School Board had its own

1	lawyer, would that have happened? I don't
2	think so. I mean, I think odds are
3	internally they would have allowed that to
4	continue, especially with the strong desire
5	of the School Board to continue that
6	process.
7	COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Thank you,
8	Mayor.
9	COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: I have a question.
10	I would just add to that: When those
11	contracts were pulled back in and they were
12	bid out, a lot of those contracts were
13	minority bus contractors and they lost
14	they lost their bus contracts with the
15	district, and so a lot of them went out of
16	business. So that was one of the negative
17	outcomes
18	MAYOR DELANEY: Well, they all went out
19	of business. I mean, you basically had two
20	or three national chains that came in. They
21	hired a lot of the drivers and this sort of
22	a thing. But, you know, the laws are you've
23	got to bid them out.
24	COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Right.
25	MAYOR DELANEY: And as you know, I'm a

1	big supporter of minority contracting,
2	minority hiring. That was one of the
3	conditions when we did the procurement.
4	That was one of the big investments we were
5	making in the Northwest Quadrant. And so I
6	get that. But there's other ways to do it.
7	I mean, the school system needs the
8	cheapest and most efficient way to deliver
9	that sys the bus routes. And it was
10	looking literally at saving close to five
11	percent of their budget, you know.
12	COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Yeah. So I don't
13	think I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman.
14	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: No, no. Go ahead.
15	Go ahead.
16	COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: I don't think
17	in my opinion, I'm not concerned with the
18	autonomy of the General Counsel's Office.
19	believe that's a good thing.
20	The part where I think it gives a lot of
21	citizens heartburn is where they don't feel
22	like they don't feel comfortable with how
23	the process works in terms of how it
24	addresses or gives those agencies an
25	opportunity to be able to provide a service

1	to themselves.
2	You know, so, if I'm if I don't agree
3	with the opinion of my general counsel, I
4	should have an option to that other than
5	spending a lot of money. You know, there
6	should be an option to that.
7	MAYOR DELANEY: Well, that would make
8	sense if it's an individual like you or with
9	your particular business; but when you have
10	a corporate entity of a billion dollars or
11	so, you just can't have the CEO saying, I
12	don't like your opinion; I'm going to go
13	keep shopping until I find the opinion I
14	like.
15	And that's not the way corporations are
16	structured, nor governments. The idea is,
17	is that the lawyer inside there makes
18	says what is legal or illegal.
19	And so it's a lot different than an
20	individual saying, I don't like my divorce
21	lawyer; I'm going to go hire a new one; or,
22	I didn't like the way they prepared my will;
23	I'm going to hire a different one.
24	That's a lot different, because this

role is as an internal Supreme Court, as

1 well as the representations. It's got two 2. functions. And if you take away that 3 Supreme Court ability, I mean, it's just a disaster, in my opinion, 'cause you're going 4 5 to have lawsuits going all over the place, and we're going to spend hundreds of 6 7 millions of dollars on lawyers. 8 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: I'm going to push 9 you back on that just a little bit, 10 Mr. Mayor; because if I work for an 11 organization and that organization is 12 represented by legal counsel, if I feel that 13 the organization has wronged me, then I do 14 have the opportunity to take some type of 15 legal action against that organization. 16 You know, if I've been discriminated 17 against, or what have you, I can take legal 18 action against that organization. I don't 19 have to use the organization's attorney. I 20 mean, they can have an internal process, and 21 I can use that internal process. If I don't 2.2 feel that that process has given me -- made 23 me whole, then I can take additional action 24 outside of that process. I think that's

what some of -- some of the discomfort comes

1	here.
2	Now, I don't have a solution for that,
3	you know. What I'd like to see is, as we
4	work as a Commission, because it's on the
5	table, to kind of workshop that and see
6	where opportunities lie for you know, to
7	remedy that. But that's just my thought
8	there.
9	But the question I really wanted to get
10	to is that since
11	MAYOR DELANEY: Can I make a quick
12	response?
13	COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Yeah.
14	MAYOR DELANEY: I'm not quite sure I
15	follow the analogy. But the I think one
16	avenue may be to involve the other
17	governmental entities maybe in the search;
18	that maybe the independent authorities
19	rotate a representative on that search
20	committee for the General Counsel so they
21	have a bit of a say-so in there. And you
22	know, we made that opportunity I chaired
23	the last search, actually, that recommended
24	Mr. Gabriel that maybe that's something

that this group could consider, to tweak

1	that, and that maybe will help with the
2	perception.
3	But, you know, if it's an individual
4	within a governmental entity, there are
5	internal remedies to that. But where these
6	binding legal opinions come in is really on
7	a larger policy call on, Can you veto a City
8	Council action? You know, can the City
9	Council pass an unconstitutional or
10	discriminatory bill? You need the General
11	Counsel to say, No, you can't do that.
12	And if the City Council says, Well, I'm
13	going to go lawyer shopping till I find a
14	lawyer that tells me that I'm able to pass
15	this discriminatory bill or an
16	unconstitutional bill, that's the reason
17	that the General Counsel's position was so
18	important, and a lot of concentration went
19	into the creation of that back in the 1960s.
20	COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Okay. And I agree
21	with that. That I do. I think we're on the
22	same page there.
23	But my okay. So I'm going to shift
24	gears now.
25	My question is, the first thing I asked

1	or had on my list was about the urban
2	core and how the urban core has been left
3	behind because you know, through
4	consolidation.
5	As a former Mayor, you know, where do
6	you see possible remedies to address these
7	issues?
8	It's been, you know, 50-plus years now,
9	and people are complaining about, you know,
10	a lot of the infrastructure you know,
11	I've been told that development in certain
12	areas of the urban core are virtually
13	impossible. There's no way to attract
14	businesses there. And I don't think
15	anything is impossible.
16	I think that maybe through this process
17	we can identify a way to support you
18	know, within the Charter, to help catch up
19	these communities that have been left behind
20	in terms of, you know, development,
21	redevelopment, infrastructure, and so forth
22	MAYOR DELANEY: Yeah. One would be a
23	structural thing. The other is more policy
24	My response would be, the first would be

Mayor Godbold created a Northwest Quadrant

Economic Development Trust Fund and put some
money into it. As part of The Better

Jacksonville Plan we put money into that as
well.

Perhaps that can be given a little more

2.2

Perhaps that can be given a little more meat and maybe -- I wouldn't call it a dedicated source of funding but -- this is going to be the discretion of council.

That's why that slides into policy -- but the idea to help be able to invest in economic development in that particular region.

When I was Mayor, I know you would recall, I stopped any economic incentives for any economic development except Downtown and the Northwest Quadrant. And we wouldn't incentivise any other development.

And America Online, for example, they were on the Northside. They wanted to move down out near UNF, and we just wouldn't participate in that. But they made their decision that's where they wanted to be.

And I think that's more on the policy area. You know, the Mayors after me did not stick with that policy, and the Chamber of

1	Commerce didn't like it either. But I
2	felt
3	COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Well, why would
4	that? I mean, it seems like that would be
5	an opportunity, to aggressively attack a
6	problem that's been a problem over the
7	years. Why wouldn't administrations want to
8	seek to remedy some of these issues;
9	because
10	MAYOR DELANEY: The argument back
11	which I rejected. But the argument back is
12	that some businesses don't want to move into
13	that area. And if you do anything that
14	makes them say Jacksonville's not as optimal
15	as St. Louis or Nashville, they'll go to
16	those other cities.
17	At the time, the economy was fairly, you
18	know, vibrant, and it didn't seem to slow
19	anything down.
20	And, you know, then there was kind of
21	the mini recession, 2000/2001; it slowed it
22	down. I left office in '03. But I stuck
23	with that policy all the way through. But
24	that's a policy thing.
25	I don't know structurally how to do it

1	other than to maybe recommend much like
2	there's the Downtown Investment Authority,
3	that structure, maybe that can be done for
4	the urban core to try you know, try to
5	help provide economic development there.
6	COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: So, in your
7	experience, you would sort of recommend like
8	maybe an urban core type investment
9	authority and recommend that future Mayors
10	or future administrations and Councils
11	properly invest in those type of
12	MAYOR DELANEY: I hadn't thought about
13	it till you framed it, but I think it makes
14	sense. If we've got an economically
15	depressed portion of town, we need to focus
16	some resources on it.
17	You know, one of the things we also did
18	was I mentioned and I think I would
19	view that Northwest area as a neighborhood.
20	It's multiple neighborhoods, but, you know,
21	it's a big umbrella is we focused
22	extensively on neighborhoods. You know, we
23	funded a neighborhood's department.
24	We focused on first four, then five and
25	six, what we called intensive care

1	neighborhoods where the Sheriff Sheriff
2	Glover increased his presence. We focused
3	on infrastructure. We focused on housing.
4	We focused on affordable housing. We
5	focused on putting in sidewalks, putting up
6	streetlights. Not every neighborhood,
7	frankly, wants sidewalks or streetlights, so
8	you've got to respond to the local
9	neighborhoods.
10	But I think there are things like that
11	that could be structural that could help
12	focus focus those minds. But, you know,
13	other Mayors recessions hit in the the
14	massive recession in 2008 and the resources
15	went away, and so some of that was
16	dissolved. Sports Authority was actually
17	subsumed under the Jacksonville Economic
18	Development Commission. You had mentioned
19	that one earlier.
20	COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Thank you. I'm
21	done, Mr. Chair.
22	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Anyone else have any
23	other questions? Ms. Lisska.
24	COMMISSIONER LISSKA: Hello, Mayor
25	Delaney, President Delaney.

1	MAYOR DELANEY: Hello, Ms. Lisska.
2	COMMISSIONER LISSKA: Nice to see you.
3	Thank you for being your usual direct
4	self. I really appreciate that, and I know
5	the Commission members do.
6	I'd like and I appreciate your
7	comments about the General Counsel's Office.
8	It's been largely about that. You've
9	mentioned a lot about intensive care
10	neighborhoods.
11	I want you to offer us any very specific
12	recommendations you may have that you'd like
13	to see this Commission recommend in regard
14	to Charter, or changes, and the Charter,
15	anything. What you would really not like to
16	see us change or what you would like to see
17	us recommend.
18	MAYOR DELANEY: Yeah. I wouldn't weaken
19	the Office of General Counsel. And I do
20	want to make clear that I have tremendous
21	respect and regard for Jason Gabriel. He
22	and I just spoke last night, as a matter of
23	fact. I think he is as pure in his
24	decision-making, as the other general

counsels that I'm close to, and has made his

1	decisions independent of other pressure
2	inside this government. I'm absolutely
3	convinced of that.
4	When I appeared I think I've appeared
5	every 10 years. In the original set of
6	recommendations there are a number of
7	those in the sort of the Blue Book Task
8	Force that consolidated the City. A number
9	of those didn't go through. Some are
LO	probably probably for political reasons
L1	as much as policy reasons.
12	The recommendation was to appoint the
13	Property Appraiser, the Tax Collector, the
L 4	Clerk who am I missing? The Sheriff
15	was the original recommendation that cities,
16	typically Mayors, appoint the Chiefs of
L 7	Police, and I think the Sheriff is probably
18	untouchable. And people don't like giving
19	up electing people. So those may be
20	politically undoable. But those
21	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: On the
22	constitutional
23	MAYOR DELANEY: The other constitutional
24	officers are really ministerial in function

-- the Supervisor of Elections I think is

1	one I missed that, you know, should those be
2	appointed or not. It depends on how brassy
3	you want to try to be on those particular
4	ones.
5	But I think Mr. Griggs has raised some
6	issues on where the government has maybe
7	lost some of the focus. I do think
8	neighborhoods has long been a problem when
9	you've got this big of a government that
10	there isn't the focus back on that.
11	And maybe I'll make one exception for
12	dedicated source of revenue for the
13	Historical Society. That would probably be
14	a good idea.
15	You're retired now though, so you won't
16	benefit from it, but
17	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Any other questions?
18	Sir, thank you very much. I appreciate
19	your time here today.
20	MAYOR DELANEY: Thanks for y'all's
21	service. Appreciate it.
22	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: All right.
23	COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Thank you
24	very much, John.
25	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: We've got a

1	smattering of applause.
2	(Mayor Delaney exited the meeting room.)
3	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: All right. We are
4	going to move next we have Representative
5	Wyman Duggan. And as you know, he chaired
6	this Commission 10 years ago.
7	And what I asked him to come and speak
8	to us about were the items in the Charter
9	Revision Report that they did that they were
10	not able to get to. What were some of the
11	things that they identified as issues, but
12	were not part of their report? Because I
13	think that is ground for us to look at and
14	learn from your Commission's experience and
15	some areas that maybe we can make some
16	recommendations.
17	So with that, thank you for being here.
18	REP. DUGGAN: Thank you for the
19	opportunity, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the
20	invitation. And I want to start by thanking
21	each one of you for taking on this task.
22	It's going to entail a lot of time and
23	effort on your part. And on behalf of our
24	community, we thank you.
25	So the Chairman has laid out his task to

1 me, so I will start with -- actually, with
2 the Office of General Counsel discussion.

2.2

So as Mayor Delaney touched on at length, this is somewhat of an evergreen issue. But I think the nature of the role of the General Counsel's Office, as it was set up under the Charter, lends itself to that, because at the end of the day, the General Counsel makes final decisions. And there's always somebody who's unhappy with that final decision. And as a result, it's continually looked at as something -- you know, whether or not that's something we need to change.

I will emphasize -- reemphasize a point he made, which was that, prior to consolidation, every player, every stakeholder in government back then, which consisted of a City Commission, a City Council, which was the Executive -- a five-member Executive City Council, a City Commission, which was the City Legislative body, and a County Commission, each of those bodies, plus, you know, the School Board and the Tax Assessor, everybody had their own

1	lawyer, and anytime there was a dispute,
2	they just lawyered up and sued each other,
3	and it went, you know, prolonged through the
4	courts, and the General Office of General
5	Counsel was designed to avoid that problem.

2.2

It was designed to -- I remember -- you know, the corpsman data of consolidation under the Local Government Study Commission is to foster the ability of the electorate, to pinpoint responsibility and accountability. Everything in our Charter structure is supposed to be fostering that goal. That's the key goal.

If you go back and you read the Local
Government Study Commission Blueprint for
Improvement, that was their main objective;
because before, with all these different
bodies, you had a very diffuse, very opaque
structure of government, and it was hard for
people to figure out who ultimately owns
this issue. Who can I get redress of
grievances, which is one of our
constitutional rights, for this issue?

And so we were -- we -- I say we. The founders of our consolidated government were

1	trying to get to a place where, you know,
2	the average citizen, the average voter,
3	could much more easily pinpoint that
4	responsibility and accountability.
5	So the Office of General Counsel is
6	structured to help pinpoint accountability
7	and responsibility. And while it's unique,
8	and it's not something that you see
9	elsewhere in many of our other forms of
10	government, that's the goal.
11	And so I would emphasize again, don't
12	lose sight of the fact that at the end of
13	the day you need somebody to make a decision
14	so that we can move on.
15	Structurally, as it relates to the
16	Charter Revision Commission, in our work 10
17	years ago, there was a lot of discussion
18	about that issue early on. You know, the
19	way we worked was the commissioners
20	self-identified issues that they wanted to
21	explore during their work.
22	And then I, as the chair and I did
23	not submit any issues because I just wanted
24	to be kind of the umpire, and then I just

tallied up the number of votes for each

issue. And the ones that got the most

votes, there was a clear consensus that we

want to talk about these issues. So the

Office of General Counsel was one of those

issues, and we spent some time talking about

that.

2.2

Ultimately, we came to a place where I as the chair wanted to start winnowing down issues that we were really going to dig into more. So we would -- we took what I would call kind of an indicative vote, and it was split. It was basically 50/50. Some people wanted to keep looking at it and some people didn't. Some people were fine with the way things worked. We had had a lot of testimony by that point.

And, for me, for the way that I thought the Commission could efficiently -- most efficiently run was I wanted to move us toward a final report that everybody on the Commission believed in and felt good about. And when there was no clear consensus on the Office of General Counsel one way or the other, I said, Let's not keep looking at that issue, because we as a Commission

aren't moving to a consensus on it. And so

we just stopped talking about it.

2.2

So I offer that up as one model to follow as you do your work. If you just -if it's important to you as a body, that
your final report be one that you all can
support and believe in and go out into the
community and advocate for, then, as
frustrating as it might be, if one issue
that you care strongly about the other half
of you don't, that might be a way to kind of
reach some clarity. So I offer that up as
an example.

I subscribe to what Mayor Delaney said about the importance of the Office of General Counsel as it's currently structured. And he's also right that during the five years after the last Charter Revision Commission, we did the Blueprint thing — Blueprint for Improvement II, the Task Force for Consolidated Government, which I also served on, and we did recommend some structural changes as it relates to the Office of General Counsel, which were adopted. And this current General Counsel

was selected pursuant to that new procedure, as he outlined. So, you know, it might be give it a little bit more time.

2.

2.2

Another issue that we looked at was the pension which, at the time, was the biggest issue facing the City. This was, you know, 2009. But that issue was so big that it could have been all we talked about. And, in addition, there were already stakeholders hard at work on that, on that issue. So we decided to just stay out of that.

And, fortunately, Mayor Curry has now solved that problem, but it was an issue that could have consumed our entire agenda.

And so that was -- we just kind of made the analysis, Let's tackle other things that aren't being looked at by other stakeholders and that are discrete enough that we can really get our arms around them and maybe make a difference.

Another issue that we looked at had to do with the JEA which, more particularly, it had to do with the issue of whether we could maximize the revenue under the annual contribution that the JEA paid the city.

So this was at a time -- this was 2009 when we started our work. So obviously the great recession had begun, but nobody quite understood at the time what a major restructuring in the development industry was going to occur.

2.

2.2

Deen pursuing a business model whereby they would install infrastructure in neighborhoods on their own nickel. They would run water; they would run sewer on the assumption that development would come to those neighborhoods. Homes would get built; businesses would get built; and they would tie into those utilities, and then the JEA would recoup their investment and then have a nice revenue stream.

This was also before the revolution and energy efficiency that has occurred in the last 10 years on the residential appliance side and on solar -- solar panels, the dramatic decrease in price for installation of solar panels.

So back then there was an assumption that JEA was going to be much more

1	profitable. And was there a way that we
2	could increase their annual contribution to
3	the city that they were paying essentially
4	in lieu of the taxes that they would pay if
5	they were a private entity?
6	So, you know, we started looking into
7	that and had a lot of testimony. Jim
8	Dickinson, who was then the CEO of JEA, came
9	and testified several times.
10	Ultimately, we were concerned that
11	adding additional revenue obligations on JEA
12	could affect its bond ratings and, of
13	course, you know, the rate payers.
14	And so that was another issue where,
15	after a fair amount of discussion, we
16	decided not to pursue that issue any
17	further. And, you know, as it turned out,
18	obviously, the long-term economics for JEA
19	were drastically different are
20	drastically different now than anybody back
21	then could foresee.
22	So that was turned out to be a bit of
23	serendipity in the sense that we didn't
24	spend a lot of time trying to come up with a
25	model that ultimately the real world

Ţ	economics wouldn't have supported.
2	Another issue that we looked at was
3	around an appointed Sheriff. You know, the
4	Mayor Mayor Delaney made reference to the
5	fact that the original blueprint for
6	improvement had contemplated that all of the
7	constitutional officers would be appointed.
8	And let me just digress for a second to
9	make the observation that I'm not entirely
10	in agreement with him that those all of
11	those offices are entirely ministerial. And
12	I'll give you one example, one note of
13	caution.
14	If the Mayor appointed the Property
15	Appraiser, it would be possible for the
16	Mayor to go into the Property Appraiser's
17	Office one day and say, I need you to
18	increase the assessed value of every parcel
19	in the county by 10 percent.
20	That's a backdoor tax increase. Without
21	going out and raising the millage, the
22	millage stays the same, but you just
23	increase the assessed value, so the millage
24	generates more revenue.
25	That is, for me, personally this is

just me talking -- a reason why you might
not want that office to be an appointed
office because nobody would really know
about that discussion. Other offices may be
suitable.

2.2

With respect -- coming back to the Sheriff, our discussion at that time had everything to do with budgetary tensions. It had nothing to do with, really, policing, or with the job that Sheriff -- then Sheriff Rutherford or his predecessors had done. It had to do with the fact that at budget time, the Mayor, who's the chief budgetary officer of the City, is not always able to get the budgetary result that they desire where life's public safety is concerned, because the Sheriff, as an independent elected officer, has the ability to go in and lobby for more money.

Again, ultimately, we decided to move away from that discretion as it relates to the Sheriff per se.

We did make a recommendation that's in the report that the Mayor's budgetary authority be enhanced. Right now, of course

the Mayor has a line item veto over the
budget as passed by the Council, but the
Council can override that line item veto by
simple majority, 10 votes.

2.2

We had recommended increasing that to a two-thirds override threshold to try and address that issue as to the Mayor's budgetary authority. That was never adopted. It's still a simple majority.

But that's an issue where -- we talked about it as it relates to the Sheriff, but the real broader issue we ultimately adopted a recommendation on.

So, really, those were kind of the four biggest issues that I would say that we touched on, that we moved away from for some reason, that, you know, might still have some relation to issues facing the City today.

But what I want to leave you with is, on all these issues, we had -- we, the Commission, had a clear agreement on how to move forward even if the agreement was to not move forward, because we felt strongly that we wanted to have kind of unanimity, or

a high degree of consensus, on the way we approached the issues.

2.2

So I just have a few closing thoughts, and then I'm happy to answer any questions.

I begin by thanking you for agreeing to do this. I say this in all seriousness: I want you to be prepared for that to be the last time anybody thanks you for doing this job. You are going to be subject to scrutiny and criticism. You're going to be -- potentially, you may be, I should say, pressured to take up an issue, and you may be pressured not to look under certain rocks.

And I want you to not be afraid to disappoint either group. Don't feel obligated to pursue any agenda but your own. Under state law, you are now public officials, even though you're appointed. I want you to be bold; I want you to follow the data where it leads; I want you to not be afraid to draw logical but unflattering conclusions; and don't be afraid to make recommendations that upset the status quo. This is a great privilege. Relish it. Be

1	proud of your work product at the end.
2	Our consolidated government, as both the
3	Mayor and I touched on, is a unique and
4	valuable inheritance. And I knew that when
5	I participated 10 years ago, and my
6	appreciation for it has only been
7	strengthened by my service in Tallahassee so
8	far.
9	And, again, always remember, the core
LO	mandate of consolidation is to foster the
11	ability of the electorate to pinpoint
12	accountability and responsibility.
13	Thank you.
L 4	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Thank you for the
15	closing comments. I appreciate them. I
L6	know everybody else here does, especially
L7	given your experience in this role.
L8	I wanted to ask a couple of questions on
L9	the ones that the topics that you said
20	that Council Member Brown, Reggie Brown
21	REP. DUGGAN: Yes.
22	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: put in there at
23	the end.
24	REP. DUGGAN: Right.
25	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Did vou have an

1	opportunity to look at what the impacts
2	would be, specifically with 4(b), the idea
3	of residency requirement for employees of
4	the City? Did you guys have any
5	opportunities to look into that in any
6	depth?
7	REP. DUGGAN: Unfortunately, we did not.
8	So Councilman Brown reached out to me to
9	come speak at the second-to-last meeting,
10	and that's when he put these issues on the
11	table for us.
12	So we were at the place where the report
13	was in draft form.
14	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yeah.
15	REP. DUGGAN: People were reading it to
16	finalize it and vote on the final product.
17	So I put it in there because it was
18	important, you know, that it be part of the
19	record, and that they were serious issues
20	that a future CRC could take a look at.
21	I recall that after sometime after
22	this, maybe in his first term, maybe in his
23	second. I don't remember.
24	COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: First.
25	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yeah.

1	REP. DUGGAN: So he proposed legislation
2	to this effect, and my recollection is that
3	it was withdrawn? Right. I'm not sure
4	that it even got a final vote. But it's
5	certainly a legitimate issue.
6	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay.
7	REP. DUGGAN: In my opinion.
8	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: All right. So then
9	and I guess that means, yeah, with (c) as
10	well, you didn't have a chance to really
11	I didn't realize how late it was in the
12	process that those came about.
13	So with that, open it up, the floor, for
14	any questions.
15	COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: It would be
16	easier, if you wanted to speak, to turn your
17	name this way so it would be easy for you to
18	walk up to see that I would like to
19	speak.
20	I think it would be easier. At least
21	that's
22	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay.
23	COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: It's like pressing
24	a button.
25	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yeah.

1	COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Through the
2	Chair to Mr. Wyman, for both of you.
3	He applied for the General Counsel's
4	Office and was unfortunately, wasn't
5	picked.
6	REP. DUGGAN: Well, let me just correct.
7	I never actually applied.
8	COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Okay.
9	REP. DUGGAN: I was invited to apply
10	COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Yes.
11	REP. DUGGAN: and I considered it,
12	but
13	COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Okay. Well,
14	I don't want to bring up do you want me
15	to go there?
16	REP. DUGGAN: Well, I just wanted
17	COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Let's be
18	clear.
19	REP. DUGGAN: I don't want there to be a
20	misapprehension of the public record.
21	COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: We'll look
22	at it slightly differently. I'll ask the
23	question differently.
24	Did anybody else apply other than Jason
25	Gabriel?

1	REP. DUGGAN: Yes, Patrick Krechowski,
2	an attorney then with, I believe, Gray
3	Robinson.
4	COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: And this
5	happens a lot and I'm just really letting
6	the committee know.
7	There's a lot of times that people don't
8	apply because of inside baseball. And I
9	think this is one of the problems we have
10	with a lot of things with Jacksonville, and
11	I think it's something that we should
12	address; that people see that a designated
13	person is ready to go, and some people that
14	are surely qualified, see the handwriting on
15	the wall and do not do it. Maybe it didn't
16	happen in your case, but it happens a lot.
17	So my question would be, do you think
18	that a General Counsel should serve more
19	than four years and at the same time the
20	Mayor is, or something to that effect?
21	REP. DUGGAN: So there is now, pursuant
22	to the change that was made following the
23	Task Force on Consolidation, the obligation
24	in the Ordinance Code for the General
25	Counsel to be reappointed when the Mayor

1 gets reelected or when there's a new Mayor. 2. So I would say structurally the ability 3 to make that change is in place with the Council. 4 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: You don't 5 6 have to comment on my comment; but the question is, in my experience, very few 7 8 people that came between the -- went to the 9 Rules Committee ever got denied; either --10 it would be withdrawn beforehand and it 11 would never see the light of day. And 12 almost everybody, to my knowledge, came to 13 Rules and always got approved. 14 So I understand the process, but it 15 doesn't happen as transparent as you might 16 believe. I will leave it like that. 17 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Well, I think the 18 question, having a four-year term, to where 19 if they're appointed -- 'cause that was one 20

question, having a four-year term, to where if they're appointed -- 'cause that was one of the items I believe that was brought up, you know, before our -- I mean, one is a way to tweak the selection process, if we were to look into that; and then the other is an extended term so that there is certain independent -- an independency of that

21

2.2

23

24

Τ	office regardless of the initial appointing
2	Mayor.
3	Any thoughts on that about how that
4	would how we could structure that or how
5	that is that kind of like, Commissioner
6	Schellenberg, sort of one of the ideas
7	COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: My point
8	is
9	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: that you were
10	looking at? I know what your point is; but
11	I'm thinking about a solution and what we
12	can look at structurally in the Charter.
13	COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: If Mr. Wyman
14	if Wyman doesn't have a Representative
15	Duggan doesn't have a thought does he
16	have a thought? That would be great.
17	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yeah.
18	REP. DUGGAN: There was definitely
19	attention over the duration of Rick
20	Mullaney's tenure at the time we were
21	meeting, and there was a school of thought
22	that there should have been some turnover
23	along the way.
24	The counterpoint to that though was he
25	had been confirmed four times by the

Council. And so, at what point does the obligation fall on the Council to do its check and balance? And if they -- if they, the Council, corporately felt like a change needed to be made, there was an opportunity for the Council to send that message, either publicly or privately.

2.

2.2

And so, you know, I am sensitive to the reality that people who put themselves forward for a public service, whether in an appointed or an elected role — but in this case an appointed role, you know, their confirmation shouldn't be a blood sport.

And if there's some private analysis of whether or not somebody wants to step into that arena, based on the likelihood of success, I don't begrudge them that.

And so, we have a system; every four years the General Counsel should be looked at. The Council has a role to play. And if somebody decides, I'm not going to pursue that role because -- for whatever reason, I don't see that as a system that's broken.

CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay. Commissioner Baker.

Τ	COMMISSIONER BAKER: Through the chair.
2	Thank you, Representative Duggan, for being
3	here today.
4	My area of one of my areas of
5	interest is staggered terms for City
6	Council. And 10 years ago you did recommend
7	doing staggered terms, but in the Task Force
8	it was not recommended, and you were also a
9	part of that. It says, potentially
10	detrimental effect for continuous campaign,
11	for policy reasons potentially.
12	And one of my questions was, I think
13	potentially staggered terms could lead to
14	better accountability for City Council
15	members, holding them accountable to the
16	people.
17	So I wanted to get your opinion of why
18	it was there 10 years ago; why it was taken
19	out in the Task Force; or if you have a
20	differing opinion to it, if you could speak
21	to that.
22	REP. DUGGAN: Thank you. So the Task
23	Force worked on a different model than the
24	Charter Revision Commission did, but it was
25	much larger.

1 The Charter Revision 10 years ago, we 2. worked as a committee as a whole. So we 3 didn't break up into subcommittees with separate task lists that they would come 4 5 back and report on. And my recollection is that -- and the Task Force under 6 7 consolidated government has separate 8 subcommittees that took up different issues. 9 And I, candidly, don't recall why the 10 issue of staggered terms was not a -- an

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

And I, candidly, don't recall why the issue of staggered terms was not a -- an item of recommended action in the Task Force report. And it may be because -- and I just don't remember now, at this point in time, if I was on the committee that looked at that -- the subcommittee that looked at that.

As we -- the Charter Revision Commission felt, part of the structural reality now is, as has just happened, you can get an influx of more than a -- you know, a substantial portion of the Council, sometimes even a majority of the Council, coming in on July 1 and then they get the budget on July 15.

And so part of the concept behind staggering the terms is you make that pool

1	of neophytes smaller each time that happens
2	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Explain Mr.
3	Griggs was leaning over here, and I think
4	it's good. Explain what staggered terms
5	are, for those of us that may not be
6	familiar, and exactly how that looks.
7	REP. DUGGAN: So it would simply be
8	instead of, you know, everybody or one-half
9	or a certain percentage all starting at the
10	same time, they would start at different
11	dates.
12	So, for example, at the federal level we
13	have a 100-member Senate and approximate
14	and one-third of them are up every six
15	years. So they're not all up at once,
16	unlike the House of Representatives;
17	everybody is up at the same time.
18	So that's what we're trying to get at.
19	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay.
20	REP. DUGGAN: And so you know, so I
21	would say you now have two policy menus you
22	can choose from. If that's an issue that
23	you want to pursue, you can decide between
24	the two of them.
25	But it's a legitimate policy question,

1	you know, and I can see the arguments on
2	either side. But I think they are laid out
3	in each document.
4	COMMISSIONER BAKER: Thank you.
5	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Mr. Griggs.
6	COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: I wasn't I
7	wasn't sorry. Thank you for being
8	here Representative.
9	REP. DUGGAN: Sure.
10	COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: I wasn't going to
11	ask you any more questions about the General
12	Counsel; but I did want to just because
13	you were having that discussion get your
14	opinion on staggering the terms of
15	General appointment of General Counsel
16	against the Mayor's office.
17	So the Mayor would get elected. He
18	would be he would inherit a General
19	Counsel; then two years into his term that
20	G/C would be up for reappointment, and then
21	the Mayor gets to appoint his G/C in the
22	middle of that term.
23	What are your thoughts on that, and do
24	you believe that helps with the perception
25	of, you know, this fairness, is what I

should say, for the public to kind of sort

of see that the General Counsel is not

really operating at the whim of the Mayor's

office?

2.2

REP. DUGGAN: Right. That's a very thoughtful question, and one I've never really spent a lot of time thinking of. So I don't have a thoughtful answer for you, which that question deserves.

On the one hand, I would say, you know, the new Mayor coming in would certainly be able to staff up their administration. In other words, you wouldn't necessarily think to impose that limitation on the Mayor on staffing up any of the other appointed posts that the Mayor gets to fill.

To your point though, I mean, it could lend itself more toward a notion that the Mayor doesn't just get to come in and pick their lawyer; but, on the other hand, we have a strong Mayor form of government, by design. I mean, it's not an accident. It's designed to be that way. The Mayor is designed to be the CEO, and the Council is designed to be the Board of Directors. But

the ball is supposed to be in the Mayor's
hand.

2.2

And so if we want to continue to facilitate the successful and efficient operation of the structure as it was designed, then the Mayor ought to be able to pick their attorney.

COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Yeah. I think
that we've -- you know, Mr. Mullaney was
here last time and, of course, Mayor Delaney
was here this time. And I think it's pretty
clear that the General Counsel is there to
serve everybody, to kind of keep order.

Like you said, all the opinions like the -like he said, the sort of Supreme Court of
opinions across all the independent agencies
and the constitutional officers.

So independence is important. The perception of independence is important. I don't think anybody would have an argument with the Mayor picking his person, but to give an opportunity for the public to feel that that is — that person would be acting independent of all of the agencies, you know, I think I'm struggling to look for

some additional support there to make the

public feel better that these decisions are

being made independent of anyone else, even

the Mayor.

2.2

So that is -- and that's the only reason why that was the recommend- -- you know, my thought there; because if you have someone who you have to work with coming in, you know, they're going to be still independent, or at least the perception is they're independent. They're not loyal to who you are; they're loyal to the office. That's the only thing I struggle with now.

I have another question just real quick, unless you want to respond with that.

REP. DUGGAN: I will respond just briefly because, again, that's a thoughtful question, and I'm certainly not at all trying to suggest that it's somehow an invalid question. That's an issue to look into.

I would say, also, though, you know,

Mayor Delaney went through a recitation of

the history of that office and the people

who have held it. And, you know, those are

all fine public servants who did a host of different forms of public service throughout their career, both before and after. And while in the -- you know, in the crucible of the job, the heat of the moment, while you are the General Counsel and you're calling the balls and strikes, as I said earlier, you're going to upset people. There's always going to be somebody who's upset.

2.

2.2

With perspective, looking back -- I mean, okay, so one general counsel went to prison, Dawson McQuaig. With that one exception, looking back over the people who've held that, I don't think anybody would say any of them were political hacks.

And so, again, I just want to remind people that, ultimately, there's -- you know, ultimately, there's going to be some distance. And I would hate for structural changes to be made based on the heat of the moment, when really the system has worked very well for 50 years, and the people who have held it are among the folks in our community who've got the highest reputations even today.

1	COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Yeah, I agree. I
2	think that this is a moment in time where
3	people are struggling with the decision
4	that's being made, and there's some you
5	know, there's plenty of heartburn around
6	that decision. But I still think that
7	people need to be they feel comfortable
8	that they have alternatives, or that the
9	structure is working, the process is working
10	the way it's supposed to without, you know,
11	blowing it up and starting all over again.
12	So I'll get to my last question so that

we can move on, real quick.

I was kind of struck by your comment about when you-all were looking at the -the previous Commission was looking at the Sheriff's -- issues around the Sheriff's position. And it almost sounded like your motivation was that the -- you didn't feel like the Mayor's office or the administration of the Council had a lot of, you know, perceived authority over the Sheriff's budget. They didn't really -- they didn't really feel like -- they just kind of felt like the Sheriff's Office were

able to strong-arm an opinion on how that 1 2. money should be spent outside of the Mayor's 3 office. Did I read that right? REP. DUGGAN: 4 There were definitely 5 people on the Commission who had kind of 6 that subtext, yes. And some of it related, at the time, to the pension problem. And, 7 8 in other words, the issues over the pension 9 problem were bleeding into this notion of 10 the budgetary relations between the Sheriff's Office and the Council and the 11 12 Mayor. 13 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: And so you-all 14 didn't have that feeling about the other 15 offices -- the Tax Collector, Property 16 Appraiser, Supervisor of Elections --17 because they -- you know, the budget process 18 is the same for all of them. 19 REP. DUGGAN: Correct, we did not. 20 You're right, it's the same and, correct, we 21 did not with those offices. It was more 2.2 about -- because, you know, the Public 23 Safety budget is among the largest line 24 items in the budget, and so it had more 25 relevance.

1	COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Interesting.
2	Okay. Thank you.
3	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay. Mr. Hagan.
4	COMMISSIONER HAGAN: Representative,
5	thank you for being here today.
6	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Get closer to the
7	mic.
8	COMMISSIONER HAGAN: I appreciate let
9	me not get in trouble here.
10	I appreciate all your wisdom with all
11	the many hats that you've worn, and I thank
12	you for your service as well.
13	You know, Mayor Delaney brought up
14	something on his way out the door, which
15	actually got me thinking, but because of
16	your insight, it completely changed my mind.
17	Why not have appointed constitutional
18	officers? But because of the point you
19	brought up that's an incredible point.
20	And I would also question the Supervisor of
21	Elections. I don't know how it would
22	conflict, but I'm sure there's probably a
23	way that it would conflict just as much as
24	the Property Appraiser.
25	And so a lot of what I'm going to say is

more of a statement, but it's -- I don't know the legal system like you do and -- or many people on this Commission do. So my statements may be with a question mark at the end of it just for clarification.

2.

2.2

But I would tend to agree with you -and everything that I've heard today -- a
lot of what I've heard today and at the last
meeting, and which we've read in the paper,
I would tend to agree that a lot of this is
-- and I think Mayor Delaney mentioned it -is that, you know, there's times where you
get an opinion and you don't like what you
hear, and so now we -- it's kind of like a
reaction to it, and the system could be
flawed.

I agree with you to the fact that it's worked well for so many years. I mean, I get opinions on things that I don't agree with, and I'm like, Oh, we need -- that needs to change, inside the government, outside the government. And so -- and that's just a natural reaction to it.

But I would agree with you in your statement in saying that, you know, because

it -- we're not happy with the response that we got, then let's not all of a sudden think that -- throw the baby out with the bath water and say that everything has to change.

2.

2.2

When I heard you speak, you brought up a good point, and I wanted to make sure that this is kind of what you were saying and I heard it correctly. And one of the things that I want to focus on on this Commission is streamlining government.

What's really important to me is that, you know, we're not getting bogged down in government; but it's also important to me that the checks and balances are in place, to make sure that we vet everything that goes through government. But streamlining is very important.

But what I kind of understood was -- and maybe it was part of Mayor Delaney's comments too -- was if you put an attorney on every independent authority and the School Board and every other place that the General Counsel is supposed to be, then you wind up in the position where if this -- if we were today, and the School Board had

their own attorney, then they would be suing each other; it would go to court; and no matter what side of the issue that you're on, it would probably be held up in court and probably -- you know, it could be five, six years before it ever got on the ballot.

2.

2.2

So is that kind of what you were alluding to, to the point that I'm trying to make, and just making sure that that was -- that you clear that up.

REP. DUGGAN: Yes, that's exactly the point I'm making. And there's a recent precedent where exactly that happened. And it was the tension between the City and the Police and Fire Pension Fund about five, six years ago. There were at any one time I think three or four different pieces of litigation going on in both state and federal court between the City and the PFPF over a host of issues as it related, you know, to the pension problem.

And that's exactly the result that I
think would pertain in this issue and in a
host of other issues; that if we didn't have
this model in place, you know, we can avoid

1 that.

2.2

Now, again, strong Mayor form of

government. The Mayor came out and solved

the pension problem, and all those court

cases became moot. You know, they went

away.

So that's the way we -- that's the policy choice that was made at the time of consolidation. You know, we want a strong Mayor form of government; we want to streamline government; we don't want parties bickering with each other. Frankly, we don't want taxpayer money being spent by every actor in government featherbedding their lawyers, you know, by all of this litigation. All of that was taxpayer money that was being paid to the lawyers, in some cases some who were then funneling it back to the politicians.

So that's kind of what happened that helped lead to consolidation. I'm not saying that's happened since consolidation, but that's the result. We made a policy decision we wanted to avoid.

COMMISSIONER HAGAN: And the independent

1	authorities and School Board and everybody
2	else, they had the option to go outside and
3	get their own outside counsel. I mean, that
4	was part of a they can go take their
5	part of their budget and go, you know, hire
6	outside counsel and then have an opinion,
7	which is what we're seeing today. And is
8	that kind of like their way of having their
9	own general counsel or their own opinion
10	basically?
11	REP. DUGGAN: Are you talking about
12	today, in the state of play today, they can
13	go outside?
14	COMMISSIONER HAGAN: Sure. Yes.
15	REP. DUGGAN: It's my understanding they
16	have to clear that with the General
17	Counsel's Office.
18	COMMISSIONER HAGAN: Okay.
19	REP. DUGGAN: They can't just go
20	independently and get their own. They're
21	supposed to check with the General Counsel's
22	Office and as Mayor Delaney said. And in
23	more than a few instances, that's
24	authorized, because whatever the issue of
25	law is is specialized and unique, and

1	although the General Counsel's Office itself
2	is one of the if they were a standalone
3	law firm, they would be one of the best in
4	town. They don't have every expertise under
5	roof. And so that is not infrequently
6	authorized.
7	There was something else I wanted to
8	say, but I've forgotten. Go ahead.
9	COMMISSIONER HAGAN: Okay. Those are
10	all my points. Thank you.
11	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Any other I don't
12	see any other name tags up on end.
13	All right. Oh.
14	COMMISSIONER LISSKA: I would like
15	thank you, Chairman.
16	And I think you've had every opportunity
17	to cover this and, again, thank you for
18	being here, Representative. I just will ask
19	you the same sort of questioning I asked
20	Mayor Delaney.
21	Is there anything at all you want to
22	leave with this Commission? Any suggestions
23	for us to pursue to include in our report,
24	an area you wish that your Commission had
25	spent had ended up with a recommendation?

1 I mean, I followed your four primary 2. ones. I know there was a fifth major one in Ethics as well. Has that panned out the way 3 that it had been envisioned by your group? 4 5 REP. DUGGAN: So the Ethics 6 recommendation was adopted by the Council at 7 the time. That was the only one of the 8 recommendations in the report that was acted 9 It restored the Ethics Code back into 10 the Charter where it had been originally and 11 then taken out and put in the Ordinance 12 Code. So, you know, obviously, that was 13 something we recommended and believed in, 14 and so we were glad to see that happen. 15 Thank you for the invitation. I 16 don't -- I do not want to get in the way of 17 your work. This is y'all's ball to carry, 18 and you're going to have plenty of other 19 people who are trying to convince you to 20 carry their issue. All I want you -- again, I've said it 21 2.2 before, and I beg your indulgence if you'll 23 let me say it again: It's about fostering 24 accountability and transparency. That's 25 what it should be about.

1	Everything that you do, everything that
2	you look at, everything you recommend, it
3	should be about making sure that the voter
4	sees who's responsible for an issue, and
5	making sure that whoever is responsible has
6	the authority to act on it. That's my
7	personal hobbyhorse.
8	COMMISSIONER LISSKA: Thank you.
9	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: All right. With
10	that, Representative Duggan, thank you very
11	much.
12	REP. DUGGAN: Thank you.
13	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: I appreciate your
14	time.
15	COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: A smattering
16	of applause.
17	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: A smattering of
18	applause.
19	(Representative Duggan exited the room.)
20	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay. So we
21	interrupted our updates to get our speakers
22	in here. I wanted to be respectful of their
23	time.
24	So, again, we were everyone was just
25	kind of giving, you know, an updated view.

1	Is there anybody that you think we should
2	make sure we're inviting? Have you thought
3	about any issues that we want to make sure
4	we're getting on our list of considerations?
5	And Commissioner Hagan had stepped out,
6	so we'll hit you, and then we'll go.
7	COMMISSIONER HAGAN: Okay. Well, I kind
8	of mentioned it in my last statement.
9	Streamlining government is pretty
10	important to me. I want to make sure
11	that you know, governments are very
12	important to our community; but I also want
13	to make sure that it's not something that
14	gets in the way of opportunities, especially
15	coming to Jacksonville.
16	I think Mayor Delaney made a great point
17	that without consolidated government we may
18	not have the Jaguars, and obviously they're
19	a big part of our community.
20	You know, I think, you know, what's kind
21	of paying attention to what's happening
22	with the School Board, that's pretty
23	important, and how we shake that out is
24	important.
25	The one person that, you know and as

1	I tag onto that, the one person that I
2	would, you know, think we may it would be
3	good to invite I don't know if this
4	person could do it, but it would be Speaker
5	Commissioner Richard Corcoran. I would love
6	to hear from him, have his insight. I mean,
7	just from his knowledge and standpoint, if
8	we could invite him, I think it would be
9	great to have him.
10	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay. Commissioner
11	Knight.
12	COMMISSIONER KNIGHT: All right. So as
13	I listen and as I've been thinking about, I
14	think the same thoughts you have around
15	staggered appointments. I really would like
16	to take in and understand that a bit more.
17	I hear the
18	(Adjusting mic.)
19	COMMISSIONER KNIGHT: Excuse me. I just
20	realized. Thank you.
21	You know, I hear the pros and cons and
22	the legacy and our expertise, but that's
23	heavily on my mind.
24	There's advantages for a person to pick
25	their team; but, obviously, as we know

1	today, there's also the concerns that come
2	along with it. So that's one of the things
3	that's heavily on my mind today.
4	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: All right.
5	Commissioner Baker.
6	COMMISSIONER BAKER: Thank you.
7	Yes, again, staggered terms are an
8	important issue for me to relook at as well.
9	The Office of General Counsel, whether
10	there are things that need to be changed or
11	maybe there are no things that need to be
12	changed. I think that's an area of interest
13	for me as well. I'm an attorney too.
14	Other issues I'm still formulating
15	some things, honestly, and I'm not ready to
16	bring more detailed specifics to a couple of
17	recommendations. But I do have some
18	thoughts that I will be sharing further down
19	the road.
20	As far as speakers, I think Ms. Boyer.
21	I think she's already on your list.
22	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: She will be.
23	COMMISSIONER BAKER: She's going to be a
24	really great insight for us.
25	Can we email you like the whole

1	board, potentially, if we come up with ideas
2	of like a couple of other people we want to
3	add to the list of speakers?
4	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Those should go
5	through staff, like Carol Owens
6	COMMISSIONER BAKER: Okay. It goes
7	straight to staff, not like
8	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Right.
9	COMMISSIONER BAKER: reply all?
10	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yeah. Go through
11	that
12	COMMISSIONER BAKER: Okay. We'll just
13	go through staff.
14	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: and then we can
15	do 'cause just so everybody is aware,
16	we've sent out letters of invitation to all
17	of the constitutional officers, all of the
18	independent authorities, and our full Duval
19	delegation. So those letters have gone out.
20	Those invitations have been made.
21	So if there are people that you think we
22	should be hearing from, get those names to
23	Carol, and then we can prepare the letters
24	and get them scheduled to come in here.
25	Again, my goal is that we finish we

identify our issues by the end of September so that we have enough time to do the real hard work of listening, getting testimony, doing the fact-finding, and that we have enough time.

2.

2.2

In my independent conversations with Representative Duggan, that was one of the issues that -- in fact, it was one of the recommendations, is that they extend that time period out to 12 months for the CRC to do their work.

So trying to learn from how they did it, that's why I wanted us to give ourselves enough time. But that said, I don't want to rush us if we don't feel like we have fully understood what it means of going into this issue or if there's some other ones.

So, you know, this is -- it will be somewhat fluid; but that's what my goal is, for us to really start doing the work on the fact-finding and making specific recommendations by the end of September.

And I would encourage everyone -- part of your packet that you have now is the Blueprint for Improvement II. Look through

that. And, you know, again, this work has 2. been done, and these opportunities are out there for action by the council. They don't have perhaps the same emphasis as coming from the CRC, but my hope is that if we have something different, identify the issue; but we have a different solution, then let's pursue that.

2.2

But going back and simply rehashing solutions that have already been proposed and not acted upon, I don't think it's productive for our group. So that will be my encouragement on that. Go.

COMMISSIONER BAKER: Yeah. I just want to add, I do believe in transparency, accountability, checks and balances, and also streamlining, unifying our government. We have a very big government in the City of Jacksonville. I think a lot of our citizens in Jacksonville think of the City of Jacksonville as including all of the authorities.

And so there are some issues when citizens call the city and say, Hey, I have a utility issue, and they're like, Well, we

1	can't help you; you need to call JEA. They
2	don't understand that.
3	So there are maybe some unifying, you
4	know, visions that we can create in the Task
5	Force, the what was it, the Strategic and
6	Planning Commission, I think, was the name
7	they called it. That also is a good idea.
8	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay.
9	COMMISSIONER BAKER: Thank you.
10	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Sure. McCoy.
11	COMMISSIONER McCOY: So these
12	appointments, I guess we're going to be
13	handling those 'cause I'm another one that
14	is concerned about these appointments,
15	especially like the appointments to like the
16	boards. You know, for the Mayor to be able
17	to come in and clear it out and staff it
18	again, I think we need to look at how we
19	remove people out of positions and make sure
20	there's a check and balance on that. Make
21	sure that we're not just moving people just
22	'cause but for a just cause.
23	And then I would also second that
24	staggered appointment of the G/C. It
25	just for me it makes sense that if it's

1	supposed to be for the entire City, that it
2	doesn't it shouldn't matter what Mayor's
3	in that spot because it's for the entire
4	City.
5	So it just kind of helps it brings
6	that next level of check and balance on it.
7	It's worked great for 50 years; but, you
8	know, maybe for the next 50 we need to do
9	something different.
10	The people that I want to hear from I
11	want to hear from our university experts.
12	So we have a lot of people who have, you
13	know, worked it through government. But I
14	also want to know from the people who are
15	actually working on a day-to-day studying
16	it.
17	So if we're looking at the waterways,
18	you know, we're going to bring in the Marine
19	Science Department from JU and from UNF, or
20	from one of the two.
21	If we're looking at education, we're
22	going to bring in the educational
23	professionals that have studied this stuff
24	specifically for our county.
25	So those are some things that I wanted

1	to look at and hear from.
2	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: All right. Thank
3	you. Commissioner Mills.
4	COMMISSIONER MILLS: I don't have
5	anything right now.
6	CHAIRPERSON: You don't have anything.
7	Mr. Schellenberg.
8	COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: You knew I'd
9	come I think the first thing we should do
10	is (laughter).
11	I think the first thing we should do,
12	before we start anything, is we did a
13	agenda, and we have minutes. We should
14	either approve the minutes or not approve
15	the minutes before we start any meeting.
16	So I think that's the first thing that
17	we should do before I say anything else, and
18	then I'll make a comment about the minutes.
19	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: That's probably
20	COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Right now.
21	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Well
22	COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: The minutes
23	are there, and I think we should either
24	approve them or not approve them. And if
25	there's an error, then we should correct the

1	error. So I'll leave it up to you.
2	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: No, your point
3	well made and well taken. And I should have
4	likely pulled that in right after the call
5	to order, is to
6	COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Right.
7	But my concern is this. I really
8	disagree with you on this issue.
9	Just because somebody opined about it 10
10	years ago, why don't we go back 20 years or
11	30 years? Why are we even here if we are
12	just going to just basically say that what
13	they talked about 10 years ago is approved?
14	That doesn't make any sense to me.
15	We should look at everything in the
16	Charter and what they did and decide for
17	ourselves, as a committee, if we're going to
18	do something; otherwise, throw your iPhone
19	away, because 10 years ago they barely
20	existed.
21	There's a lot of things that have
22	transpired in the last 10 years that might
23	confirm or deny some of the things that they
24	came up with.
25	UNKNOWN AUDIENCE: Correct.

1	COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: And so I
2	please don't opine.
3	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yeah.
4	COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: But I think
5	that at the last meeting and you said
6	it today appointed School Board members.
7	It's been polled many times, and
8	recently by Jax U.S.A. It came back 70
9	percent, 80 percent of the people say no.
10	You're not going to they don't want to
11	give up the right of voting for people.
12	And so for us to affirm it means that
13	we're basically saying the citizens don't
14	know. And that might be the case, that
15	maybe we need to educate them. But I am not
16	going to be on record that's saying the
17	appointed School Board members of 10 years
18	ago, they opined about it, and they
19	recommended they recommended the I am
20	not on that page. We should discuss it.
21	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: All right. So
22	that's fine. We can discuss that, because
23	here's what
24	COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: But you said
25	that we're just going to move over move

forward on it, and I'm not going to do that.

CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Our charge as the

commission is to look at the Charter. Our

charge is not to go back and say up or down

5 on any of the recommendations from a prior

6 Charter Revision Commission. That was the

7 point of my comments.

2.2

No one is endorsing any of the prior recommendations. My point has simply been those recommendations have been made. There is the opportunity to act upon them, which has been acted upon by Representative Fischer with his J Bill, and the resolution that has been put forward by Council Member Carlucci as to the appointed School Board issue. That's being acted upon.

For us to get involved in that one way or the other is now involving the Commission into a policy debate that is occurring amongst the elected bodies. That is not our role.

Our role is not to go back and look at this Charter Revision or the ones before that or the ones before that or the ones before that and vote up or down on all of

1	those recommendations. They're there.
2	We're not approving them; we're not
3	endorsing them; we're not saying that
4	they're good; we're not saying that they're
5	bad. They are simply there. So those
6	issues have been tackled.
7	If we want to do something different, if
8	we say, perhaps, we have part appointed,
9	part elected, if we want to look at
10	something like that, if there is a different
11	solution for the issue, that's where I want
12	this Commission to look at. But not to go
13	back and rehash and come up with the same
14	recommendations that have already been put
15	forward and either acted upon or not acted
16	upon.
17	COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Well, let's
18	go back to what actually was done, because I
19	looked at the audio and video.
20	Ms. Baker said, Don't reinvent the wheel
21	by ignoring the previous Charter I'm just
22	reading this previous research and
23	recommend it.
24	And you said, except for a few words in
25	here and there, That's okay. But that's not

1	okay with me, because there are other
2	solutions. And, in fact, he has other
3	solutions that were recommended other than
4	approval of the School Board.
5	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: I just said, if
6	there are other solutions, yes.
7	COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Okay. So in
8	spite of the fact that Jason Gabriel I
9	mean, Jason Fischer introduced it and Matt
10	Carlucci did, that will be done. That will
11	be over with probably within the next two
12	months. And if you want to postpone the
13	discussion on appointed School Board,
14	that until after they do all the
15	whatever, and we can come up with better
16	solutions, I'd be okay with that. But I am
17	not in favor of the comments that we are
18	going to just research and recommend what
19	happened 10 years ago, which is my point.
20	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay. What would
21	your suggestions be with regards to the
22	School Board?
23	COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: There's a
24	lot of suggestions. There's a lot of
25	suggestions. I'm just saying that we should

1	look into not having an appointed School
2	Board because the citizens as a whole
3	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: We don't have an
4	appointed School Board, so
5	COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: But it's one
6	of the recommended 10 years ago. Anyway
7	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Hey. We're not here
8	to debate what they did 10 years ago.
9	COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: I know. All
10	I'm saying is that we should look at the
11	School Board and saying maybe we should
12	look at it and say that we oppose appointed
13	School Board members. We can do that.
14	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: That's not our role.
15	That's how it exists. I like the Charter.
16	COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Okay.
17	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: I mean, are we going
18	to do that for every provision of the
19	Charter? And that's my point. Otherwise,
20	we go down a rabbit hole of feeling like we
21	have to ratify everything as it currently
22	exists, and we're not going to waste time
23	doing that.
24	COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: That's not
25	what

1	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: We don't have an
2	appointed School Board.
3	COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: That's not
4	what the minutes say. That's not what the
5	report says.
6	It says we're going to research and
7	recommend the same thing. That's what was
8	affirmed in the meeting, was my point.
9	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Then if I if that
10	came out that way, then
11	COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: That's
12	exactly what was said. Go look at it.
13	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: then that was a
14	mistake, and that was a miss-wording by
15	me
16	COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Okay.
17	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: in that respect,
18	because we are not ratifying what's been
19	done by the previous Commission.
20	COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Okay. A
21	couple thoughts.
22	I think that all elected officials
23	are have to do a financial disclosure. I
24	think senior staff of the administration
25	need to do that too.

Τ	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay.
2	COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: And I think
3	too we should look at them having to leave
4	office and come back and immediately lobby
5	afterwards, or be hired afterwards. I think
6	there should be a grace period in which they
7	have to be out of office for a while.
8	I think that we should look at campaign
9	financing on how we do elections. We have a
10	state law of a thousand dollars per
11	individual, but we have a lot of pack money
12	that is thrown in there that overwhelmed
13	some campaigns.
14	Just the thought someone read the
15	I get calls all the time. And I'm not
16	recommending it. It's something that I need
17	to research, and it's called ranked voting.
18	It's done in Maine and Australia. I'm not
19	sure if I'd want to follow either of them,
20	but someone's mentioned that to me.
21	I did touch base
22	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Can I just
23	interrupt?
24	Does everybody understand what ranked
25	voting is?

1	COMMISSIONER LISSKA: No.
2	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay.
3	COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: I'm not
4	familiar with it.
5	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay. I'll briefly
6	briefly explain, is that if there are,
7	you know, like several candidates, five
8	candidates, whatever, you rank them. You
9	say it's going to be pretty much kind of
10	like what we're going to be doing when we
11	get to our issues. But you say, This is my
12	first choice. If my first choice doesn't
13	win, then this is my second choice.
14	And so what they do is they go back
15	through, and they'll tally up the votes and
16	say, Okay. Well, here's our top three.
17	They didn't get or top one didn't get 50
18	percent plus one.
19	So now we go back and you knock out the
20	bottom ones and you look at the second
21	choice, and you add up those and you see,
22	Okay, we'll do those. When added up with
23	the first choice, do we now have 50 percent
24	plus one?
25	What that does efficiency-wise is

1	eliminates the need for runoffs, because you
2	go through and you have one election, and
3	then you get the candidate that has the most
4	people who like them, I guess, to say it
5	that way. But that's how ranked voting
6	works.
7	COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: (Inaudible
8	cross-talk) more like a survey.
9	COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Great. I
10	haven't done enough research. That sounds
11	like it's right. And I heard what you
12	said
13	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yeah.
14	COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: and I'm
15	thinking I'm still confused.
16	Okay. I don't particularly like the
17	idea, but I've had a lot of people tell me
18	about the non-partisanship of the election.
19	Have non-partisan elections.
20	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: For everything?
21	COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Uh-huh
22	(affirmative response).
23	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay.
24	COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: I'm not
25	saving I'm in favor of it I can't tell you

1	how many people tell me this. And it was
2	discussed in my other members' elections.
3	And that is a huge problem.
4	If we had thought about it, and I
5	thought that I could get the Council in the
6	first term to move it into the fall
7	because that way they would come in office
8	in January, and a lot of the budget stuff is
9	discussed between, you know, March, April
LO	and May. And those are where the Council
L1	people engage the administration and say,
12	Hey, I got lots of things in my district.
13	These are my top priorities; put them in the
L 4	budget.
15	But because of the way the election
16	runs, the new people come in and the old
L7	they might not like the recommendation of
18	the guy that the guy or woman that
L 9	they're replacing, and those priorities are
20	different.
21	And so if you had the election in the
22	fall, and they took the office in January,
23	it would give everybody a way to feel the
24	world, and then the budget, and engagement

between administration and the elected City

25

_	Council	people	would	go for	rward.

2.2

And -- I -- this is worthless

information, but about -- and it wasn't my

idea, but I don't object to taking good

ideas and going with it.

But Jim Bailey with the Financial News and Daily Report back at seven -- six, seven, eight years ago wrote that the Mayor should meet with a group of people every quarter, twice a year, to make sure that they're all on the same page.

That means -- right now, actually, the independent authorities actually all get together to make sure they don't overlap and see how four of them can work together to make five. But I recommended -- and it was a resolution, though Mayor Brown ignored it and this Mayor ignores it. But basically get in a group of independent authorities, college presidents, which would hit you, maybe the specific Council President and two or three other people that I can't remember who all, but basically sit down -- and it doesn't necessarily have to be in the Sunshine, and the President of the Council

define, and just sit down in a conference room and discuss the issues that each of them are having and see if they can work together to find a better solution.

2.

2.2

And, quite frankly, Chris Hagan -- his partner has done that with City Council -- I mean Public Works for the City and JTA to make sure that we have projects that potentially can overlap; we don't tear up a road one year and then the City or JTA the following year has to tear up the same road. Coordinate efforts so we're being more efficient with our money and the quality of life for the City.

And that was the concept that I think

Jim Bailey had. I liked the idea, and I

think it's important; to force the Mayor to

meet quarterly or maybe -- quarterly or at

least twice a year to discuss what everybody

is doing and to see how they can better work

as an efficient, transparent organization.

CHAIRPERSON BROCK: I like that idea.

And I can tell you from personal experience,
there are a lot of different groups in the
transportation and maritime side. And two

1 years ago they formed a group, 2. Transportation and Logistics Network, which takes the heads of all of those different 3 groups, and we meet just like -- we meet 4 5 quarterly, and we all talk about issues that 6 we're hearing in the industry. And we have several times teamed up and been able to get 7 8 a lot of synergy on an issue and put it out 9 there. 10 So that's -- I think if there's a 11 structural way to put that into place,

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

So that's -- I think if there's a structural way to put that into place, you're right. It certainly works on the efficiency side.

COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Yes. And before I forget, I think that there -- we do have a strong Mayor, but there's no balance. And I saw it for eight years. There's really no balance. It's structured this way, but I think it's overwhelming, the power of the Mayor, versus the 19; because as a 19, we cannot discuss any issues with Ms. Mills or any of us, but the Mayor and lobbyists have indiscriminate ability to talk to each one of us independently, find out how our votes are and know exactly where

Τ	anybody is at any particular time.
2	So objecting to various things or
3	whatever it is, I cannot I'd have to have
4	a committee meeting or a noticed meeting to
5	talk to one or two, and then go on from
6	there. It is time consuming and sometimes
7	inefficient.
8	And I'm not quite sure of the how to
9	find that balance, but I think right now
10	it's out of whack. There's no balance. And
11	I'm not quite sure what the recommendation
12	is.
13	And that's my last comment. And I
14	apologize if I was too aggressive in regards
15	to the appointed School Board, and I
16	apologize.
17	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: No. There's no
18	reason to apologize. We're all this is
19	the work that we're doing. And if I was
20	stronger in my response than I should have,
21	then I apologize back. We'll hug it out
22	later.
23	COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Okay.
24	That's fine. We're in an arm wrestle.
25	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: And that was you

1	know, one of the things too, I was
2	realized when you mentioned about the
3	minutes, I forgot that we do have a
4	transcript. So the approval of the minutes,
5	we can do it. It's been kind of
6	ministerial, but we have it down exactly,
7	what has all been said and done in there.
8	So with that, we've done the
9	presentations. Do we have any oh.
LO	COMMISSIONER LISSKA: I have a question.
11	And this is regard because you tweaked
12	an area of interest of mine, and the area of
13	interest is campaign financing.
L 4	But, you know, looking at the Charter
15	and I'm going to review oh. Can I hold
16	it
L 7	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: 'Cause we're going
L8	yeah. We're going to go back to
L 9	commission discussion after
20	COMMISSIONER LISSKA: Oh, I'm sorry.
21	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: we get some
22	public comment.
23	COMMISSIONER LISSKA: I apologize.
24	That's fine.
>5	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: But weah So that

1	we can all talk about some of these
2	different ideas.
3	COMMISSIONER LISSKA: Oh, I'm sorry.
4	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: All right. We have
5	Stanley Scott
6	MR. SCOTT: Absolutely.
7	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: wants to talk
8	about leadership.
9	MR. SCOTT: That's what's on the list.
10	But after talking to y'all, I'm going to
11	change some things.
12	Do you want me to sit here?
13	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yes, sir, you can
14	sit right there.
15	MR. SCOTT: Okay. Stanley Scott.
16	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Tell us your name,
17	and basically we'll follow kind of the same
18	protocol with Counsel.
19	MR. SCOTT: My name is Stanley Scott.
20	I'm here to represent the African-American
21	Economic Recovery Think Tank.
22	First of all, accountability, ethics,
23	transparency. I hear a lot of people
24	talking about especially today, talking
25	about the great job that everybody have been

1	doing. What city are y'all talking about?
2	Because I've got empirical evidence to show
3	that you have a leadership problem. And we
4	continue to play that game 'cause it used to
5	be, when I was coming up, it was a Tale of
6	Two Cities based on race. Today it's the
7	have and the have nots.
8	You have administration, ever since
9	consolidation, where you made promises,
10	promise to the African-American community.
11	And not one of them, not one of them I
12	don't want to get started here, but I will
13	be hoping that my company, the
14	African-American Economic Recovery Think
15	Tank, would be invited to this meeting.
16	This would be the third Charter that I have
17	participated in, been asked to speak.
18	We got a problem in this City, and I
19	know a lot of people, especially the
20	African-American I mean the Caucasian
21	leadership, the Caucasian male leadership is
22	appalling.
23	This City have no life, no quality of
24	life. Look at downtown. You could come
25	down the main roads of downtown, coming from

1	Arlington, and you see all that trash in
2	this city.
3	I go down to Orlando and I can almost
4	lay on the floor in some in parts of
5	Orlando. But all these years that
6	Jacksonville have been around, you have
7	moved you have moved the power structure
8	where you got most the way south of Beach
9	Boulevard, that's a whole different city.
10	It's disconnected.
11	You've got four areas of Jacksonville,
12	and you are spending most of the money in
13	the intellectual capital on the Southside.
14	You are not engaged with the whole city. So
15	you've got an issue here.
16	I'm going to call out some quick things
17	here 'cause I know I'm short on time.
18	But we've got equality of outcome; we've
19	got equality of opportunities.
20	Now, you like I say, when I was
21	coming up, it was about race. Race is still
22	an issue, but today it's about the have and
23	the have nots. We see numerous millions
24	of dollars, going up to billions of dollars

being stole from this City. We have, like I

25

1	say, empirical evidence of this fact.
2	But leadership continues to play these
3	games in this City here, and you're causing
4	a problem in the City 'cause this is one of
5	the worst cities for quality of life.
6	Thank you.
7	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Thank you.
8	COMMISSIONER LISSKA: Point of
9	information. Do we have a chance to ask
10	questions or
11	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: To the speaker?
12	COMMISSIONER LISSKA: Yes.
13	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Certainly.
14	COMMISSIONER LISSKA: Thank you. Thank
15	you, Mr. Brock.
16	Just a couple questions: Tell me about
17	your organization and/or corporation. It
18	could be one and the same. Do you have a
19	website? Who are your officers? What is
20	your IRS reporting status? I just want to
21	know more about your group.
22	I've heard you speak before, and tell me
23	a little bit more about your group, The
24	Think Tank.
25	MR. SCOTT: Well, the African-American

1	Economic Recovery Think is the focus on the
2	African-American community working from the
3	bottom up. That means we're looking at the
4	issue here where most of the time in the
5	City the issues are dealed from the top.
6	Very seldom did we look at things from the
7	bottom here.
8	We have a lot of great people in this
9	City here, and they are not able to get the
10	microphone. What I mean about the
11	microphone, being able to their voices
12	not being heard. You've got an ethics
13	problem.
14	And with the African-American Economic
15	Recovery Think, we looking at we are
16	holistic, meaning we look at everything,
17	based on all the criterias that's available
18	in this country, and we see that we still
19	have the same problem as for a
20	leadership.
21	But when it come to the African-American
22	community, well, there's a little over
23	300,000 of us in the African-American
24	community in the north part of Jacksonville
25	what we call the North sorry about

1	that in North Jacksonville I mean
2	Jacksonville Metro. Sorry about that.
3	And we look at and we are nationally
4	known too. We do more work on our side of
5	Jacksonville because we have an education
6	problem in Jacksonville.
7	COMMISSIONER LISSKA: I hate
8	interrupting you, but I'm going to
9	because
10	MR. SCOTT: Yes.
11	COMMISSIONER LISSKA: what I'm trying
12	to find out, like do you have officers?
13	When do you have meetings?
14	MR. SCOTT: Absolutely.
15	COMMISSIONER LISSKA: How many members
16	do you have, if at all, and what is your IRS
17	status? I just want I want to know about
18	the organization, not how the organization
19	works.
20	MR. SCOTT: Okay. I understand. I
21	gotcha.
22	COMMISSIONER LISSKA: Yeah. I just want
23	to know if it's a formal IRS recognized
24	non-profit
25	MR. SCOTT: Absolutely.

1	COMMISSIONER LISSKA: or a
2	profit-making organization or
3	MR. SCOTT: No. It's for profit.
4	COMMISSIONER LISSKA: Yes. Just a
5	couple of words or two could tell me.
6	MR. SCOTT: Yeah, it's for profit.
7	COMMISSIONER LISSKA: So I can look you
8	then I can look it up.
9	MR. SCOTT: We have over 5,000 people
10	connected with it.
11	COMMISSIONER LISSKA: Members?
12	MR. SCOTT: Absolutely.
13	COMMISSIONER LISSKA: And who are the
14	officers, may I ask?
15	MR. SCOTT: Oh. We have about 12
16	officers.
17	COMMISSIONER LISSKA: Are you the
18	president?
19	MR. SCOTT: I'm the owner/president.
20	COMMISSIONER LISSKA: Okay. Is it a
21	501(c)(3)?
22	MR. SCOTT: No. It's for profit.
23	COMMISSIONER LISSKA: Okay. Thank you.
24	That's yeah.
25	MR. SCOTT: I apologize for that.

1	COMMISSIONER LISSKA: And can I find a
2	website.
3	MR. SCOTT: Yeah. I get a little savvy
4	when I come up in here 'cause there's so
5	much evil.
6	COMMISSIONER LISSKA: Okay. There is a
7	website that I can look at?
8	MR. SCOTT: Absolutely. Yes.
9	COMMISSIONER LISSKA: Thank you. Thank
10	you.
11	MR. SCOTT: But we are a 100 percent
12	legit business, LLC.
13	COMMISSIONER LISSKA: Okay. Thank you
14	so much.
15	MR. SCOTT: Yes, ma'am, around 14 years.
16	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Thank you.
17	MR. SCOTT: Okay. Thank you. I hope
18	I'm on the list to speak besides public
19	comment.
20	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay. Mr. Nooney.
21	MR. NOONEY: Hello. My name is John
22	Nooney, and thank you for the opportunity to
23	participate. I'm just excited that there's
24	a stenographer here just to record all of
25	this and you know, the Charter Revision

1	Commission, you know, I participated 10
2	years ago, and I made almost every single
3	meeting. And, you know, the Ethics, you
4	know, that was a recommendation. But you
5	know what? What was recommended and if you
6	look at what is there now, it's been gutted.
7	You know, I went upstairs let me just
8	share with you and I want this to be part
9	of the record. I'm going to leave a copy.
10	But these are the agendas for City Council
11	meetings. And, hopefully, you know, you can
12	all look at it.
13	MS. OWENS: That's no agenda; that's a
14	calendar.
15	MR. NOONEY: But pardon me?
16	MS. OWENS: That's a calendar.
17	MS. MATTHEWS: That's a calendar.
18	MR. NOONEY: I know. But I'd like it to
19	be I'll start submitting them. But
20	okay. But, anyway, here's another one.
21	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: We'll accept
22	we'll take the calendar.
23	MR. NOONEY: Okay. All right. It's a
24	calendar, but, you know, there's a lot of
25	information on a calendar. You know,

1	meetings that are cancelled, not cancelled.
2	But, anyway, here are the speaker cards.
3	Like I went up; I participated 10 years ago.
4	And I submitted lots of different things.
5	But, anyway, here's the speaker card,
6	you know, from like one of the first ones in
7	June, and then my first one that I found
8	wasn't until almost the end in November.
9	And, you know, so, in other words, I was
10	hoping, you know, to go up there and come
11	and be prepared to share with you a lot of
12	the stuff that I did 10 years ago. But
13	thank goodness that you can go and read the
14	record from the stenographer.
15	Okay. So that's so, anyway, what I'm
16	here about right now, the biggest thing, in
17	my opinion, should be bringing in Ashley
18	Moody, the Attorney General for the State of
19	Florida. The public trust has been crushed.
20	It's out the window.
21	You know, one of the biggest
22	recommendations from the Ethics last time
23	was the independence. Well, they used to be
24	over in another building. Where are they
25	now?

1	You know, also there used to be a you
2	know, a jail time for violat we took
3	that out.
4	Look at it's up there in the records.
5	You go and look at Sunshine and then you
6	look at the codes. In 10 years it's been,
7	in my opinion, gutted.
8	So, anyway so even though you want to
9	pat yourselves on the back that we did
10	something with ethics, you're it's been
11	eliminated almost.
12	And so, I only have three minutes and,
13	you know, my
14	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: You have about 45
15	seconds left.
16	MR. NOONEY: How many seconds?
17	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: 40.
18	MR. NOONEY: 40. Well, anyway, my
19	biggest thing is the waterways, you know.
20	And I'm and then, I guess, the Waterways
21	and Ethics. It has to get back to like
22	meetings I attend to. And I just have a
23	you know, the ethics is gone. And we have a
24	lot of serious issues there.
25	For all of you that are here, you know,

1	that are left, you know from 15 down to, you
2	know, to just how many of you are here just
3	even listening to this but go up and
4	look, 'cause that's what I did, you know,
5	because I was just aghast that everything
6	that I thought I did 10 years ago that's
7	why going forward now I feel like it's a
8	learning curve, especially if you're not
9	used to it.
10	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Thank you.
11	MR. NOONEY: And I've been, you know,
12	threatened, intimidated. I've got dozens of
13	stories. I mean dozens.
14	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Thank you.
15	MR. NOONEY: All right. Well, thank you
16	for listening.
17	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: I'm sorry we don't
18	have a light and the timer and all.
19	MR. NOONEY: Oh. No problem. I hope to
20	come back and try to share with you more.
21	But look at the ethics; it's gone.
22	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Thank you.
23	Any other cards? No. Okay.
24	Now, Commission discussion. And as much
25	as Commissioner Lisska was about to

1	COMMISSIONER LISSKA: Oh. That's all
2	right.
3	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: No, no, because
4	that's what I was hoping we'd do is we
5	heard a lot from we all had the
6	opportunity to ask questions.
7	And so what were some of the ideas, I
8	guess, that you had? And we'll all you
9	know, if you want to talk about something
10	else, turn your card up.
11	COMMISSIONER LISSKA: Mine is more of a
12	Emily Lisska, and mine is more a point of
13	information that I need to move forward.
14	There was a suggestion and I have an
15	interest too in campaign financing; but as I
16	understand, that is controlled by both
17	federal and state, and I don't know what
18	role we can play.
19	I will reread the Charter in that regard
20	'cause I know there's a whole chapter area
21	on elections, but I don't think campaign
22	financing is specifically covered. And I
23	would like to see us have input as possible.
24	I mean, you know, our charge is the best
25	form of government we can have, and I think

1	that clearly is an area that should be
2	explored.
3	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: And 'cause I had
4	noted that as well. One of the areas that I
5	thought
6	COMMISSIONER LISSKA: And then do we
7	seek help from the from counsel on that?
8	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Well, yeah. We
9	certainly we could certainly reach out to
10	General Counsel, because I was wondering if
11	that were something that would fall under
12	Ethics, since Ethics is now in the Charter.
13	COMMISSIONER LISSKA: Okay. I see your
14	point.
15	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: That may be
16	something that we could look at.
17	And maybe we can get a little more
18	clarity, Ms. Johnston, on that; as far as if
19	we were to look at campaign financing, where
20	would we address something like that?
21	Within the Charter or perhaps
22	recommendations to the Legislature on that?
23	MS. JOHNSTON: Okay.
24	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Any other discussion
25	items from what we've talked about?

1	COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Yes. Go
2	ahead, Ms. Mills.
3	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLS: Thank you.
4	Yes. I wanted to find out I know at
5	the last meeting we talked about making it
6	more making the Charter more visible to
7	the public so that we would get more public
8	speakers to come to public comments to
9	come in.
10	I know we do have a website, but have we
11	worked on anything as far as media awareness
12	so people could you know, would know that
13	they could come and speak?
14	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: So the short answer
15	is, yes, we sent out a press release that
16	has the CRC@coj.net.
17	COMMISSIONER MILLS: Okay.
18	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: They received a call
19	from WJCT, Abukar Adan, I think who
20	interviewed me; and I, you know, told him
21	about it and thanked him and said, We really
22	want to get that out.
23	I spoke with Carla Miller about the
24	idea. During our last meeting I said, I'd
25	really like to try and use social media and

those sorts of things, and she essentially
said that, While, yes, that does get the
information out there, it creates
opportunities for a lot more problems for us
with regards to Sunshine violations. So my
view was we don't want to go down that
route.

2.2

And so what I would encourage all of us to do is -- to the extent you have your social media, is to put that out there, and to let people know that you can be an avenue for them; but also encourage them to use the CRC@COJ.net email address because we're going to have those emails circulated to all of us as they come in.

And, you know, again, to the extent that I'm going to be, probably next week, on the radio, reaching out to some of the other television stations and radio to get on there and promote that, to get people aware so that if they're not able to come here to the meetings, they can at least send an email of, Hey, I would like to see these issues dealt with. And then we'll all get it, and it will all be part of our record

1	and our list of things that we're working
2	on.
3	So that's kind of I probably should
4	have given that update in the very
5	beginning. But that's how that is playing
6	out, that the email address is going to be
7	the best way for folks that can't make it to
8	these meetings.
9	Anything else from anyone else?
10	Yes.
11	COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Yes, a
12	couple things.
13	Lisa Green, the Inspector General, might
14	be some help. You know, she investigates
15	issues within the City and maybe she might
16	make have some recommendations on how we
17	should anyway.
18	And the other one that she came 10
19	years ago was Nina Waters, who runs the
20	Community Foundation. She might be good.
21	My only other comment is that I was
22	keeping track of the people here. So we
23	have 10 people here. Now we only have nine.
24	We had 15; one dropped off.
25	So I'm kind of concerned if the date's

1	correct. And if the date's correct, we only
2	have two-thirds of the people here. And I
3	don't think that's a healthy environment for
4	this Committee going forward.
5	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: No. And we're going
6	to be working on that.
7	We had excusals from four was it?
8	I've got the email. But we had several that
9	said they weren't able to make this first
10	one, but now that we have the schedule out,
11	that they're going to be that they're
12	going to be working on that.
13	COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Okay. Good
14	enough.
15	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: And the one that
16	said they couldn't was Scott Shine.
17	COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Right.
18	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Everyone else
19	folks had vacations scheduled up in this
20	time, but everyone has made a commitment
21	that they're going to be here for the
22	remainder of them.
23	Yes, sir.
24	COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: You've been doing
25	a great job at taking everyone's ideas, and

1	I'm just a little I'm wondering about the
2	process.
3	So, we've sort of dictated a bunch of
4	ideas to you, and then we're going to be,
5	you know, inviting speakers or making
6	recommendations for speakers to come and
7	present.
8	How are you are you the one vetting
9	all of this? Are you using staff to do
10	this?
11	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: We are using staff.
12	COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: And how can we
13	make this easier? Because I'd like to
14	the recommendations that I made earlier or,
15	at least the points I made earlier, I'd like
16	to be able to, you know, sort of formally
17	submit those ideas with it and perhaps
18	attach as supporting information or speakers
19	to go along with it.
20	I send that to staff; but then are you
21	going to receive it, and does that sort of
22	screw up with the Sunshine?
23	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: I don't think no,
24	it doesn't screw up with the Sunshine,
25	because it's in relation to scheduling.

1	COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Okay.
2	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: The issues our
3	goal is, after this meeting, we're going to
4	go through the transcript from today and
5	from last week.
6	We're going to get all of our issues
7	down on paper. We're going to have those
8	circulated before our next meeting; and if
9	there are I've got to see what our
10	schedule looks like for our August 28
11	meeting.
12	But if there are people that we can get
13	and invite to come speak to us then on those
14	topics, we want to do that. Because I want
15	to try and maximize, you know, our time in
16	here while we're doing our prioritizing of
17	what are the issues out there so that we all
18	understand how they work and how they look.
19	I think it's fair to say OGC, in some
20	respect, is going to be looked at in with
21	their the idea of staggered terms. A lot
22	of people have mentioned that. Ethics.
23	You know anyway, I'm rambling on, but
24	I don't want to take up your time.
25	COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Okay.

1	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: But, yes, we're
2	going to get that issue list, and we're
3	going to have it circulated around so that
4	everybody can see it.
5	COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Okay.
6	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yes.
7	COMMISSIONER LISSKA: Mr. Chairman, one
8	more quick question.
9	We've already had Carla Miller come
10	before us, and I actually had jotted a note
11	to myself before the public comments, that I
12	would like Ms. Miller to reappear from the
13	standpoint of any any changes, anything
14	she'd like to see; because she only
15	instructed us when she was here, and we
16	didn't quiz her about this 10 years of
17	the office. And it would be lovely to have
18	her come back so we could hear what her
19	thoughts.
20	And other than that, I might suggest
21	that unless it doesn't work for the
22	Chair, that October and November we could
23	turn our dates in, and we could get those
24	months scheduled so we can make other
25	appointments that are needed.

1	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yes. That was one
2	of the first things that I had mentioned
3	there, is for everyone to get us, you know,
4	dates where you are not available.
5	COMMISSIONER LISSKA: Oh. Going forward
6	even.
7	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Going forward, yeah.
8	COMMISSIONER LISSKA: Okay. Sure.
9	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Now through
10	December
11	COMMISSIONER LISSKA: I'll do that.
12	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Let's work now
13	through December
14	COMMISSIONER LISSKA: Perfect.
15	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: And everyone on
16	dates that you are not available because
17	we have constraints as far as availability
18	of rooms. I think once we get through the
19	budget, it will be a lot easier, and we'll
20	have more opportunity and flexibility in
21	scheduling. But we want to make sure that
22	everybody gets that information out.
23	And, Carol, perhaps we can get an email
24	out through your office to all of the
25	members, those that are excused from their

1	appearance here today, so that they know as
2	well to get us those dates.
3	And it's important you know, even if
4	it's just one date, please send it in,
5	because we want to make sure that we're able
6	to get these in here.
7	And I agree. I want to bring Carla
8	back. And you had mentioned the Inspector
9	General, because that was one area that I
10	was looking at and doing a little bit of
11	homework of, there seems to be perhaps some
12	overlap, and maybe some ways that we could
13	structure the Inspector General in with the
14	Ethics and, you know, look at something
15	along those ways of streamlining it and
16	making it more efficient so we have less
17	overlap in the oversight.
18	Anyone else? Oh, yes. Santiago.
19	COMMISSIONER SANTIAGO: I just had a
20	quick question.
21	You just stated that our next meeting is
22	August the 28th. I just want to verify. Is
23	it the 29th?
24	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: I'm sorry. It's the
25	29th.

1	COMMISSIONER SANTIAGO: Okay. Just
2	verifying. Thank you.
3	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: That's kind of an
4	inside joke that I had with Jessica.
5	Yes. Yes. Whatever so it is the
6	29th?
7	MS. OWENS: Yes.
8	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: 9:00.
9	MS. OWENS: Yes.
10	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Here.
11	MS. OWEN: In chambers.
12	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: In chambers?
13	MS. OWENS: Yes.
14	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Oh, okay. Oh, yes,
15	I remember it well.
16	COMMISSIONER SANTIAGO: Thank you.
17	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Thank you. So very
18	good, clarification on that.
19	So everybody got that? August 29th, in
20	Chambers, at nine o'clock, we'll meet on
21	that.
22	So Mr. U, I saw you come in. Did you
23	want to say anything to us or are you just
24	here to
25	MR. U: Just here to observe.

1	CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Just here to
2	observe. All right.
3	Any other business?
4	Thank you all very much. We stand
5	adjourned.
6	(The Charter Review Commission Meeting
7	was adjourned at 11:18 a.m.)
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	<u>CERTIFICATE</u>
2	STATE OF FLORIDA)
3	COUNTY OF DUVAL)
4	I, Ellen G. Watterson, Registered
5	Professional Reporter and Notary Public, duly
6	qualified in and for the state of Florida, do
7	hereby certify that I was authorized to and did
8	stenographically report the foregoing Charter
9	Review Commission Meeting; and that the
10	transcript is a true record of the proceedings.
11	I further certify that I am not a relative,
12	employee, attorney or counsel of any of the
13	parties, nor am I a relative or employee of any
14	of the parties' attorney or counsel connected
15	with the action, nor am I financially interested
16	in the action.
17	Dated this <u>23rd</u> day of <u>August</u> , A.D., 2019.
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	