

CHARTER REVISION COMMISSION MEETING

DATE: Friday, November 22nd, 2019

TIME: 9:00 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
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
Ronald Swanson, Board Member
Frank Denton, Board Member
Nick Howland, Board Member
Heidi Jameson, 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

Transcribed from **digital recording** by:

ELLEN G. WATTERSON, RPR
FIRST COAST COURT REPORTERS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

P R O C E E D I N G S

CHAIRPERSON BROCK: We will call the meeting to order.

The Charter Revision Commission, and the first item action on our agenda is approval of the October 25th minutes. (Inaudible.) Motion? Second. All in favor?

Thank you. (Inaudible) are approved. Public comment.

I see Mr. Nooney.

(Inaudible) name and address, please.

MR. NOONEY: Yeah. Hello. My name is John Nooney, 8356 Bascom Road, Jacksonville, Florida 32216; City Council District 4; (inaudible) 3, House District 12, Senate District 4, Congressional District 4.

Gosh. You know, I -- you know, with the agenda, I don't know if the Pledge of Allegiance is on there or not, but I do want to use my time for the Pledge of Allegiance.

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

1 Also, I'm missing the court reporter and
2 the -- you know, what is going on?

3 All right. You know, the primary
4 reason -- you know, when I -- when this
5 Commission was convened, you know, go
6 upstairs and look at the last Charter
7 Revision Commission. And let me just say,
8 you know, ethic. It's gone.

9 You know -- I'm only down to two
10 minutes, but I want to -- my whole focus
11 now, and I would hope it would be of the
12 Charter Revision Commission, is the simple
13 Pledge of Allegiance.

14 And let me tell you how I came about
15 that. And let me just say, full disclosure.
16 You know, I'm not an attorney, but I do
17 watch Perry Mason reruns.

18 Now, I want this to be entered into the
19 record. It's Exhibits A, B, C and D, uno,
20 dos, tres, cuatro. These are four agendas.
21 I'm only down to a minute. But the first
22 one -- and look at the dates. These dates
23 encompass just two months, but this is the
24 Council on Elder Affairs. Here's the Pledge
25 of Allegiance. It's September. And then

1 the very first meeting of the Charter
2 Revision Commission, which I want to be
3 entered into the record, and this was
4 October. So it's literally just weeks
5 later. And I attended the Council on Elder
6 Affairs. And there's the Pledge of
7 Allegiance. The greatest generation,
8 Councilman Newby was there.

9 And so here I come to the Charter
10 Revision Commission. It's our Charter. And
11 then here's another. The next agenda is
12 Crime and Safety. And you look at the
13 people that are on this distinguished list:
14 State att- -- I mean, you just look at this
15 thing, and the Pledge of Allegiance isn't
16 there.

17 Then the next one is Waterway. And pull
18 the tapes on that and look how that is being
19 taken care of.

20 I'm only down to ten seconds. But the
21 focus should be, with this commission,
22 given -- this to me is a national news story
23 that I hope --

24 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Thank you, sir.

25 MR. NOONEY: -- you'll encompass and

1 embrace.

2 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Thank you.

3 MR. NOONEY: Well, thank you for
4 listening.

5 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: All right. Next
6 item is remarks from the Chair on timeline
7 and Charter Revision.

8 I know everybody has been working hard
9 and diligent on the subcommittees. I
10 appreciate it. I've been reading through
11 the minutes on all the work. We'll be
12 giving everybody a chance to talk about the
13 work that's been done in each of the
14 subcommittees, but I wanted to share and
15 make sure we're all aware of the timelines
16 that we're looking at.

17 My goal for us is that all of the
18 subcommittees will have their final drafts
19 of their recommendations ready by our
20 meeting on February 28. If we have that --
21 and we've talked about them all in these
22 meetings about where we're going -- where
23 each of the subcommittees are going, and we
24 have that, then that gives me and Research
25 an opportunity to take all of that and put

1 it together into our final report, which we
2 can circulate.

3 And then we have two dates reserved
4 there towards the end of March. We may not
5 need both of them 'cause we come together
6 and everybody looks at it and says, Okay.
7 You know, this is a good final report. Then
8 we can take that and I will file it with the
9 City Council and the Duval delegation as we
10 are directed to. But that is my goal for us
11 in that regard.

12 I know that we have had some issues on
13 quorum, and we have to have -- I guess I'll
14 let Ms. Johnston talk about what we need in
15 that regard with regards to the
16 subcommittees.

17 MS. JOHNSTON: Thank you. Through the
18 Chair to the committee -- or the Commission.

19 For each of the subcommittees, a quorum
20 is three for the committees to hold a
21 meeting. And that is three present. That
22 is not three present by phone.

23 And so I would ask that when you're
24 scheduling your meetings -- I've heard many
25 of the schedulings, and I know that you try

1 to make sure that, at least, you know, a
2 majority of people can be at each meeting;
3 but we have run into some situations
4 where -- and I know things come up with
5 family and work and whatnot where people
6 have to leave or don't get to come to the
7 meeting. But in order to conduct the
8 business of the subcommittee, you have to
9 have three present.

10 So if you are going to be out of town,
11 or you know of people on the subcommittee
12 that are going to be out of town, if you can
13 just try to manage that when you're booking
14 those meetings; otherwise -- because people
15 are being booked to come to the meetings to
16 speak to the committee, and they can't
17 conduct their business if there's not three
18 there.

19 So I would just ask the Chairs, when
20 you're scheduling those meetings, to keep
21 that in mind. And staff will work with you
22 the best we can to try to find dates that
23 work for the majority of the members.

24 But I would recommend, if at all
25 possible, to not encourage people to attend

1 by phone because that limits their
2 participation in the overall process, and it
3 doesn't count towards a quorum.

4 So if anyone has any questions about
5 that, I'm happy to talk in more detail with
6 you one on one.

7 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay. And we have
8 to have -- you have to have a quorum if
9 you're going to take a vote on anything, but
10 otherwise they can receive information.

11 MS. JOHNSTON: Well, through the Chair.
12 If you don't have three, you can't have a
13 subcommittee meeting. You can't conduct any
14 business. You can't move the minutes. You
15 can't conduct any business.

16 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Right.

17 MS. JOHNSTON: You can talk. But it's
18 just treated as a noticed meeting of members
19 of the Commission. It's not a subcommittee
20 meeting.

21 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay. I see
22 Mr. Schellenberg.

23 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Through the
24 Chair. I was just going to echo. You can
25 have the conversation; you just can't act on

1 anything.

2 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: No.

3 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: So I
4 understand what you're saying, Paige, but,
5 in reality, I wouldn't dismiss the group.
6 They can still come. They can read the
7 minutes afterwards. The minutes are kept.
8 You just can't conduct and vote on anything,
9 period, which is what the Chair said.

10 MS. JOHNSTON: We had a situation where
11 one subcommittee had one member present.
12 There is not a meeting at that point.

13 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: I
14 understand.

15 MS. JOHNSTON: It is a noticed meeting
16 where people can discuss, but they're not
17 conducting business.

18 So I just want to make everyone aware on
19 the Commission that you can't continue to
20 have subcommittee meetings where you don't
21 have a quorum present.

22 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: No votes --
23 as long as no votes are taken, the
24 conversations between that one person and
25 those people that have committed to come and

1 talk to the committee can have a discussion,
2 period. And it's on the record because
3 minutes are being kept.

4 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: And I think the
5 point is for, you know, all of us, as much
6 as we can, especially as we get to points to
7 where we are making decisions on language,
8 things like that, is -- you know, it's going
9 to take some sacrifice.

10 Frankly, I would rather be sitting in an
11 easy chair nursing my wounds here on the
12 side of my head, but it's important that we
13 conduct the business of the Commission.

14 So thank you, Paige, on that. And I
15 know that everyone will work toward making
16 sure that we have quorums when we need to
17 take action on those items.

18 An update on what I have been working on
19 as Chair, on the one-offs. Obviously, the
20 removal of the Housing Authority is a rather
21 simple one.

22 I have taken language that Ms. Johnston
23 has provided to me from other counties that
24 have a Charter Revision Commission and have
25 been working on that. I have a draft. I

1 have not reviewed that with Ms. Johnston to
2 make sure that the language that I've used
3 is consistent with other language in the
4 Charter so that we're not introducing new
5 language but we're using language that has
6 been developed and used throughout the
7 Charter. I'll be doing that.

8 My hope is to have a draft on that
9 available to everyone our next meeting,
10 which I believe is December 13. And
11 everyone can look at that and see if we're
12 in agreement on how to kind of move the
13 process of putting the Charter Revision
14 Commission into the Charter itself and just
15 give you the bullet points on that. So on
16 putting the Charter Revision into the
17 Charter itself.

18 The term of the Charter Revision
19 Commission would be consistent with the term
20 of the president at the time the Commission
21 is convened so that it's all within one
22 president's term. And then at the end when
23 the report is given, there is a mechanism
24 for the president to submit a resolution on
25 each of the recommendations for the Council

1 to move forward on them or not move forward
2 on them. So that there is a vote, action
3 taken, on the recommendation of the Charter
4 Revision Commission moving forward.

5 I think all of us agree that that's an
6 important component for service on this
7 Commission. And for those that will serve
8 on this Commission in the future is that
9 they know that there will be action taken
10 with regards to those recommendations.

11 So that's a brief outline of what I'm
12 working on, the draft that I've got. And
13 I'll have that to you at the next meeting.

14 Judge Swanson.

15 JUDGE SWANSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

16 I would just like to pulse you in terms
17 of what the expectation, from you, what you
18 would like to see from the subcommittees in
19 terms of written format, or what exactly do
20 you anticipate we should submit to you, and
21 the form, and just working kind of input.

22 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay. Fair
23 question.

24 What I'm hoping that each of the
25 subcommittees can provide is, No. 1, draft

1 language that could be added, removed, or
2 changed in the Charter. That first. Then
3 having the support, the reasoning. Why are
4 we proposing these changes? Who did we hear
5 from? What documents did we look at? What
6 testimony did we get from the various
7 speakers who have come through there?

8 So if we have that -- if you give me the
9 proposed language and then the reasoning of
10 the need for that proposed change, that's
11 what I'm looking for, because then I can
12 take that and we can put that into a full
13 report in there.

14 Does that answer your question?

15 JUDGE SWANSON: In part. Let me dig
16 down in here a little bit.

17 Each subcommittee, ours in particular,
18 we have a multiplicity of bullet points that
19 we were encouraged to consider, review,
20 whatever, prioritize. And we are in the
21 process, I think, of doing that in our
22 subcommittee.

23 And I'd like to compliment everybody on
24 our subcommittee. We have tremendous
25 corporate knowledge with Mr. Schellenberg,

1 and everybody has been so diligent about
2 what they've been doing.

3 But we have a lot of things that are
4 bullet points. So how many of those do you
5 anticipate realistically we should go
6 forward with numerically, rough windage?
7 Numerically, rough windage, how many should
8 we go forward with in terms of suggesting
9 some action on? And, those that we choose
10 not to go forward on as a subcommittee, do
11 we need to say why we chose not to go
12 forward with those types of things?

13 Because, obviously, you've got a lot of
14 things on the plate, you're not going to
15 prioritize all of them. We can just discard
16 a bunch and hit on one, two or three. I
17 just need some guidance on what your
18 expectations would be.

19 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: So I'll give you the
20 famous two-word answer, it's 10, as far as
21 the number.

22 And I say that in the sense of there may
23 be one topic or a bullet point that has a
24 significant amount of verbiage that would
25 need to be added, changed, or removed from

1 the Charter. So if you have a topic that
2 has significant changes, then obviously you
3 wouldn't want three of those because that
4 would be a tremendous workload of going
5 through and analyzing what needs to be
6 changed and then the support or why.

7 So I would not expect any of the -- I
8 mean, some of the subcommittees, the Urban
9 Core, you know, has a more narrow focus.
10 The other two -- well, even the Strategic
11 Planning is a bit narrower, but the
12 Government Structure is a broad -- so I
13 would not expect for the subcommittee to
14 provide meaningful changes on any more than
15 two or three, just from knowing what the
16 bullet points were in there.

17 But if you find that there is one that
18 is broad enough, that it encompasses several
19 things, then that may be what the
20 subcommittee, you know, does and decides to
21 move forward on. But you've got the
22 discretion in there as far as how many you
23 want to tackle, how many you think you can
24 get done by February 28. I wish I could
25 give you more.

1 JUDGE SWANSON: No, I think that's
2 helpful because, I mean, reality therapy is
3 appropriate, that we're not going to get 20
4 or 30 changes to the Charter.

5 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: And then let me
6 answer the last part of your question, which
7 was an explanation as to why you didn't
8 cover some of the other ones.

9 I think that's good. Even if it is --
10 even if it's brief, but I think it is good
11 for the report to have that, for the public
12 to have that, and -- because there may be
13 things that are important, but it's just
14 that these two or three other ones were more
15 important at the time.

16 JUDGE SWANSON: Well, let me just --
17 I'll close out with this last question.

18 It seems to me that the subcommittees
19 have the delegated authority to prioritize.
20 And the subcommittee may prioritize items A
21 and B, and that may be different than maybe
22 potentially the Commission as a whole would
23 prioritize; but we're going to prioritize A
24 and B, and that's what we're going to go
25 forward with, and that's just life in the

1 big city, I guess.

2 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yes. And that's
3 what I'm hoping, when we get to our next
4 item on the agenda of each of the
5 subcommittees; because, again, the goal was,
6 as the subcommittees are working through
7 their priorities and working through their
8 proposed language, would report back to the
9 Commission as a whole, receive feedback from
10 the Commission as a whole, and incorporate
11 that in your deliberations and in your work.
12 Because at the end of the day what I am
13 hoping we can do is all of us have consensus
14 on the final report that -- you know, why we
15 may have thought something else may have
16 been more important to address, we can agree
17 that this one is important to address and
18 that this is the better way, if not the best
19 way, to approach a solution on it.

20 Does that answer it?

21 JUDGE SWANSON: Thank you. Yes.

22 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: All right.

23 Mr. Schellenberg.

24 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Through the
25 Chair, to follow up on Ron's comment.

1 You are not going to get a hundred
2 percent recommendations on probably
3 anything. So is it going to be a two-thirds
4 vote to move it forward or just a majority
5 vote to move something forward?

6 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Well, procedurally
7 it would be a majority vote to move it
8 forward.

9 Again, what I am hoping we can do as a
10 Commission is reach a consensus,
11 understanding that, while there may be other
12 things that we believe are important and
13 should be addressed, but they may not be;
14 nevertheless, what is being moved forward is
15 good for the City and good for our
16 community, and that we can all get behind
17 it.

18 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Okay. So
19 let me just make sure I understand that.

20 So getting 8 of 7, and then you're
21 trying to prioritize and you take it to the
22 City Council; they look at it and go, Well,
23 it's 8/7. It most likely will never see the
24 light of day is my point.

25 And I understand what you just said, but

1 it doesn't have very much impact when you
2 say a majority will move it forward.

3 That was my -- that's my comment to
4 yours. Thank you.

5 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: I understand that.
6 And my hope is that we won't be in that
7 situation; but if we are, then we are. So
8 I've played enough cards to realize you've
9 got to go with the ones in your hand, not
10 the ones you want. So hopefully we'll be
11 able to move forward in a consensus form.

12 All right. Seeing no one else, the next
13 item is subcommittee updates and discussion.

14 And Urban Core, and I believe
15 Mr. Griggs, is going to give us an update on
16 where you guys are.

17 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Thank you,
18 Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the opportunity,
19 and I know that each one of our
20 subcommittees are doing great work.

21 It can be sort of challenging to meet
22 with the schedule demands, but I think
23 everyone is up to it because we're all
24 dedicated to this purpose and cause.

25 And I want to thank our subcommittee

1 members, Mr. Denton, our Chair, Ann-Marie
2 Knight, and Ms. Celestine Mills for their
3 participation. And in Ms. Knight's absence,
4 I will go ahead and give our update.

5 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yeah. And in
6 deference to Ms. Knight, her employer is
7 having a rather large ribbon-cutting with
8 the new emergency room there at Wildlight in
9 Nassau County. She's going to try and get
10 here.

11 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: I understand she's
12 still -- she's going to be efforting to make
13 it here --

14 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yes.

15 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: -- regardless of
16 the time.

17 Okay. So we've been having some very
18 robust conversations, but I'll start with
19 the fact that we did outline and define
20 goal, and that goal for the Urban Services
21 District Subcommittee is through an
22 assessment of historical and current facts
23 and data.

24 Our goal is to consider relevant
25 information to aid possible recommendations

1 to, one, establish -- to establish an Urban
2 Core Investment Authority and, two, to
3 address unfilled promises of consolidation.

4 So we've sort of adopted -- and with
5 this goal in mind, we've sort of adopted a
6 timeline for our work. And I'm glad that
7 you restated the completion date time
8 because I believe that's where we were
9 headed anyway.

10 One, we've been using the early part,
11 the first 30 days, to gather historical
12 facts. And then once we do that, we'll be
13 assessing the current state and -- the
14 current state of affairs here where we're
15 using that information. And then we'll be
16 working to understand and define what are
17 the opportunities around the recommendation;
18 and then, finally, to summarize the proposal
19 or recommendation going forward.

20 The first month has consisted of
21 listening to guest speakers and reviewing
22 research data to try to determine promises
23 made during consolidation and to identify
24 our exact geography for those
25 recommendations. Our time was also spent

1 reviewing historical and some current state
2 information to date.

3 Our next steps are to keep -- or do a
4 deep dive of current state and comparison of
5 the status of our community during
6 consolidation. This will include
7 understanding the impact, benefits to our
8 community from investments made since
9 consolidation. This analysis will also
10 include an assessment of gaps and
11 infrastructure, the current impact, and the
12 possible opportunities.

13 Some of the guests this month have
14 provided a wealth of expertise. But a lot
15 of the research information that we've been
16 gathering include reviewing of the current
17 community health needs assessment, a map of
18 the original Consolidated City of
19 Jacksonville, Health Zone 1 demographics,
20 Duval County District 8 and District 10
21 demographics, which make up a large portion
22 of the Urban Services District, a summary of
23 the -- of our previous speakers and the
24 comments they made for us during our full
25 commission meetings.

1 We are looking at developing, or at
2 least in analyzing the opportunity to
3 develop an Urban Services District equity
4 atlas. There are some indicators there that
5 will be important to the work that we're
6 trying to do. Duval --

7 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: I'm sorry; you said
8 equity what?

9 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Atlas.

10 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Atlas.

11 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Yes. That is
12 pretty much a group of indicators that sort
13 of tell a story about the area of town that
14 we're looking at.

15 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay.

16 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Okay. Duval
17 County Health Zone data. As such, we've
18 been sort of looking at that. That's been
19 available as well. Community quality of
20 life plan for the Eastside, Springfield, and
21 Northwest Jacksonville; Urban Core school
22 grades, the laws from the Charter --
23 Florida's Charter, we've got some
24 information regarding the original Charter
25 from the State Charter; and we've also had

1 some information from the State Charter as
2 well regarding how Jacksonville was
3 consolidated; the Ordinance Code -- a couple
4 of different Ordinance Codes; the blueprint
5 for improvement from 1966, which is the
6 document that led to the consolidation; and
7 the blueprint from 2014, which was a review
8 of that effort.

9 We've had Mr. Hand come back and talk to
10 us a little bit more from -- information
11 from a Quiet Revolution, and we've had --
12 we're reviewing also the Water and Sewer
13 Infrastructure Task Force Report.

14 So those are just a handful of
15 information that we've sort of surveyed or
16 been looking at trying to assess as much
17 data as we can regarding the Urban Services
18 District and how that might play into coming
19 up with a recommendation that will have some
20 real legs to it as we come back to the full
21 Commission.

22 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay. I've got some
23 questions, but I see Mr. Schellenberg.

24 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Through the
25 Chair. Can I make a suggestion?

1 There's a group that actually met, I
2 think, a couple of days ago. It's called
3 the Jacksonville Urban Core Economic
4 Development Forum. Did any of our CRC
5 members go?

6 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Yes. Through the
7 Chair. I attended and Ms. Knight was there
8 as well.

9 And I'll add to that that Mr. Thompson,
10 Devin Thompson, from LISC, whose
11 organization who sponsored the event, did
12 present at our last subcommittee meeting.
13 So some of the information that was --

14 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yeah, and I had
15 asked staff to send that around to their
16 subcommittee, when I saw that meeting was
17 happening.

18 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Well,
19 there's several information about it.

20 But the other thing that was kind of
21 interesting -- and I'm trying to pull it
22 back up. There was a lady from -- Jennifer
23 Fay, Fee, from the Bookings Institute. She
24 shared ideas on ways to increase economic
25 development in the Urban Core.

1 So we need -- I guess my point would be,
2 not only to the Urban Core Committee, but
3 all of us, to see what other cities are
4 doing. She obviously has a broad
5 perspective about what's working in other
6 areas.

7 I heard what you are doing, Charles. It
8 seems like almost too much, and we should
9 maybe focus on some of the ideas that she
10 focused on. And, again, I didn't read it --
11 the minutes or anything like that. But I
12 would probably pare down, because you only
13 have -- we only have three months left, and
14 we've got the holidays.

15 So that was -- I didn't see it. I saw
16 the notice, and I saw that it was well
17 attended. Obviously, thank you for
18 attending. But maybe she might be able to
19 help us, you, narrow down the focus to get
20 the -- to find out what is possible going
21 forward.

22 Thank you very much, Chair and Charles.

23 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Thank you,
24 Mr. Schellenberg, and through the Chair.

25 Much of the information that she

1 presented during the forum was consistent
2 with the information that Mr. Thompson
3 presented to us during our subcommittee
4 meeting. And, in fact, some of the best
5 practices.

6 It was funny because, as she was doing
7 her presentation, I was looking over at
8 Mr. Thompson, and we were kind of nodding at
9 each other, but -- for sharing the
10 information that he shared with us.

11 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: I have a question.

12 You talked about the geographical area,
13 that you're working on that. Have you
14 narrowed that down?

15 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: So, Mr. Chairman,
16 no, we have not. We have been primarily
17 looking at the original Urban Services
18 District.

19 My guess is -- and not speaking for
20 Mr. Denton or my other subcommittee
21 members -- is that we'll probably end up
22 with something very similar to that. Given
23 the work that is probably going on -- that's
24 going on in Arlington currently and -- that
25 was originally part of the Urban Services

1 District, it may call for us to do that as
2 well.

3 But my guess is going to look either a
4 lot like Health Zone 1 or a lot like the
5 current -- or the past Urban Services
6 District.

7 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: And my own guess is
8 the more we can not reinvent the wheel, the
9 easier the process will be for your
10 subcommittee work. But also we've got --
11 you know, already having a defined area
12 that's similar is good.

13 Have you -- and give me -- I didn't hear
14 it in here, but have you guys looked at
15 funding?

16 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: I knew that was
17 coming.

18 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay.

19 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: It's not included
20 on here.

21 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yeah.

22 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: But the
23 conversation is coming. I have some ideas,
24 and I haven't shared them because I'm still
25 trying to vet those ideas. But we do plan

1 to include some -- you know, some funding
2 recommendations for the recommendation
3 piece.

4 We have heard from folks who have been
5 presenting to us that have given us
6 recommendations. I know Mr. Thompson gave a
7 couple of ideas or recommendations last
8 Friday that certainly will be considered.
9 And -- but until the committee has an
10 opportunity to discuss those, I wouldn't
11 want to, you know, put them out there like.

12 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Understood. Thank
13 you for that.

14 And, you know, just for everybody's -- I
15 have purposefully not attended any of the
16 subcommittees during this first time so that
17 everybody gets, you know, working together
18 and all of that; but I do look forward to
19 attending some as we move forward in here to
20 the later process, just so that I'm aware as
21 Chair of what all we're doing, because I'm
22 going to try and take all of these pieces
23 and put it into a magnificent, beautiful
24 puzzle for us.

25 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Yeah. Thank you.

1 Mr. Chairman, before I leave -- I don't
2 know if there's any more questions.

3 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: I don't see anyone
4 else on cue.

5 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: I'd like to ask --
6 Mr. Denton serves on the subcommittee, and
7 I'd like to ask if he had any additional
8 comments.

9 COMMISSIONER DENTON: No.

10 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Okay.

11 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: All right. Thank
12 you.

13 Next is Government Structure.

14 Judge Swanson.

15 JUDGE SWANSON: Mr. Chairman, I will be
16 brief.

17 We've had two individuals appear before
18 us, and they've appeared before the
19 Commission as a whole previously, but Chris
20 Hand and Ms. Boyer. And they both helped
21 us, I think, bring some focus in terms of
22 prioritization, what might be realistic in
23 terms of suggestions for revision.

24 We have additional subcommittee meetings
25 scheduled, additional individuals scheduled

1 to appear before us. I'm confident that we
2 will be able to meet the 2/28/20 date with
3 something hard copy for you in proper form.

4 And other than that, I don't -- we have
5 a great subcommittee. Everybody's full
6 participation, good group, and I think we're
7 on track.

8 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Have you made any
9 priorities or determined that yet?

10 JUDGE SWANSON: No. I would actually
11 defer to others on the subcommittee to see
12 if they sense any elevation of topics to a
13 priority.

14 In my mind, both Ms. Boyer and Mr. Hand
15 suggested election dates as a priority that
16 would be beneficial and possible.

17 So in my mind that's probably something
18 that we could easily identify that has been
19 bubbling up to the top. But I really defer
20 to the others on the subcommittee to see if
21 they have any other thoughts on that.
22 That's the one I would identify.

23 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay.

24 JUDGE SWANSON: Anything from any of the
25 other subcommittee members?

1 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay. I see
2 Mr. McCoy.

3 COMMISSIONER McCOY: And, actually, I
4 have my two right here.

5 So the election dates and the --
6 election dates, nonpartisan elections, those
7 kind of things have been bouncing back and
8 forth.

9 And then these next two are kind of like
10 a mix, 'cause if you kind of do one, you
11 will kind of do the other. But we're
12 looking at a balancing of power with the
13 strong Mayor and City Council's role,
14 whether it's in budget or legislation. So
15 just really kind of figuring out how that
16 balances.

17 I think that's kind of what I've been
18 sensing coming up consistently within our
19 conversations.

20 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: All right. Any
21 other questions for the Government
22 Structure?

23 Okay. Next we will move on to Strategic
24 Planning.

25 COMMISSIONER SANTIAGO: Good morning.

1 So our group has met three times now, I
2 guess, similar to the others. The first
3 thing that we did was plan out our dates
4 that we were going to start meeting again,
5 making sure that everybody was available.

6 We have had Chris Hand, Council Member
7 Aaron Bowman, former Council Member Laurie
8 Boyer -- have all come to speak to us. Our
9 next speakers will be more city related, so
10 Don Lockhart, Joey Grivey (phonetic), and I
11 believe Sam Mousa is the next one coming to
12 speak to us.

13 But, originally, we had aligned -- our
14 first meeting we had a list. We were
15 following kind of the blueprint and wanted
16 to see, Okay, what categories do we include
17 in this strategic plan? Do we do it by
18 departments? Do we do it government? Do we
19 do it more public? How do we do this?

20 And I think the consensus on the second
21 meeting was we really don't need to hear
22 from every health care, every government
23 agency, every non-profit. We really wanted
24 to focus in on how do we build the
25 structure, very specifically to things such

1 as who actually makes the appointments. Is
2 it Council? Is it the Mayor? Who's going
3 to be represented in this group?

4 One of the recommendations was that we
5 do a two-tier approach. So that might be a
6 possibility as well, where we start out
7 really broad and then narrow down.

8 I was doing some homework -- and I
9 haven't shared this with our group yet, but
10 there's a couple of cities that have set up
11 a similar structure for a strategic plan,
12 and they actually started the other way
13 around. It was with the Mayor making -- or
14 the City Council making a recommendation
15 very small and then going broad, so that
16 everybody aligned to that original mission
17 or vision.

18 We've talked also about how often does
19 it get reviewed. Do we set up a staff so
20 that there is consistency in not only once
21 the strategic plan is set up, how do we make
22 sure that it's actually implemented and how
23 do we review that?

24 In this next meeting, part of what we're
25 going to be doing is asking about those

1 budget questions. How do we finance it,
2 especially if we have a staff that needs to
3 be there on a continual basis?

4 We talked about replacement and, you
5 know, if somebody needs to step down, how do
6 we do that? Succession planning, that sort
7 of thing.

8 And then we went back and forth between
9 do we make it more government focused or
10 more community focused? So that's been a
11 big portion of our discussion as well, is
12 which way do we go with that?

13 One of the recommendations that I
14 thought was really interesting was that we
15 use the Mayoral Transition Committee to help
16 establish those original -- that original
17 mission vision, the strategic plan or goal,
18 that will then be executed by different
19 members of city government or community
20 related.

21 We also talked about -- what else did we
22 talk about?

23 Oh. One fun thing -- one fun fact that
24 Ms. Liska brought up is that in 2022, the
25 City of Jacksonville will be celebrating

1 it's 200th anniversary, and so it might be a
2 nice time to be able to roll something like
3 this out. I've noticed with some of the
4 other cities it's taking about 18 months
5 from start to actual execution of a
6 strategic plan. So that might actually work
7 out aligned really nicely to be able to do
8 that celebration.

9 One of the things that we're going to be
10 doing -- and we're working on this. One of
11 the other invitations is to work with
12 Pinellas County. They have set up a
13 strategic plan.

14 This is a rather unusual process that
15 cities have not adopted, to do a strategic
16 plan. Many businesses do; obviously,
17 non-profits do. But from a city
18 perspective, this is not -- not common. But
19 we understand that Pinellas County has done
20 that.

21 And so part of the conversation that
22 we've been having with council -- with staff
23 as well -- is, is there a way for us to
24 Skype in or do some type of communication so
25 that they don't have to come here, but we

1 can still have them come to our meetings.

2 I was doing -- like I said, I was doing
3 some homework. San Diego has one; Tulsa has
4 one; and there's a group in London that have
5 actually set up strategic plans.

6 So rather than looking at -- and we
7 still have some local people that are going
8 to come talk to us and give us
9 recommendations. But we wanted to see how
10 this was set up in other parts of the world
11 and see if there were some best practices
12 that we could follow.

13 So we have -- it's a very delicate
14 balance, I think, right now, as we continue
15 to press forward, because we want to make
16 this strategic enough or concise enough that
17 it can't just be changed with each new
18 administration. So there is a foundation,
19 and this is the minimum that you have to do.
20 But we want to leave it broad enough so
21 that, as the new group comes in, they're
22 able to establish their own strategic plan
23 and not have to follow.

24 So part of the recommendation as well
25 from Laurie Boyer was maybe you don't

1 include every single representative, but
2 rather, you know, keep it broad enough so
3 that whoever's leading can choose their own
4 committee.

5 So we're looking at a lot of different
6 variations in trying to come up with a good
7 recommendation based on a -- on just a lot
8 of different variables.

9 But I would -- through the Chair, would
10 open it up to my committee members --
11 they're all here -- if anybody wants to add
12 anything that I've missed or misread
13 something from our notes as well.

14 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: I see Ms. Jameson
15 and then Mr. Howland.

16 COMMISSIONER JAMESON: Thank you. I
17 just have a question.

18 As you're looking at these other cities
19 and -- Pinellas County, San Diego, Tulsa --
20 how long is their strategic plan? Is it a
21 four-year, five-year, ten-year? What's kind
22 of the best practice there? Because I also
23 think that that might go to the point of
24 going through multiple administrations, and
25 certainly that can obviously change how the

1 City wants to handle that.

2 So I'd just be curious, with your
3 assessment and your research, how that has
4 been.

5 COMMISSIONER SANTIAGO: So, through the
6 Chair, we have actually not talked to any of
7 the other ones. This was just kind of
8 homework I was doing on my own.

9 What I can see is that it's just -- once
10 it's established, it's just a matter of
11 implementing that plan. And I believe the
12 recommendation was to review it perhaps
13 every five years.

14 Part of the question was do we do it
15 every four years so that each administration
16 gets to have their input? Do we do it every
17 six years so that it's in the middle of, and
18 so there's some continuity before it
19 changes? I think what I'm seeing though is
20 about five years -- has been the
21 recommendation.

22 The big challenge there, as well as far
23 as the structure is concerned, is the
24 analytics and the dashboards and how do you
25 really measure that you're actually doing

1 what you set out to do, so...

2 COMMISSIONER JAMESON: Thank you.

3 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay. Mr. Howland.

4 COMMISSIONER HOWLAND: Thank you,
5 Commissioner Chair, and thanks, Commissioner
6 Santiago.

7 I think in one respect we're luckier in
8 our subcommittee than some of the others
9 because we have a specific objective that
10 we're already working on narrowing the
11 details whereas the others have to --

12 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: And legislation.

13 COMMISSIONER HOWLAND: -- narrow down to
14 specific objectives.

15 Yeah. I mean, we established early on
16 that our objective is to create a strategic
17 plan that is designed to develop a unified
18 vision and mission for the city, coordinate
19 planning among various city entities, and
20 promote strategic continuity between, you
21 know, different levels and changes and the
22 natural migration of city government.

23 So the goal, as Commissioner Santiago
24 said, is to figure out the right way to do
25 that. And to her point as well, we started

1 with the task force and consolidation's
2 model that they built, and we're looking to
3 see how we can make adjustments to that.
4 And Commissioner Santiago laid out very
5 clearly what elements we're looking at
6 specifically. So, yeah. It's going well
7 so far. Thanks.

8 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Very good. I don't
9 see anyone else on the cue.

10 I had a couple of questions. Have you
11 looked at linking proposed legislation and
12 budget process to the strategic plan?

13 COMMISSIONER SANTIAGO: So, yes. You
14 know, we also had -- and I kind of
15 questioned this a little bit, and then we
16 had a sidebar conversation with one of our
17 speakers. It seems like we're speaking to
18 the same individuals. However, I believe
19 that they are addressing each group very
20 differently -- was the consensus of our
21 conversation.

22 But to answer your question, yes, we are
23 looking at how does this all tie in
24 together. From a financial perspective, how
25 do we tie this into the budget? From a

1 legislative perspective, how do we introduce
2 this? Is it -- oh. I'm trying to remember
3 what he said. There were some
4 recommendations as to how to do it.

5 I think one of the big things -- one of
6 the big takeaways that I had as well, or
7 revelations, was that we also need to
8 consider our legal staff to be able to guide
9 us through this process. Because one of the
10 things that keeps coming up is if we focus
11 heavily on government, then is there a
12 violation of Sunshine Law when it comes to
13 executing it, because now departments can't
14 talk to each other about this topic.

15 So that's where we've got to really --
16 our next -- I think one of our next issues
17 that we need to resolve is do we do it goal
18 first and then -- or do we do it community
19 first and then narrow down? So that's part
20 of what we're looking at right now as well.

21 But there's been a couple of
22 recommendations as to how we do this. I
23 think as far as the Charter -- and this is
24 me speaking, not my group, because we
25 haven't discussed this; but I think as far

1 as the Charter, we would just like to have
2 it introduced, and then perhaps give it some
3 flexibility so that they can massage it as
4 needed.

5 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay. I had some
6 other question, but I see Mr. Schellenberg
7 on the cue.

8 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: (Inaudible.)

9 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Oh. You mentioned
10 two tiers. What do you mean by the two
11 tiers in the process?

12 COMMISSIONER SANTIAGO: So I think part
13 of that conversation was exactly what we've
14 been talking about. Do we do it as a
15 directive from the Mayor and the Council,
16 for example, and make it a very small group
17 to begin with? And then second tier would
18 be to listen -- town hall meetings,
19 community meetings, and kind of get the
20 community consensus on that before we
21 actually implement.

22 So that was kind of the -- that was the
23 suggestion that was made to us, that we do
24 it that way. But I'd really like to hear
25 from the other cities to see how they did it

1 because the reverse could actually work as
2 well to do -- to talk to the community, see
3 what ideas they have, and then narrow down
4 the focus. And then maybe third tier would
5 be to actually implement the plan.

6 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: The next one was you
7 mentioned using the Mayor's Transition
8 Committee. How would you envision that
9 working structurally within the process?

10 COMMISSIONER SANTIAGO: So this was a
11 recommendation that was made at our last
12 meeting, and we kind of went back and forth
13 on that one to try to figure out. But the
14 thought process was that with each new
15 administration, they're reviewing everything
16 that was just done. They're setting their
17 new goals. And so part of those new goals
18 could be setting a new strategic plan that
19 the City would follow.

20 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay. Yeah. And
21 that's -- I think for a strategic plan being
22 implemented for the City -- and I know we've
23 talked about it several times, and we were
24 debating it as a group -- creating the
25 structure for the planning to occur, rather

1 than, you know, having policy in there --
2 because, obviously, if you have goals, then
3 the way you achieve those goals, the policy
4 that you implement to achieve those goals,
5 can be different. But you have that same
6 goal.

7 So, you know, creating that structure to
8 develop goals I think is probably going to
9 be something that might have the best legs
10 to walk the furthest through our process in
11 there.

12 Oh. And the one final thing was if we
13 want to take a trip to London to meet with
14 that group, let me know and I will gladly
15 join those efforts.

16 COMMISSIONER SANTIAGO: Wouldn't that be
17 fun?

18 One last thing that also -- it keeps
19 coming up in our conversation, and I open
20 this up to the group because we're really
21 looking for recommendations -- is how do we
22 make it so that, if there are people
23 appointed to this -- high-ranking or
24 high-level people appointed to this, that
25 they actually attend and that they commit to

1 the process and not send somebody on their
2 behalf?

3 We feel that the only way that this is
4 really going to work is if we actually have
5 the elected or the appointed or person in
6 the room and not necessarily somebody else
7 that they send.

8 So that was part of the conversation as
9 well, is how do we enforce that.

10 So a lot of decisions to be made between
11 now and February 28th.

12 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Well, name the
13 position and say, I'm not their delegate.

14 All right. Now Mr. Schellenberg.

15 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Through the
16 Chair. So you mentioned departments. I'm
17 not quite sure what you mean by departments,
18 because they're really not limited to the
19 Sunshine Law.

20 COMMISSIONER SANTIAGO: So in that
21 conversation I think part of it was if you
22 have your higher ranking, at what point does
23 Sunshine not apply?

24 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: It does not
25 apply. It doesn't apply at all in the

1 departments other than administration.

2 COMMISSIONER SANTIAGO: Perhaps not in
3 the departments, but in the original
4 conversations with the leadership, that's
5 where Sunshine -- you may have some --
6 depending on who's appointed to the
7 committee. For example, if it's City
8 Council members, then outside of that
9 meeting you can't talk about it.

10 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Okay. I'm
11 still not sure what you're -- where that is
12 applicable. I mean, it doesn't happen.

13 You cannot have two elected officials on
14 the same body talking to one another without
15 a noticed meeting.

16 COMMISSIONER SANTIAGO: Correct, and
17 that was the point; was that we would not be
18 able to -- as far as establishing a
19 strategic plan, the only time that they
20 could do any -- talk about anything would be
21 in the noticed meeting. But then to
22 actually implement the plan, how do they
23 give that -- how do they have those
24 conversations to say, I need your department
25 to do this in order for my department to do

1 this?

2 And it was more from perhaps the
3 director level, not necessarily at the staff
4 level.

5 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: I know, but
6 the directors -- just for clarification.
7 The department heads, they can meet with any
8 department --

9 COMMISSIONER SANTIAGO: Uh-huh
10 (affirmative response).

11 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: -- without
12 any noticed meeting.

13 So this is -- it's not -- I guess, don't
14 waste -- I guess my point would be not waste
15 your time on that because it's not
16 applicable. I think it's a hindrance to
17 good government that we have the Sunshine
18 Law with one or two elected officials as
19 well as this group.

20 This is insane that we can't talk to one
21 another without a side and a noticed
22 meeting.

23 But I'll opine about this in just a
24 minute. Thank you.

25 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: And the --

1 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Wait a
2 second. One other thing. There is a
3 threshold. I think Jessica can verify this.
4 You get an appointment for I think four
5 years, generally speaking, and if they come
6 up for renewal and they don't hit I think 70
7 percent or 75 percent of a -- what is the
8 number? You're shaking your head.

9 UNKNOWN: 75.

10 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: 75.

11 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: 75. If you
12 don't attend 75 percent of the time, then
13 you have to come before the committee and
14 explain why you're not showing up. And
15 sometimes there are legitimate reasons for
16 that.

17 But there are -- during that four-year
18 period, yeah, they don't have to show up at
19 all. They can put it on their resume, which
20 a lot of people do. But, generally
21 speaking, you have to attend at least 75
22 percent of the meetings.

23 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: And I think probably
24 the concern with Sunshine is if those
25 department heads were actually members of

1 the Strategic Planning Committee in there,
2 that that might create it, if they're
3 actually on a committee in there.

4 But, yeah, in general, you know, it
5 shouldn't have any issue with that.

6 Next, Mr. Griggs.

7 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Thank you,
8 Mr. Chairman. Through the Chair to
9 Ms. Santiago. Great work over there.

10 I just had one question quick.

11 I thought I heard you say that your
12 group, your subcommittee, is working towards
13 a recommendation that's going to be fairly
14 broad, and you just want to kind of get it
15 on -- get it out there so that folks can
16 massage it on their own? Is that --

17 COMMISSIONER SANTIAGO: So the challenge
18 that we have is that we are not working on
19 the strategic plan. We are simply setting
20 up the structure for it. So we want to be
21 careful about being too specific to say
22 these are the members that need to be on it.

23 So in the blueprint there was a very
24 specific list, and when we talked to them --
25 we've gone back and forth on this particular

1 issue -- is the list could be a hundred
2 people, because we want to hear everybody's
3 voice. But that is not practical as far as
4 setting up a strategic plan.

5 So rather than listing all the members
6 that should be a part of it, we want to
7 perhaps focus on who the leadership should
8 be and let those people be the ones to pick
9 their committees.

10 And, perhaps, in order to include all
11 the voices, then you do that through more of
12 a town hall or subcommittee or, you know,
13 some type of other meeting or other forums
14 where the community can still present, but
15 they wouldn't have a voting -- a vote in the
16 final recommendation.

17 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: So through the
18 Chair to Ms. Santiago.

19 Again, without dipping too deep into
20 your subcommittee work, would you be not --
21 not make a recommendation to identify key
22 members? Not just leadership, but key
23 members, or key organizations that need to
24 be a part of the strategic planning? Maybe
25 that list is only seven or eight or 10. I

1 don't know. But just some key members who
2 you know really need to be at the table, and
3 then the leadership can figure the rest out.

4 COMMISSIONER SANTIAGO: We have not come
5 to that consensus yet, but that's the idea;
6 is to just list your top leaders and, again,
7 just allow them to set up their own
8 structure as far as who would then be
9 represented.

10 Again, we've gone through this list, and
11 even our initial -- our initial meeting we
12 had a list, quite substantial, of people
13 that we wanted to come talk to us. And when
14 we sat down to think about it, while it
15 would be extremely interesting to hear
16 what's happening in the nonprofit world or
17 in health care or in any other subject,
18 waterways, anything, it didn't really add
19 value to what we were doing, which was
20 structure, not plan. That's the challenge.

21 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yeah. And that is,
22 because we -- the Charter is meant to be an
23 enduring document. So when you name an
24 organization that may be prevalent and
25 relevant and active now, 20, 30 years from

1 now, it may have been absorbed into
2 something else.

3 So, yeah, as broadly as you can describe
4 those members -- certainly within government
5 we have a lot more resiliency of those
6 members that would be participating. But
7 when you get outside of the government
8 structure, that's where I think -- if I'm
9 hearing you correctly, you're talking about
10 just identifying communities or the input
11 that you would get during that process.

12 Judge Swanson.

13 JUDGE SWANSON: I'd just like to make a
14 comment.

15 I agree with some of the other folks on
16 the Commission that Sunshine can be tedious.
17 And I think you guys have made a good catch
18 that you have to recognize that it is
19 tedious and address how to deal with it
20 efficiently so that you don't torpedo the
21 whole concept.

22 And I may be stating the obvious, but
23 have you asked for General Counsel to give
24 you some guidance on how to focus on that
25 particular thing, to deal with it so that

1 it's not a show stopper?

2 COMMISSIONER SANTIAGO: Through the
3 Chair, not yet.

4 JUDGE SWANSON: What I -- and, again,
5 I'm not at your meetings, so these are maybe
6 things you-all are considering. But it
7 would seem to me that if you came up with a
8 recommendation at the end of the day that
9 you're going to provide to the Chair, you
10 would come up potentially with a
11 recommendation, and then subset A might be
12 recognition of Sunshine issues and how to
13 address those Sunshine issues so that the
14 ultimate recommendation is viable.

15 I don't think it's -- I agree with
16 Mr. Schellenberg. I don't think it's going
17 to be a show stopper, but I think it's -- it
18 was insightful for your subcommittee to
19 recognize you have to deal with it. But I
20 think it's something you can deal with. And
21 I would just suggest you ask the General
22 Counsel for a very brief opinion with some
23 suggested language on how to address that.

24 That's my two cents. Thank you.

25 COMMISSIONER SANTIAGO: Thank you.

1 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Thank you. Next,
2 Ms. Baker.

3 COMMISSIONER BAKER: Hi. Commissioner
4 Santiago. Okay. So I understand that
5 you're creating a committee or a commission
6 with potentially people who will have to be
7 there based on who they are or what their
8 title is, and then potentially also
9 appointed people by someone.

10 But my question is -- and this also goes
11 to Sunshine Law -- are you guys looking to
12 create this committee or commission as a
13 standing commission that will be there --
14 like always be meeting every year,
15 quarterly, whatever it is, or are you
16 looking at creating this commission almost
17 like our CRC is, where they're going to meet
18 for a period of time every five years to
19 reevaluate?

20 Because if they're not going to be a
21 standing commission, and they're only
22 meeting for 10 months every five years, then
23 the Sunshine Law wouldn't really be
24 applicable because they're looking at the
25 plan; but then when they dissolve the

1 Commission and they implement the plan,
2 there's no Commission anymore; right?

3 So I guess that's my question.

4 And, also, if it is standing and always
5 going to be there, that might be the
6 hindrance to the attendance. If it's only
7 meeting for 10 months every five years like
8 we are, that gives you incentive to attend
9 and be very involved for that short period
10 of time.

11 And I had one last point, and I can't
12 remember what it was now. But I think
13 that's my question.

14 COMMISSIONER SANTIAGO: Thank you very
15 much.

16 And through the Chair. I think we've
17 discussed this as well. And so the idea was
18 to kind of do a hybrid of that.

19 So the Commission itself would meet
20 similar to a Charter, that they meet every
21 five years, every 10 years, whatever we
22 establish as the set amount of time;
23 however, we wanted to make sure that there
24 was implementation and action being taken on
25 that.

1 So the idea there was to establish some
2 sort of staff with a budget that could
3 actually ensure that those items are
4 being implemented. So that staff and those
5 individuals would be the ones that would be
6 having the periodic meetings with the
7 community, with the departments, to say, Are
8 you doing what you said you were going to
9 do?

10 COMMISSIONER BAKER: And can I have a
11 follow-up to that?

12 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Sure.

13 COMMISSIONER BAKER: Okay. The other
14 point I was going to bring up was if you
15 have appointed people -- because I agree
16 with you that it can change in five years.
17 And there's different leaders of the City,
18 different Mayors, different Council
19 presidents.

20 So would those two individuals maybe be
21 the people who would appoint to this
22 commission, who meets every five years,
23 because they're also involved, if you will,
24 and so they would like to have an input on
25 who is going to be re-looking at the

1 strategic plan?

2 COMMISSIONER SANTIAGO: So through the
3 Chair. The answer to that is that's exactly
4 what we're trying to decide right now.

5 That's kind of the idea, yes, that
6 whoever these -- the initial group that sets
7 up the committee each time, they would be
8 part of -- they would just set it up every
9 five years, depending on, as things change,
10 as groups come and go and needs come and go,
11 similar to what we're doing right now with
12 removing the hospitals -- the hospital board
13 from our Charter. I think we leave it broad
14 enough so that whoever is in leadership at
15 that time can be able to make those
16 adjustments.

17 COMMISSIONER BAKER: But then also
18 couldn't you just put in the Charter that,
19 you know -- I want to say like, whoever the
20 Mayor is, whoever the -- you'd have to
21 follow the strategic -- can't we just -- can
22 that be put in the Charter, that that's a
23 statement --

24 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: I don't think you
25 can bind future administrations.

1 COMMISSIONER BAKER: Okay. That's the
2 problem.

3 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Am I correct with
4 that, Ms. Johnston?

5 MS. JOHNSTON: Through the Chair to the
6 Commission.

7 It wouldn't really be so much binding
8 the Mayor as more of a separation of powers
9 kind of issue. Because the Mayor's role --
10 as an executive, he has certain abilities to
11 choose what he wants to choose, and by
12 putting it in the Charter, you may be
13 usurping his power in that regard. So I'm
14 not sure you could.

15 You could encourage the Mayor, through
16 the Charter, perhaps; but I think if you
17 directed him through the Charter, it may be
18 a separation of powers issue. But we'd have
19 to look at that further.

20 COMMISSIONER BAKER: So without delving
21 too much into your subcommittee -- my
22 apologies -- yeah, it is a tough -- there's
23 a lot to think about.

24 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Mr. Griggs, the
25 second time.

1 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: I'm sorry; I
2 apologize, Mr. Chair, and to Ms. Santiago
3 for the second question.

4 But I was wondering, since you mentioned
5 implementation and we discussed timelines
6 and how many times the groups would meet,
7 there would be -- if it's a strategic plan,
8 and it calls for some type of
9 implementation, then it would also call for
10 some type of evaluation. And I don't think
11 that every five years is -- I think that's
12 too far along. You've got to look at it
13 somewhere in the middle, every two years or
14 whatever, to evaluate whether or not you're
15 headed in the right direction.

16 And then if -- and if you are evaluating
17 it, like you mentioned, having a staff, you
18 know, somebody's got to be responsible for,
19 quote, holding those people accountable who
20 are responsible for certain implementation
21 areas.

22 For example, if part of the plan said,
23 you know, in the next 10 years we would like
24 to have -- since this is a popular subject,
25 a hundred percent removal and replacement of

1 all septic tanks; right? If the plan called
2 for that in 10 years and then you -- and the
3 implementation would have benchmarks along
4 the way, somebody would have to be held
5 accountable for marking those benchmarks.
6 You wouldn't want to wait five years down
7 the road to see that you're five years
8 behind, you know, four years behind.

9 So that would be my recommendation, not
10 delving too far into your subcommittee work,
11 is to maybe have some type of evaluation
12 component there.

13 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Any response?

14 COMMISSIONER SANTIAGO: Through the
15 Chair.

16 And so these are the types of questions
17 that we want to ask of the different cities
18 that have implemented it, to look at what
19 their best practices -- what has come since
20 they've implemented their own strategic
21 plan.

22 I know one of them it took them three
23 months just to establish the mission vision,
24 and then there was about 18 months of work
25 that was done before anything was actually

1 enacted.

2 So I think really a lot of these
3 questions, these are the things that we're
4 looking at right now, but it's -- a lot of
5 these questions are going to have to be --
6 you know, we're just going to have to listen
7 to see what other cities have done as far as
8 we can and use our own knowledge from a
9 business perspective as to how does this
10 work. Because, again, it is -- it's a
11 tricky one because we're not -- we're trying
12 to see into the future what's needed, but
13 we're also not actually putting the plan
14 together. We're just putting the structure.

15 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: And on that
16 structure one, I was making some notes in
17 here because you talked about staffing and
18 implementation and evaluation.

19 I would encourage you to look at the
20 existing structure within the government,
21 and, in particular, as far as evaluating as
22 to how is it being done.

23 We have a Council Auditor's Office where
24 something like that, it would seem to me,
25 would be fitting in that role within the

1 current structure that we have. And,
2 obviously, I think you would probably want
3 someone within the Mayor's office as well as
4 the City Council's Office, because of those
5 priorities that would be developed through
6 the strategic planning process of having
7 someone in both sides of that.

8 And perhaps having that Council Auditor
9 in the role of evaluation for the government
10 structure, on this idea of balancing out a
11 strong Mayor form of government, is that
12 perhaps therein lies a method of
13 accountability as far as a report that could
14 come out with regards to that.

15 So just kind of thinking about the
16 existing structures that we have and how can
17 we just maybe add in with those.

18 All right. I don't see anyone else, so
19 we will now move to any other business.

20 Anything else we need to bring up?

21 UNKNOWN: Mr. Schellenberg.

22 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay. I just didn't
23 see -- oh. We haven't moved down to the
24 other business item.

25 Okay. (Inaudible.) It's not moving

1 down. (Inaudible.)

2 Nevertheless, they tell me,
3 Mr. Schellenberg, you are on the cue.

4 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: I was
5 actually on the cue when Ms. Santiago was
6 there, but...

7 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Oh. I apologize.

8 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: There's a
9 couple of things that do impact what we're
10 trying to do. And one is, there are very
11 few cities like us. We have a strong Mayor,
12 and so each Mayor has his own priorities.
13 And, generally speaking, you can't force --
14 along with Ms. Baker, you can't force him or
15 the Council to do anything that they don't
16 want to do.

17 So -- but the other thing, for
18 implementation of these things, term limits
19 drastically impact going forward.

20 You can have a councilman make a great
21 recommendation and he's out in four years;
22 and the next person that represents the
23 area, he could care less, generally
24 speaking, about your priorities. He has his
25 own going forward.

1 So these are things that are behind the
2 curtain, are very impactful, getting things
3 done going forward. And all you have to do
4 is look at downtown, because we've had four
5 mayors, five mayors that all said downtown
6 is going to be good, and we're still right
7 where we were 20 years ago.

8 The other thing is that, generally
9 speaking -- and I know Ms. Boyer talked
10 about it -- most of them have a county
11 manager, and they don't turn over so much so
12 they move forward in a certain direction.
13 And that's all I wanted to address there.

14 Can I go just to new business?

15 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yes. That's fine.

16 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Okay. So,
17 you know, I am -- I guess I'm beating a dead
18 horse. But it came up briefly during our
19 committee, and Chris Hand was asked, What
20 would you change? And he was going to move
21 in the direction of General Counsel. And it
22 was -- you know, I wanted him to tell us
23 what would he do differently. And that
24 would be the General Counsel. And he wasn't
25 able to elaborate because it wasn't on our

1 list of discussion.

2 But General Counsel is one of the most
3 powerful positions, if not the most powerful
4 position, in Jacksonville. And I want to
5 have Jessica pass this around. This is why
6 it's important.

7 There's a photo that the Mayor took late
8 March.

9 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: What's the purpose
10 of the photo?

11 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: The purpose
12 is that I --

13 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: I mean, you can make
14 your point without pulling out old tweets.

15 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: No. I think
16 that it's --

17 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: It's a tweet --
18 Mr. Schellenberg, I'm sorry. But we're not
19 going to engage in disparagement through --

20 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: I'm not. I
21 am not disparaging anything.

22 I'm demonstrating why it's important to
23 deal with the General Counsel's Office and
24 how we deal with it and even though it's
25 not --

1 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: That is a
2 subcommittee issue for --

3 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: No, it is
4 not, because it came up and the subcommittee
5 chair said, No, it's not one of the things
6 on our list, even though --

7 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Then,
8 Mr. Schellenberg, if it has been brought up
9 in the subcommittee --

10 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: No, it
11 wasn't.

12 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Well, you just told
13 me that it was --

14 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: No.

15 CHAIRPERSON: -- and that your Chair
16 decided you were not going to be doing that.
17 So we're not going to rehash decisions that
18 are made in the subcommittee here. That's
19 not what this purpose is for. Nor are we
20 going to bring up tweets from the Mayor with
21 pictures of people. That's not moving this
22 committee -- this Commission forward.

23 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Okay. But
24 you and I can disagree on this. It was
25 brought up and ready to be discussed by

1 Chris Hand, and the Chair said, It's not on
2 our list. And I said to him that you said
3 that if we wanted to take it up, we could.

4 So now I'm bringing it up to the full
5 committee to discuss how important it is --

6 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: We are not here to
7 do subcommittee work in the body as a whole.
8 Bring this up in the subcommittee. We're
9 not here to do subcommittee work.

10 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Okay.
11 Great. Through the Chair to Judge. Would
12 be bring it up in a subcommittee?

13 JUDGE SWANSON: May I comment?

14 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yes, sir.

15 JUDGE SWANSON: In fairness to
16 Mr. Schellenberg and the Chair of the
17 Commission, let me put some context in this.

18 When the bullet points came out of what
19 was under government structure and -- I
20 believe that there was a motion made to move
21 -- before we prioritized the one, two,
22 three, four items that were going to be
23 delegated to the subcommittees, I believe
24 that there was -- and we could refer to the
25 minutes on this. But I believe it may have

1 been Ms. Baker that made the motion.

2 But, at any rate, I think there was a
3 vote to move one of the bullet points that
4 was in our tasking from our tasking to the
5 general concept of General Counsel.

6 So that meant that the items that were
7 referred to our committee to look at did not
8 include the issue of General Counsel, which,
9 I agree with Mr. Schellenberg, is a
10 significant matter. I don't dispute that at
11 all. I'm talking process, not substance at
12 this point.

13 So when that item was removed from our
14 subcommittee's Charter -- or the bullet
15 points, and then we all, as a Commission as
16 a whole, voted and prioritized, the General
17 Counsel I think was prioritized as issue
18 five or six or something of that nature, and
19 so it was not provided to a subcommittee to
20 look at.

21 With that background, when the issue
22 came up at our subcommittee as to whether or
23 not we would focus on General Counsel
24 issues, even though personally I think it's
25 a matter of significance, I felt bound by

1 the vote of the Commission as a whole where
2 it was not prioritized as one of the top
3 four or five things, however that worked
4 out.

5 So after talking and gaining consensus
6 from the subcommittee, I did make the
7 determination that I did not believe that
8 that was something we could or should pursue
9 without it coming back to the Commission as
10 a whole.

11 So in fairness to Mr. Schellenberg, I
12 believe that at this point he has indicated
13 that this is something that, in his view, is
14 a matter of grave significance and, in
15 essence, he's doing what I suggested he
16 should do, which is bring it back to the
17 Commission as a whole.

18 I don't know that that means we should
19 re-vote on it or readdress it, but he's
20 certainly within the parameters of what I
21 contemplated should transpire based on the
22 subcommittee action.

23 Now, the ruling of the Chair may be,
24 Asked and answered; we've already addressed;
25 it's done. And if that's the case, we will

1 pursue that -- we will proceed as a
2 subcommittee with that tasking.

3 But I don't know where that adds
4 clarification that would be of any benefit.
5 I think I've accurately stated what
6 transpired.

7 And so in my view -- and I think I used
8 the language, if we vectored off onto
9 General Counsel's issue -- General Counsel
10 issues as a subcommittee, in essence, we
11 would be going rogue because that was not
12 the direction from the Commission as a
13 whole.

14 So I did curtail pursuing that issue.
15 Does that make sense?

16 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: That makes sense.

17 And, Mr. Schellenberg, if you were
18 pursuing a strategy that you believed was
19 recommended, then I apologize for shutting
20 you down on that.

21 When we made the priorities and when we
22 merged the two, Government Structure and
23 Preservation of Corporate Knowledge, we said
24 that because General Counsel fell within
25 Government Structure, if the subcommittee

1 wanted to go into that. So I would leave
2 that to the subcommittee to determine --

3 JUDGE SWANSON: Well, let me interject.
4 That's not my recollection. And if that's
5 the ruling, we will proceed in that manner.

6 My recollection is that General Counsel
7 was one of the bullet points under
8 Government Structure. And as I recall --
9 and somebody could review the minutes, or,
10 Ms. Baker, it might have been you that made
11 the motion.

12 As I recall, there was a motion that
13 moved that bullet point from Government
14 Structure out and put it under the issue of
15 General Counsel generically.

16 So my understanding of what transpired
17 meant -- that action meant General Counsel
18 was no longer a matter within our discretion
19 to pursue because it had, by Commission as a
20 whole, actually been moved out of our
21 listing of issues to address.

22 If I'm wrong about that, then I seek
23 clarification.

24 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: I'm going to pull up
25 the minutes from our October 25th meeting.

1 You got it? Great. We've got those
2 coming up.

3 In the interim, Ms. Liska.

4 COMMISSIONER LISKA: This is with great
5 irony, I have to say, 'cause I just thought
6 this was a session where we could speak
7 about contacts at this point in our agenda,
8 since the last meeting with -- you know, you
9 said seek meetings outside of our
10 committees, et cetera, and so I did. And,
11 oddly, it was about the General Counsel.

12 So I'm going to stop at this point, not
13 chime in. I'll wait to see what you're
14 coming up with, and that was it.

15 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay. Next,
16 Ms. Jameson.

17 COMMISSIONER JAMESON: Thank you.

18 I guess we'll soon find out in just a
19 couple of minutes, but my notes here -- we
20 had an original motion from Mr. Denton and
21 two Gentry amendments that added the Office
22 of General Counsel to our priorities, and
23 all of those were voted down.

24 So I just wanted to clarify that through
25 the minutes that are being reviewed right

1 now; but I agree with the Judge, that's my
2 recollection as well.

3 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: And I'm looking
4 through here and --

5 UNKNOWN: (Inaudible.)

6 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay. So the Office
7 of General Counsel was topic B. There was a
8 motion by Gentry to add a fourth topic --
9 fourth committee of B. That motion failed.

10 So we did not have the Office of General
11 Counsel as a separate line. I'm trying to
12 see if there's anything in here.

13 JUDGE SWANSON: I believe there was
14 actually an affirmative motion by someone to
15 remove General Counsel from Government
16 Structure, but there was a --

17 COMMISSIONER BAKER: Mr. Chair, may I?

18 JUDGE SWANSON: I defer.

19 COMMISSIONER BAKER: Mr. Chair, may I?

20 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Well, let me ask.

21 Are you talking about during your
22 subcommittee or during the -- no.

23 The motion -- there was a motion to add
24 B into the Government Structure. That
25 failed. There was a motion to -- again to

1 add B. That motion was withdrawn. And then
2 later there was a motion to add B as a
3 separate subcommittee, and that failed as
4 well.

5 I'm going to continue looking through
6 here -- okay. Here's where I thought it
7 was.

8 Reading in the minutes on page 6 at the
9 top, it says, Commission Howland asked if
10 the subcommittees can consider issues beyond
11 the specific bullet points listed at the
12 time the committees are created.

13 Chairman Brock said they could.

14 That was my recollection of what I said,
15 that there is discretion, within reason, for
16 the subcommittees to go beyond the bullet
17 point.

18 So that was why I was saying that if the
19 subcommittee says we want to add this in, or
20 when you're prioritizing and it's something
21 that falls within your general committee
22 charge but may not be a specific bullet
23 point, then that is something that the
24 subcommittee could go into. But that's at
25 the discretion of the Chair and the view of

1 the subcommittee members.

2 So that was -- this was what I had
3 remembered in my process in there, that it
4 was something that you could go outside
5 the -- you could go outside the specific
6 bullet points if it fell within the general
7 description of your committee.

8 JUDGE SWANSON: I'm not afraid to make a
9 decision and I'm happy, at the subcommittee
10 level, to do that. But I don't think we
11 have -- I think, not only the issues that
12 you addressed were voted upon, I actually
13 have a recollection that there may have been
14 an affirmative motion to move the bullet
15 General Counsel from Government Structure
16 and put it under the general topic of
17 General Counsel. And I believe that that
18 was moved, seconded, and passed.

19 And if I'm accurate about that, that
20 would mean the Commission as a whole has
21 affirmatively moved a bullet point from the
22 subcommittee that I chair.

23 And what I told Mr. Schellenberg -- and
24 Mr. Schellenberg has been accurate in terms
25 of his representations of our subcommittee

1 meeting. But what I said at that point was,
2 I'm not comfortable, if there was an
3 affirmative vote by the Commission as a
4 whole to remove that from the subcommittee
5 Charter, to then unilaterally go back and
6 initiate exploration of the topic.

7 So if there's somebody else on the
8 Commission as a whole or on my subcommittee
9 that has an independent recollection of that
10 motion to move that bullet point, I would be
11 grateful if you could elaborate on that.

12 But at any rate, if you're telling me
13 that we have the discretion to deal with it,
14 I know how to make decisions and we can
15 address that. Thank you.

16 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: So in answer to your
17 question about a specific motion, there was.

18 On page 3 of the minutes, Motion by
19 Commissioner Baker, amend the Gentry motion
20 to -- which was to move the bullet point
21 assessing the function of OGC, including
22 possibly implementing staggered terms for
23 the General Counsel -- to move that from
24 topic A, Government Structure -- or, excuse
25 me, Preserving Institutional Knowledge, to

1 topic B, which was the Office of General
2 Counsel.

3 So you're correct that there was a
4 specific motion to remove that issue of
5 General Counsel down to B, by the General
6 Counsel's Office.

7 JUDGE SWANSON: Okay. Based on that, is
8 it your determination here today that our
9 subcommittee still has the discretion to
10 address matters related to the General
11 Counsel, or is it your view that that
12 affirmative motion, which was passed by the
13 Commission as a whole to remove --
14 specifically remove that from our listing of
15 agenda items that we were to explore, that
16 that precludes us from going there?

17 I just need you to give me some guidance
18 on that, and we'll deal with it.

19 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Well, it was -- that
20 motion was approved unanimously by the
21 Commission to move that topic from -- the
22 OGC topic from A to B.

23 I still stand by the statement that I
24 had made in there that if there are topics
25 that fall within your broad, you know,

1 function, especially -- I mean, you're -- an
2 argument can be made for just about anything
3 because of how broad Government Structure
4 is. But if you are looking for guidance
5 from the Commission as a whole, then I would
6 tell you that that motion to remove it was a
7 unanimous motion. So it's still within your
8 discretion as the subcommittee Chair.

9 JUDGE SWANSON: Well, let --

10 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: But I'm just reading
11 the minutes --

12 JUDGE SWANSON: I'm not being
13 argumentative. I just want to make sure I
14 have clarification.

15 As I reviewed what transpired at the
16 Commission as a whole, it was my view that
17 the affirmative motion removing General
18 Counsel from our topic list, which was voted
19 upon and passed by the Commission as a
20 whole, was a signal to the subcommittee that
21 we should not go down that route.

22 Moreover, in view of the fact that
23 matters were prioritized and that the
24 General Counsel had a specific line item in
25 the prioritization, and it did not fall

1 within the top three or four, as ultimately
2 delegated to the subcommittees, it was my
3 sense that the Commission as a whole had
4 spoken, and we should not go there without
5 bringing it back to the Commission as a
6 whole.

7 Now, if you are, in the exercise of your
8 discretion as Chair of the Commission,
9 giving direction to the subcommittee that we
10 have the discretion to go into that matter,
11 that's fine, and that's -- we will then
12 address it at the subcommittee level; or if,
13 in the alternative, you feel this is a
14 matter that's been voted upon and addressed
15 and requires additional action to allow us
16 to do that, additional action by the
17 Commission as a whole, then I would
18 appreciate the Commission as a whole giving
19 us that latitude.

20 However you want to address that is fine
21 with me. We'll take it up at the
22 subcommittee level if you just want to pass
23 on it and give it to us. And I don't know
24 that I have any more to say about it.

25 But if anybody else in the subcommittee

1 wants to weigh in, I'd appreciate it, if you
2 have any thoughts in the matter. Thank you.

3 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: I do want to hear
4 from everybody else.

5 Mr. Schellenberg, I have you next on the
6 cue.

7 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: I'll wait
8 for other people to opine.

9 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay. Oh, that's
10 right, that's your second time.

11 Mr. Denton, the first time.

12 COMMISSIONER DENTON: Thank you. My
13 recollection from that discussion, and I
14 made at least one of the motions and
15 advocated that the General Counsel issue --
16 it wasn't so much to remove it from your
17 subcommittee; it was to create a fourth
18 subcommittee just on that topic. Because at
19 the time I felt, as Mr. Schellenberg does,
20 that it's so important that it needs to be
21 addressed, and I felt it would have been
22 best by a separate subcommittee. That was
23 voted down. And my recollection was that it
24 was voted down to keep the number of
25 subcommittees to three.

1 And I thought, Mr. Chairman, that at the
2 time -- and you're reading a transcript, so
3 you can correct me with facts. But my
4 impression was that you said that the
5 General Counsel -- and I think it was the
6 tenor of the conversation on the Commission,
7 that if the Government Structure
8 subcommittee chose to take up the General
9 Counsel, that it could.

10 So when I left the meeting that day, I
11 thought, Well, I'm sorry that we didn't
12 create a separate subcommittee, but I was
13 hopeful that the Government Structure
14 subcommittee would take up the very
15 important issue of General Counsel.

16 That's my recollection, buying time for
17 you to read the actual transcript.

18 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: I've got it in
19 there. Next, Mr. Griggs.

20 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Thank you,
21 Mr. Chairman.

22 My biggest recollection of that day was
23 that every topic we had on the list fell
24 into one of the three categories, with us
25 sort of collapsing everything with the

1 intent of not having too many different
2 categories.

3 My recollection is similar to
4 Mr. Denton's -- consistent with Mr. Denton,
5 is whether -- because we did not formulate a
6 specific General Counsel one, it
7 automatically fell into the Government
8 Structure one.

9 But I also recall, Mr. Chairman, that I
10 didn't believe, and I don't now believe,
11 that any of these issues were, quote, dead
12 issues just because we discussed them and
13 they may have been acted upon at that
14 particular time.

15 My thought was that they were always --
16 if we felt like there was opportunity or a
17 will to discuss them or to vet them in a
18 subcommittee, then they would be dealt with.

19 And then the other thing was that we --
20 and I specifically remember asking this
21 question, you know, what about additional
22 public input?

23 If someone were to come to us after
24 we've done our subcommittee work and we're
25 formulating our recommendations, I wanted to

1 make sure that we weren't shutting the
2 public out of us revisiting an idea or
3 visiting a topic just because we considered
4 it earlier.

5 So I would imagine that, you know, we
6 might have someone from the public who came
7 and thought this was a -- even if it wasn't
8 a commissioner, might have thought this was
9 important for us to put back on the table
10 and convince us to doing so, we would not
11 not consider it because we had already
12 talked about it before.

13 So that was my comment, Mr. Chair.

14 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Next, Mr. McCoy,
15 first time.

16 COMMISSIONER McCOY: I just wanted to
17 say that if we are able to take this up in a
18 subcommittee, I will amend what I said
19 earlier was important in our subcommittee,
20 and General Counsel would go first.

21 I had to bring a little bit of humor to
22 it.

23 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Ms. Liska.

24 COMMISSIONER LISKA: To make this
25 simple, my recollection -- and the reason

1 for my vote to clean up the agenda that day,
2 which is the vote I thought I was offering
3 that day when the General Counsel entry was
4 removed from -- I believe it was Government
5 Structure, that's the sole reason I voted
6 for that.

7 And my recollection is the same as
8 Mr. Denton and Mr. Griggs on that day, that
9 we could move forward, hear the public out,
10 which I was going to share with you is
11 something I had heard -- a moot point right
12 now -- and continue on with any and all
13 topics that came before us. And I realize
14 the Chair has discretion of each committee.

15 But, nonetheless, just to clear up, my
16 vote that day wasn't to take it off the
17 agenda permanently. Never.

18 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay. Let's see.
19 Ms. Jameson.

20 COMMISSIONER JAMESON: Thank you,
21 Mr. Chair.

22 A couple of questions for you. If our
23 Commission -- or, I'm sorry, our
24 subcommittee decides to take this up in our
25 subcommittee, as the Judge had mentioned, if

1 we take a vote, let's say, on an issue and
2 we bring it, is that where that vote
3 resides, or do we then need to bring it to
4 the full Commission for another vote?

5 If we have decided that there's a topic,
6 let's say, that we don't want to continue to
7 investigate, is that where the authority
8 lays?

9 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yes.

10 COMMISSIONER JAMESON: And I guess a
11 follow-up to that question is, we have a lot
12 of topics that fall under our two categories
13 that were combined for our subcommittee, and
14 what we're trying to do right now is narrow
15 those down, because we really only have
16 two-and-a-half months, let's just say, that
17 we need to write a final report. So there's
18 a lot of business to go through, and we are
19 trying to narrow that path down.

20 So, again, I'm curious, if our
21 subcommittee does make a determination, is
22 that where that authority lays?

23 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yes.

24 COMMISSIONER JAMESON: Thank you.

25 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Ms. Baker.

1 COMMISSIONER BAKER: Thank you,
2 Mr. Chair.

3 I do recall you did say that we could go
4 outside of the sub-bullets that are listed
5 under the broader topics that we voted on;
6 but it was more my understanding, as
7 Commissioner Swanson stated, that we voted
8 as a Commission of the whole to not take up
9 OGC. It did not meet -- it did not land in
10 the one through four. I think it was fifth
11 or sixth.

12 And we further discussed that if we did
13 take up OGC, that we -- it should be its own
14 subcommittee because it's a very large
15 issue, and the other two larger topics of
16 Government Structure and Preserving
17 Institutional Knowledge already have so many
18 sub-bullets that we're trying to go through
19 as a subcommittee.

20 So since we intentionally put OGC as a
21 separate, broader topic, if I'm kind of
22 looking at it like I'm an attorney, we
23 excluded that from our charge as a
24 subcommittee because we prioritized
25 different subtopics and broader topics.

1 And so we did discuss that in our
2 subcommittee and determined that if we
3 started down OGC, it would take up -- it
4 would be time consuming. It would take up
5 all of our time, and that we need to focus
6 on the priorities that our Commission of the
7 whole voted on.

8 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Mr. Hagan.

9 COMMISSIONER HAGAN: Thank you,
10 Mr. Chairman. And I apologize; I wasn't
11 able to be at the meeting where we
12 prioritized all of our -- went through the
13 list, prioritized them all. I did, however,
14 turn mine in.

15 And so I guess my question to you,
16 Mr. Chairman, for you to opine on a little
17 bit, is we've got a list that you've given
18 us, and then we were to prioritize them.

19 If all of those items could then be
20 lumped into some other subcommittee, what
21 was the real purpose for us to prioritize as
22 opposed to just making three big boxes and
23 putting them all in there for them all to be
24 discussed? Do you understand what I'm
25 saying?

1 I mean, I don't know why we went through
2 the exercise of prioritizing if they were
3 just all going to be brought up again.

4 The second point -- and I'll let you
5 jump in on that question 'cause that is kind
6 of a question -- is that if we start doing
7 this, my concern is that the recommendations
8 that come back to the whole Commission as a
9 body is going to be either watered down
10 because there's going to be so many broad
11 topics that's going to be talked about and
12 so many different opinions on it, as opposed
13 to -- and I'm just taking my subcommittee.
14 For example, we've got a very specific topic
15 that we're attacking and going to try to get
16 as much of the specificity out of it as we
17 can and zero in on that one issue.

18 If you take a subcommittee and you just
19 have all these different topics that you
20 talked about, then it's just going to get
21 watered down; you're going to run out of
22 time; and that's going to create an issue
23 when it comes back to the Commission.

24 So those are just my comments. I'm
25 sorry I wasn't able to be at the meeting.

1 But if you'll opine on the first question I
2 asked.

3 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: I will, but I want
4 to finish with the remaining speakers.

5 We have Mr. Schellenberg for the second
6 time.

7 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Through the
8 Chair to the Committee.

9 I understand where everybody is. I
10 understand that there's some people that
11 might know actually the sausage-making at
12 City Hall. But I'm on the committee partly
13 because I can tell you how they actually
14 work. And I understand all the areas in
15 which you're working on because the Council
16 has never acted on some areas of the city,
17 and they have never made it priority.

18 But to my conversation and my breadth of
19 contacts, if you dismiss the OGC, they're
20 going to look at it -- and I'm not trying to
21 be arrogant. Everybody I talked to say, Are
22 you dealing with the OGC?

23 Well, I was involved in the OGC. I see
24 currently, over the last nine months or
25 year, how it's operating and how they relate

1 with other independent authorities. There's
2 an issue that needs to be dealt with. And,
3 yes, I would put it as the top -- in all my
4 things, when you asked me priority, I
5 basically said the OGC is the most important
6 aspect of this committee, mostly because of
7 what is happening right now in the city and
8 his relationships with all the independent
9 authorities.

10 And all I'm saying is, yes, you can
11 dismiss it. I didn't want to belabor it
12 when they were doing committees 'cause I
13 always thought that we can bring it up in
14 the committee. Now, I don't want three
15 committees to do it, but I thought the one
16 that I was involved in would actually
17 discuss it.

18 And even if it took all two months
19 dealing with the OGC, that is the most
20 important thing that we do going forward,
21 because he is the most powerful person in
22 the City of Jacksonville, without question.

23 Thank you.

24 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Judge Swanson.

25 JUDGE SWANSON: Operator error. I

1 really didn't need to make any additional
2 comment.

3 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: All right. So I
4 will read from the transcript beginning on
5 page 100. And as the context of this, there
6 had been a discussion, as I referenced in
7 what I'm about to read, where Ms. Jameson
8 had asked about duplication and topics --
9 subtopics being within other subtopics and
10 how are we going to address that and deal
11 with it. It obviously led to the motion by
12 Ms. Baker removing that duplication as it
13 related to Preserving Institutional
14 Knowledge in topic A and moving into topic
15 B, which was OGC. I already read through
16 the minutes on the motions related to OGC.

17 Here is what I said at that meeting.
18 Page 100, line 1: Mr. Brock: Yes -- the
19 question was: Will subcommittees be able to
20 consider other issues -- excuse me. This is
21 on page 99. I feel like a Court reading a
22 deposition.

23 This is on page 99, and beginning at
24 line 22, and it's a question by Commissioner
25 Howland: Will the subcommittees be able to

1 consider other issues besides what are the
2 comments under each subcommittee on this
3 issues list?

4 Moving to page 100, Chairperson Brock:
5 Yes, to the extent that the subcommittees go
6 into areas -- again, these sub-bullet points
7 were merely meant as guidance. They are not
8 defined boundaries, and that was precisely
9 in response to Ms. Jameson's question in
10 there about the duplication, was precisely
11 in case we went into something, that one
12 priority topic took over another, that we
13 were still going to have those items being
14 addressed.

15 So to the extent -- and I'll go back to
16 that. And, Judge, I'm going to give you the
17 minutes and this transcript because it will
18 come up in your subcommittee, because that's
19 where I believe it should.

20 So, again, to the extent there are
21 issues that fall within the broad topics
22 that you have, and they are not listed on
23 there, then, yes, you can go into them.

24 Your rationale that OGC was taken out,
25 that OGC was not voted on as one of the top

1 priorities is a valid rationale for your
2 decision in not moving into it. And you can
3 go through, for your own guidance, and see
4 the margin of votes in there if you're
5 looking for direction and sentiment of the
6 Commission as a whole.

7 But that was -- my recollection is that,
8 yes, you as Chairs have that discretion. I
9 think looking at votes that have been done,
10 looking at discussions that have been had by
11 the Commission as a whole, can guide your
12 decisions in those, you know, in making
13 those priorities, and in the areas to where
14 your subcommittee will go.

15 I do not believe -- and I do not want us
16 to re-vote on priorities. That's
17 subcommittee work within your individual
18 subcommittees as to where you're going to
19 deal with it.

20 OGC is a broad topic. It's an important
21 topic. But it is probably one that, if it
22 were to go in there, would usurp all your
23 time and effort. And that's a decision for
24 that subcommittee.

25 But I just -- I wanted to read that from

1 the transcript on there. Like I said,
2 Judge, I'm going to give you all of this so
3 that you have this background when the issue
4 comes up in your next subcommittee.

5 I see you on the cue.

6 JUDGE SWANSON: I heard you, and I got
7 it. But, in essence, what we have done by
8 that assessment is re-prioritized the
9 subcommittee tasking because, as you just
10 noted, the General Counsel topic is a topic
11 that could consume any single subcommittee.
12 And to the extent that we as a subcommittee
13 elected to go down that road, it may be at
14 the expense of all other issues that were
15 prioritized by this Commission in front of
16 or ahead of the General Counsel topic.

17 So what you are doing is delegating to
18 the subcommittee the discretion to ignore
19 prioritized topics of the Commission as a
20 whole and to ignore, or at least sublimate a
21 vote by the Commission as a whole to
22 prioritize the General Counsel below those
23 other topics.

24 Now, if that's the ruling of the Chair,
25 we will deal with it. But I don't want to

1 be in a position of going forward on that
2 topic without the Commission as a whole
3 understanding and, more importantly,
4 acquiescing in the path that we may -- or
5 the course that we may take.

6 So I don't know that I need to say any
7 more about that. I think we -- as a
8 subcommittee, we've expressed the issues
9 that confront us, and if that's the position
10 of the Commission of the whole, that you're
11 comfortable with us prioritizing a topic
12 that was not listed at the expense of two
13 topics that were listed, we'll go forth and
14 do it, potentially.

15 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: And the response to
16 that, I am not saying to disregard the vote
17 of the Commission as a whole as to the
18 importance of the priorities under those.

19 And to the extent that one that was
20 specifically voted not to have its own
21 subcommittee is going to usurp the other
22 priorities that were voted on, then I think
23 that would be wrong. That's why I said,
24 your assessment and, you know, determination
25 of, Hey, this was specifically pulled out;

1 we've got enough on our plate to deal with
2 these two topics, is a valid one, especially
3 looking back at the transcript and the
4 votes.

5 JUDGE SWANSON: Would it be out of line
6 for myself, as a subcommittee chairman, to
7 request a vote of the Commission as a whole
8 that would authorize us the discretion to
9 pursue the General Counsel topic, or would
10 that be something you just would rather
11 leave to the discretion of the subcommittee?

12 Quite frankly, I'm uncomfortable. And
13 I'm uncomfortable for the two reasons I've
14 stated. One, this was not an item that was
15 prioritized; and, two, it was specifically
16 removed by vote from our topic listing.

17 And the reason I'm uncomfortable is --
18 this is a big topic. I'm not suggesting
19 that I don't think it's important. I think
20 I prioritized it as number one personally;
21 but I'm here as -- in service to the
22 Commission as a whole as a Chair of a
23 subcommittee, and I don't want to do
24 something that is rogue.

25 I'm comfortable pursuing this, and I can

1 see that this may take up all of our -- all
2 the oxygen in the room for our subcommittee;
3 but I would certainly like -- if that's
4 something we have the discretion to do, I
5 would like the Commission as a whole to
6 acquiesce in that before I go down that
7 path.

8 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: So are you making a
9 motion to --

10 JUDGE SWANSON: I can, or I can defer to
11 one of the subcommittee members, or I can
12 sit here mute and not -- I've expressed my
13 concerns. I'm not going to make the motion,
14 because you told me I've got the discretion
15 at the subcommittee level to pursue this.

16 So I'm not going to make the motion, but
17 I can tell you that I would certainly
18 appreciate somebody else making the motion,
19 and I would appreciate a vote on the topic.

20 But if you -- and I'm not being
21 confrontational, because I don't mean it
22 that way at all.

23 But if you perceive that you've
24 addressed this issue and we don't need to
25 address it further, I'll deal with it; but

1 if on the other hand somebody on the
2 Commission would like to make a motion, I
3 would appreciate it.

4 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Let's see. I think
5 I have Mr. Griggs for the second time.

6 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Thank you,
7 Mr. Chairman.

8 I, like Judge Swanson, I'm uncomfortable
9 too, and maybe it's for a different reason.

10 I didn't know we were making final
11 decisions on this Commission until this
12 Commission had adjourned.

13 It was my understanding that when we
14 prioritized the list, that that would be a
15 guideline for how everything would be --
16 fall into different categories. I did not
17 know that the prioritization would also
18 extend into the subcommittee work. You
19 know, I didn't -- that wasn't my
20 understanding; because if that was, then we
21 probably perhaps should have moved forward
22 with exploring multiple committees.

23 It was my understanding that, in the
24 interest of reducing the amount of
25 subcommittees, that we would gather or group

1 these areas -- led by some of the
2 priorities, we would group these areas so
3 that we could minimize the number of
4 subcommittees we were having. That was my
5 understanding. Not that the prioritization
6 extended into the subcommittee work.

7 It's my understanding that the
8 subcommittees have the discretion to do
9 whatever work they want to do. Case in
10 point: Our subcommittee is very narrow. We
11 only have one thing.

12 So it bothers me, really it does,
13 that -- for us to be having a conversation
14 and to be given the impression, not only to
15 us but to the public, that things -- that
16 items are dead and can no longer be
17 discussed or considered. And I don't think
18 that's fair. I don't think that's fair to
19 this Commission; I don't think that's fair
20 to the public.

21 If people want to know -- what if
22 someone walked in here and had another great
23 idea and a subcommittee had already decided
24 it wasn't a priority? Do we then explain to
25 the public we already considered it before

1 they walked into the room? I don't think
2 that's fair.

3 Now, I'm not advocating for anything one
4 way or the other. I just want to see the
5 process followed the way I thought that it
6 was going down, and it doesn't seem like
7 that to me. It seems like -- I'm going to
8 say it again so I can be clear.

9 It was my understanding that we were
10 prioritizing the list. And when we got to
11 the list, we decided to do groups because we
12 were trying to minimize the number of
13 subcommittees, and those areas went into
14 these particular groups based upon where
15 they were.

16 I did not know that those
17 prioritizations extended into the
18 subcommittee work. That's not -- that
19 wasn't my understanding. Because, if it is,
20 we only have one Urban Core Service -- Urban
21 Services District Subcommittee. We have one
22 priority there, one thing to do, and you've
23 got other groups that have multiple things
24 to consider.

25 So it doesn't sound like to me that that

1 makes a lot of sense, if that is the
2 rationale. Thank you.

3 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Ms. Jameson.

4 COMMISSIONER JAMESON: Thank you. I
5 hate to have you read through those
6 transcripts again, but I would like to
7 remind the group that -- and it's
8 interesting that you brought this up even
9 though you weren't at the meeting.

10 Ms. Liska did have a very interesting
11 idea to take all of our topics and create
12 three subcommittees from all of those
13 topics, and ultimately that was voted down,
14 if I believe -- if that's correct.

15 So by doing that -- again to this
16 conversation of we did purposefully decide
17 that we wanted to have certain priorities
18 and not have every topic in here as
19 subcommittees.

20 So I would like to maybe be reminded of
21 that. I believe that that was a motion that
22 I do think that we did ultimately vote on.

23 And then I would also like to discuss,
24 as you had mentioned, Mr. Chair, that the
25 decision of the subcommittee is the standing

1 decision.

2 We did have a discussion at our very
3 first meeting about this topic, and we
4 decided that this was not a topic we were
5 going to pursue. So we have made a decision
6 on that one.

7 JUDGE SWANSON: Well, we did. But, in
8 fairness, I think it was against the
9 backdrop of a perception that the priorities
10 that you just discussed, as voted on by the
11 Commission as a whole, were outcome
12 determinative. That was certainly my
13 approach.

14 So if that's -- that's why I've sought
15 some guidance.

16 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: And I'll address
17 that comment, but I'll let Ms. Baker speak.

18 COMMISSIONER BAKER: It was my
19 understanding we had nine broad topics that
20 we all thought were very, very important
21 issues, and we listed them. And it was my
22 understanding that we decided to prioritize
23 them because we knew that we don't have a
24 lot of time. We have eight months to make
25 recommendations.

1 And although all of these nine topics
2 were very important topics, we knew we
3 needed to narrow it down as a group to
4 address the topics that we felt were the
5 most important at this time to address.
6 That doesn't mean that these other topics
7 aren't important or that the -- you know,
8 that the public would like to see additional
9 topics discussed; but because we only have
10 eight months, that was my understanding as
11 to why we prioritized the list and again why
12 we voted to not make three subcommittees of
13 all nine topics. That's just my take.

14 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Mr. Schellenberg.

15 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: (Inaudible.)

16 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Apparently yours is
17 not working. Okay. Then Mr. McCoy.

18 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Because this is
19 really like specific and germane to our
20 committee, I would like to have our
21 committee just discuss it next week, and
22 we'll come up with a thing.

23 We already have -- we have an
24 understanding from our Chair that says, Hey,
25 you guys have the latitude to add to it.

1 Let's go on and make that discussion in our
2 thing if we're going to add to it. If we
3 are, we can determine how much. We do not
4 have to take the whole thing up. You know,
5 we did kind of discuss that. We can make it
6 real narrow if we need to, or we could just
7 not do it.

8 But I believe that this is real specific
9 to our committee, so I think we just need to
10 take it to our committee and kind of go from
11 there.

12 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Mr. Schellenberg.

13 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: (Inaudible.)

14 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay. Research was
15 kind enough to point me to, Ms. Jameson,
16 what you've recalled; yes, Ms. Liska -- it's
17 on page 48 -- that she made her motion to
18 merge all of them, for us to cover all
19 topics.

20 We -- that was voted down, and we then
21 went through a process of defining and
22 identifying all of -- you know, exactly what
23 we were voting on, exactly what we were
24 prioritizing. And several motions were made
25 to include General Counsel as a topic. They

1 were all voted down. After the
2 prioritizing, and General Counsel did not
3 make it into the top three, all motions to
4 add General Counsel in were voted down.

5 That's why I said, Judge, if you're
6 looking for ratification or, you know, a DCA
7 on your opinion, then I said, Yes, your
8 making that determination at the committee
9 level based upon what had transpired in our
10 discussions is a valid and rational decision
11 in that.

12 What I had said, admittedly, that, yeah,
13 other topics were open, and simply because
14 it wasn't listed, it didn't mean you
15 couldn't consider it.

16 So -- and, you know, I thought everybody
17 understood the context of how that was
18 meant. In particular, it originally
19 generated out of Ms. Jameson's questions
20 about areas of duplication. Well, if it's
21 in this one, but we didn't vote it as a
22 priority but it's kind of in this one, can
23 we still go there?

24 I would note that we specifically voted
25 unanimously to remove OGC, the OGC

1 sub-bullet point, or bullet point, from
2 Institutional Knowledge -- Preserving
3 Institutional Knowledge into the OGC
4 directly.

5 So when I look at that from the view of
6 the Commission as a whole, your decision
7 that we have these affirmed priorities of
8 Preserving Institutional Knowledge and
9 Government Structure, those -- we have an
10 affirming vote on pursuing those. That's
11 why I said, to usurp those or, you know,
12 push aside those priorities that have been
13 voted on by the Commission as a whole, in
14 favor of a topic that was not voted on by
15 the Commission as a whole, would be improper
16 because it would not be reflecting the vote
17 of the Commission as a whole.

18 And that was why I mentioned that, in
19 looking at the decision that was made, I
20 think it's a valid decision.

21 Yes, sir.

22 JUDGE SWANSON: For clarity, the ruling
23 of the Chair is that it would be improper
24 for us to pursue issues related to General
25 Counsel in light of the votes, the past

1 votes, that were taken by the Commission as
2 a whole.

3 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: The ruling of the
4 Chair is that the vote and the action that
5 was previously taken by the subcommittee was
6 proper. That's what I would say, is that
7 the action that you've already taken at the
8 subcommittee level is proper; it's within
9 your discretion. And in my review of the
10 transcript and the minutes, and the votes
11 that were taken, it's valid.

12 Ms. Liska.

13 COMMISSIONER LISKA: I thought I had
14 removed myself from the cue; but since I was
15 called up, I'll just quickly say, I'm here
16 for the same reason as everybody. I just
17 care about good government. I feel like we
18 could discuss, you know, details of OGC.

19 I'm just -- you know, I'm here -- I've
20 been sitting here; I've listened to the
21 speakers who have come before us. I know --
22 I'm a big believer in the structure and
23 chairpersons and people running committees
24 and making rulings. I believe in all of
25 that.

1 I just can't get it out of my head how I
2 left that one meeting that day, the last
3 time we met as a full commission, saying we
4 had the right to take up what we want. Now
5 I'm hearing your committee -- excuse me,
6 through the Chair, the Judge's committee has
7 taken up the issue.

8 It is a big disappointment that it
9 appears as though it will not be taken up
10 again. Certainly it's the one area citizens
11 have asked me about the most of every issue
12 we're considering, but I know how -- this
13 Commission has certainly taught me how to
14 advocate outside of the Charter Revision
15 Commission. And certainly maybe is -- or
16 individual citizens, that's needed.

17 So I'm disappointed, but I certainly
18 appreciate the structure. I think I know
19 where this has come to. I think I
20 understand what the Judge just said, what
21 the Chair just said; but it's certainly --
22 other than the subsequent meeting of the
23 subcommittee, I will have to say, Mr. Chair,
24 it's not how I felt the day I walked out of
25 here when the charge was given to the

1 subcommittees.

2 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Mr. Schellenberg.

3 If you'll --

4 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: So I think
5 this is so important that that's why I bring
6 it back up. Apparently, this has gone on
7 for 50 minutes or so. Clearly, I didn't
8 think it was going to be eliminated. I
9 thought by the action that we could bring it
10 up in a subcommittee.

11 You know, I hate to be repetitive. But
12 both inside City Hall and outside City Hall,
13 I have never been more attune to the
14 problems with the OGC issue. Nothing else
15 comes up, although they're all good. But if
16 you're eliminating the most important thing,
17 the most powerful person in Jacksonville and
18 you're not discussing it, wow.

19 Then the next question is, I understand
20 you set these commissions up. I want to ask
21 Ms. Paige Johnston, can I have another
22 meeting that's not authorized that only has
23 CRC members and have a committee about,
24 specifically, the OGC, or does it come
25 directly from the Chair?

1 If I decide to have a meeting and notice
2 the meeting, make sure that it's
3 appropriate, can I have a specific committee
4 inside CRC to discuss OGC?

5 MS. JOHNSTON: Through the Chair to the
6 Commission, I may have to think about that
7 and look into that further.

8 My inclination would be to say you can
9 have a noticed meeting and invite other
10 members of the CRC to attend to discuss, but
11 I don't know that you can establish a
12 subcommittee on your own.

13 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: I don't
14 think so either. That's why I -- I can have
15 a noticed meeting, specifically discuss the
16 issue on OGC if my committee decides to
17 overrule me and decide going forward; is
18 that correct?

19 Is that right, Ms. Johnston?

20 MS. JOHNSTON: Through the Chair, I
21 don't believe you can establish your own
22 subcommittee.

23 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Great.
24 Great. Thank you.

25 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: And what I would ask

1 this Commission and every member to do --
2 well, I see Judge Swanson.

3 JUDGE SWANSON: I appreciate
4 Mr. Schellenberg's comments, I truly do, and
5 I really think the subcommittee could have
6 guidance beyond just the Chair if we would
7 just have a motion and a second to address
8 whether or not the Commission as a whole
9 felt it was proper for us to pursue the
10 issue of General Counsel. Because I can
11 tell you, as a Chair, based on the comments
12 of the subcommittee, based upon the votes
13 that were taken, and based upon the comments
14 of the Chair, I will not pursue issues
15 related to the General Counsel in the
16 subcommittee because I feel like the trump
17 card has been played.

18 So the only way that I'm going to
19 deviate from that is if the Commission as a
20 whole gives me the latitude, specific
21 latitude, to go there. And it's for the
22 reasons that the Chair has said, the voting
23 that has taken place on the issues and the
24 movement of things from the listing of
25 topics to -- the General Counsel and then

1 the prioritization of General Counsel down,
2 I just don't feel I have the discretion to
3 do that in face of all those votes.

4 So if we are going to pursue that as a
5 subcommittee, I'm telling the Commission as
6 a whole right now, I will not pursue that
7 unless I have a sense from the Commission as
8 a whole that that's an appropriate act on
9 the part of the subcommittee.

10 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Mr. McCoy.

11 COMMISSIONER McCOY: I'm trying to get
12 this to move to my committee so, therefore,
13 I move that the CRC allows the Government
14 Structure subcommittee to deal with the
15 topic of Office of General Counsel.

16 UNKNOWN: Second.

17 UNKNOWN: Second.

18 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay. I've got a
19 question about having the motion on this
20 issue if it's not specifically in our
21 notice.

22 Ms. Johnston, is it appropriate for us
23 to take up this issue?

24 MS. JOHNSTON: Through the Chair, you
25 have subcommittee updates and discussion on

1 your agenda. I would suggest that that
2 would enable you to discuss matters
3 concerning the subcommittee.

4 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay. So there has
5 been a motion and a second. Any discussion?

6 Mr. Hagan.

7 COMMISSIONER HAGAN: Thank you,
8 Mr. Chairman, and I guess maybe this is a
9 question for Ms. Johnston.

10 Because there was a motion and a second
11 and a vote at the prioritizing meeting of
12 not taking it up, is this a -- would this be
13 more of a -- to reconsider? Because as of
14 right now we're going right against what was
15 the motion and all the votes in the passage
16 of the last motion.

17 So do you see what I'm saying? I want
18 to make sure that we're in the right
19 posture.

20 MS. JOHNSTON: Through the Chair. From
21 what I've heard of the discussion, it would
22 appear that there is an attempt by the
23 Commission to gain some clarification as to
24 what was voted on and ranked at the last
25 meeting.

1 So to the extent that you're seeking to
2 clarify with regards to the last meeting, I
3 think you're able to do that.

4 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Mr. Griggs.

5 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Thank you,
6 Mr. Chair.

7 It's my interpretation that Mr. McCoy's
8 motion is to take up a topic in a
9 subcommittee. And from what I recall, we
10 could take up topics in subcommittees, even
11 if they weren't -- I could move it to Urban
12 Services District if I wanted to.

13 I mean, if Mr. Denton wanted to make a
14 motion that we take it up in Urban Services
15 District, we could move a topic to a
16 subcommittee. Am I clear? Is that what I'm
17 hearing? That's the intent of the motion,
18 to take up a topic in a subcommittee?

19 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: That is the motion
20 currently on the floor, is for Preserving
21 Institutional Knowledge and Government
22 Structure subcommittee to take up the topic
23 of General Counsel's Office.

24 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Okay.

25 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Your hypothetical

1 for Urban Services taking it up, I would
2 question it unless it had a relation to --

3 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Unless we made
4 some type of point.

5 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yeah. There would
6 need to be some sort of connection.

7 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: My clarification
8 here is, is that the attempt is to address a
9 topic, not specific to a topic, whatever the
10 topic is. That's my process point here.
11 So is that intent, is to revisit or look at
12 a particular topic?

13 I'm asking the person who made the
14 motion.

15 COMMISSIONER McCOY: The attempt is --
16 so as the Judge has already stated, to gain
17 specific clarification and permission from
18 the body of the CRC to take that topic up in
19 Government Structure, as we have had votes
20 that say one thing; but then, when the
21 Commission Chair says you have the latitude
22 to add something there, regardless of what
23 the whole body decided as a body they were
24 going to take up, we could still take up
25 this topic.

1 So just to make sure that we have
2 specific clarification on it, if the body
3 now votes and says, Hey, you do have that
4 latitude to deal with a topic that -- even
5 though we said as a body we won't take, but
6 as a subcommittee you can take. So that was
7 the intent.

8 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Thank you.

9 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Ms. Baker.

10 COMMISSIONER BAKER: I'm very
11 uncomfortable voting on this because, as a
12 full commission, we all prioritized these
13 broad topics. We are missing three of our
14 Commission members, so they don't have a say
15 if we're going -- basically, I feel like
16 we're going back to re-prioritizing all nine
17 broad topics.

18 And so I feel very uncomfortable making
19 this decision because we don't have people
20 who should be here who prioritized
21 themselves OGC somewhere in those nine. I
22 don't know where.

23 I would like -- also, as we've already
24 stated, this is our subcommittee, our
25 Government Structure subcommittee. I

1 believe it is up to our subcommittee to make
2 a determination about whether we should
3 proceed looking into OGC, because we have a
4 lot of other issues to look at.

5 And so I would like to amend the motion,
6 if it's proper, to allow our subcommittee to
7 make that determination.

8 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay. There's --
9 what is that? Is that a motion to table?

10 MS. JOHNSTON: Through the Chair, that
11 would be a substitute motion. You would
12 need a second, and then you would have to
13 vote on the substitute motion. And if that
14 was successful, it would replace the
15 original motion.

16 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: And then we would
17 vote on substitute --

18 MS. JOHNSTON: And then you would vote
19 on the original motion as amended.

20 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay.

21 UNKNOWN: Second.

22 MS. JOHNSTON: So she's -- yeah. So
23 you'd need a second.

24 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: We got a second.

25 MS. JOHNSTON: You'd discuss the

1 substitute motion, and then you'd take a
2 vote on that.

3 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: All right. So we're
4 now on the substitute motion.

5 I had Ms. Jameson on the cue. Are you
6 speaking on the substitute motion to move it
7 back to the subcommittee for determination
8 of the priority?

9 COMMISSIONER JAMESON: Yes. Thank you.
10 You know, sitting here and thinking
11 about this more, I guess I'm more conflicted
12 and confused than I think we initially were
13 with this conversation.

14 I feel like we already have a
15 determination out of our subcommittee. I
16 agree with Ms. Baker's concerns that this is
17 reprioritizing when we don't have three of
18 our members here.

19 I think that each of these subcommittees
20 should be able to determine their own
21 priorities. I don't necessarily think that
22 this body should vote to say, Yes, your
23 subcommittees can come up with your own
24 priorities.

25 So I think that this is kind of setting

1 a bad stage for one particular subcommittee.
2 And then other subcommittees, do they have
3 to come to the full body to ask for
4 permission to come up with their own
5 priorities?

6 So I guess I'm more conflicted now than
7 I was before. But I would agree that I
8 think that our priorities should be
9 determined in our subcommittee.

10 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Mr. Hagan, you're on
11 the substitute motion? Okay.

12 COMMISSIONER HAGAN: Thank you,
13 Mr. Chairman. And I will echo Ms. Baker and
14 Ms. Jameson and what they're saying. I
15 think that if we're going down this -- this
16 is kind of a slippery slope.

17 If we start going down this, we might as
18 well just go ahead and reprioritize and --
19 do a whole 'nother noticed meeting and go
20 ahead and reprioritize, because then you can
21 start -- I mean, because then it's like
22 there's no reason to even have the
23 prioritizing meeting, like I mentioned
24 before, if you just lump everything into
25 everything else, and we'll just talk about

1 every other item.

2 So that's why I think it was
3 important -- this body has already made a
4 determination on what the three major topics
5 were. If that committee wants to have the
6 -- if that subcommittee wants to have the
7 conversation, then let them have the
8 conversation. So that's why I supported our
9 second and Ms. Baker's motion.

10 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Mr. Schellenberg.

11 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: I'll pass.

12 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: You'll pass. Okay.

13 Mr. Griggs. Oh. Well, Mr. Griggs
14 already spoke. So, yes, Mr. McCoy.

15 COMMISSIONER McCOY: I just want to make
16 sure I clarify for my fellow committee
17 members, that's the goal of my original
18 motion, to get it into our stuff so that we
19 can discuss it, so we can stop discussing it
20 in front of the body. That was the original
21 intent.

22 So I think that even the substitute
23 motion still does what I was trying to do,
24 which is making sure that there is
25 clarification for our Chair's sake because,

1 again, we had votes really on a different
2 topic.

3 It wasn't saying that you couldn't take
4 this up. It was just saying it wasn't going
5 to be a committee on its own; right?

6 And then we also had that little line in
7 our list of things in -- I think it was the
8 Government Structure where we had OGC,
9 dealing in there. But because of what
10 happened at the previous meeting, we thought
11 that that was supposed to be lumped in with
12 something else.

13 Either way, the goal is, for our
14 committee to be able to deal with it and
15 have the latitude to deal with it, and that
16 the Chair has the comfortability dealing
17 with it, because we technically then deal
18 with it.

19 The Chair has said, Hey, we voted that
20 we weren't going to do anything as a body.
21 And so in order for us to get past that and
22 to make sure that we have the latitude and
23 our Chair feels comfortable with it, so that
24 we can just take it into our thing and say,
25 Hey, we either are going to deal with this

1 or we're not going to deal with it. That's
2 the goal of the original motion, and I think
3 the substitute motion still does the goal.

4 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: So are you
5 withdrawing your original motion for the
6 substitute?

7 COMMISSIONER McCOY: I'm leaving them
8 both up because they both do what I want.

9 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay.

10 UNKNOWN: (Inaudible.)

11 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yes. You're not --
12 okay. Well --

13 COMMISSIONER BAKER: Well, I don't want
14 to withdraw my substitute motion.

15 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay. So we're
16 still on the substitute.

17 Ms. Liska.

18 COMMISSIONER LISKA: Well, it was the
19 Chairman of the committee who asked for a
20 motion for direction by the full Commission.
21 That's the only thing I can say about -- the
22 substitute motion makes it completely
23 unviable, and we're back to square one from
24 about an hour and 15 minutes ago, as I view
25 it, if we move forward with that motion,

1 because the Judge did ask for a rather
2 specific type of motion.

3 So I would say we let stand -- we vote
4 down the substitute motion, if that's the
5 vote that's coming next.

6 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Mr. Schellenberg.

7 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: You know,
8 when you're elected, you learn how to count
9 votes. And I can count the votes, and I'm
10 pretty sure that Mr. McCoy's first motion is
11 going to pass, and I think that's an
12 affirmation for the committee to move
13 forward and discuss the General Counsel.

14 I hate to be damn repetitive, but if you
15 ignore the most important thing and the most
16 powerful person in Jacksonville, at least
17 not review it, I'm not sure -- and I'm not
18 sure -- and by the way, I also can count in
19 the subcommittee, and right now I think it's
20 probably 50/50, and that's not what I want.

21 So I'm counting the votes. The Chair
22 has asked specifically for moving forward.
23 And I'd rather have the vote on the whole
24 Council giving the Chair like -- to a
25 certain extent, some authority to move

1 forward without being overwritten and not
2 discussing it in subcommittee, 'cause I'm
3 going to be there, and I'll probably keep on
4 aggravating the committee, because this is
5 what we should be discussing.

6 And it won't take -- everybody talks
7 about taking a long time. No, it won't take
8 a long time. You talk about a few people;
9 you vote; you move forward; and see if
10 there's any changes that need to be done in
11 the OGC office about how he's elected, how
12 he's appointed, and how he -- it won't take
13 that long.

14 So to say that this one issue will
15 consume all our time, I think that's the
16 elephant in the room, and it won't. And we
17 should move forward with credibility and the
18 committee to do the right thing. Thank you.
19 I hate that term, by the way.

20 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Let's see.
21 Mr. Howland, first time.

22 COMMISSIONER HOWLAND: Thank you,
23 Mr. Chair. A quick question, and then I
24 want to make a comment, and maybe you can
25 answer the question.

1 But can you reiterate specifically the
2 motion and the substitute motion? But
3 before that, I just want to say I'm inclined
4 to allow a subcommittee to be able to vote
5 in a committee to make a decision on whether
6 they want to discuss an additional topic.

7 Then if you -- if I shift and I say my
8 specific opinion on the attorney -- or the
9 General Counsel topic, I would say that,
10 looking back to Rick Mullaney's discussion
11 when he was here, the General Counsel is
12 part of the fabric of our government, tying
13 it together. So I like the structure.

14 And I think maybe just because there are
15 folks who maybe disagree with an opinion of
16 a current General Counsel doesn't mean we
17 should change the structure as it is,
18 because there may be a time where someone
19 else disagrees with such opinion. It's
20 almost like FDR packing the Court, you know.

21 So, to me, you know, if we want to look
22 at that, I would look at maybe how we
23 appoint the General Counsel, as in an aspect
24 of changing it, if it comes down to it; but
25 that was my fourth or fifth priority when I

1 looked at prioritization. And all that
2 said, if the subcommittee wants to take it
3 up, I would agree.

4 And for clarification, so I know which
5 motion I would support and which I wouldn't,
6 I would just like to know the distinction
7 between the two. Thank you.

8 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: So the original
9 motion by Mr. McCoy --

10 UNKNOWN: (Inaudible.)

11 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yeah, I know. I was
12 answering his question -- was for the
13 Commission as a whole to vote to -- as
14 clarification, to permit the Government
15 Structure subcommittee to consider, if it
16 chooses, the issue of Office of General
17 Counsel.

18 The substitute motion was, before the
19 Commission as a whole says that, now that
20 we've had all this discussion, for the
21 subcommittee itself to go back and decide if
22 it were to take up the OGC.

23 Did I restate that correctly?

24 Okay. Do you understand the
25 distinctions?

1 COMMISSIONER McCOY: I do.

2 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay. Mr. Griggs.

3 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Thank you,
4 Mr. Chairman.

5 To move the conversation and the meeting
6 along, I'm going to support the motion and
7 the amendment.

8 But I think my concern comes in where I
9 think it should be up to the subcommittee to
10 decide which direction -- with all deference
11 to the Chair, which direction they should
12 head. And the reason why I am for that is
13 because what we're about to do is we're
14 about to set precedent for future work on
15 this Commission should something come up
16 that needs to be considered that -- and the
17 subcommittee is, you know, sort of strapped
18 in terms of how they should make a decision.
19 You know, that Chairperson is going to want
20 to come back here to the full body to get,
21 you know, clarification. And that may be
22 holding up the work that needs to be done.
23 That concerns me because I don't think
24 we've heard all of the ideas and all of
25 the -- excuse me -- all of the potential

1 recommendations that we could possibly
2 consider. And if we are boxing ourselves in
3 because we're, you know, trying to give some
4 clearer directions, then we may be hurting
5 ourselves along, you know, down the road.
6 That's my only thing.

7 I agree that we do need clarification,
8 but I would hope that the subcommittee would
9 consider that on their own, and be able to
10 handle that on their own, given the fact
11 that there was some ambiguities about this
12 topic going into the subcommittee work.

13 That's my only thing. I'm concerned
14 that this -- we're setting a process
15 precedent that may hurt some of the work
16 that we have to do maybe in the next month
17 or so. Thank you.

18 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Ms. Baker.

19 COMMISSIONER BAKER: For clarification,
20 on my substitute amendment to the motion, I
21 do agree, Commissioner Griggs, that we
22 should, as subcommittees, be able to
23 determine what we're going to be working on.
24 However, to be blunt, I don't agree that any
25 subcommittee can just take up any issue that

1 is unrelated to the broad topic that was
2 voted on by the Commission of the whole.

3 So to be blunt, if your subcommittee is
4 talking about Urban Services District and
5 you, as a subcommittee, decide to take up
6 OGC, I do not think that was in your charge
7 as a subcommittee. And I want to just
8 clarify with our Chair that that was our
9 intention of prioritizing all of the broad
10 topics.

11 And to further -- and to further, to say
12 more, my understanding of taking up other
13 sub-bullets that weren't listed as our
14 sub-bullets was maybe there was something in
15 Preserving Institutional Knowledge that is
16 not listed here; but, you know, maybe
17 there's another idea that would help further
18 promote Preserving Institutional Knowledge.
19 It wasn't taking up other sub-bullets that
20 have nothing to do with Preserving
21 Institutional Knowledge. Does that make
22 sense?

23 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yes.

24 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: So -- I'm sorry,
25 Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to respond to

1 that. And I'm going to go -- thank you,
2 Commissioner Baker, for the comments. But I
3 want to go back to what Chairman Brock
4 mentioned earlier when he read the minutes.

5 He said to the -- you know, commenting
6 on --

7 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Mr. Griggs, I've got
8 other people that have not spoken on this.

9 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Okay. Can I come
10 back?

11 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yes. I thought you
12 were just going to address --

13 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: I was. I am
14 addressing, but I just wanted to make the
15 point that you said that we could pick up --
16 subcommittees could pick up if they crossed
17 over. There may be an area that crosses
18 over into another area that is in our
19 subcommittee that we certainly need to
20 address, and I would hate that we would not
21 be able to do that.

22 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Understood.

23 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Thank you.

24 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Ms. Jameson.

25 COMMISSIONER JAMESON: Yes. I have a

1 clarifying question for Ms. Johnston.

2 If we have made a determination in our
3 subcommittee on this topic, what is the
4 process here then to perhaps undermine that
5 decision that has been made?

6 MS. JOHNSTON: Through the Chair.

7 I don't want to speak directly to
8 intent, but I believe that Mr. Swanson was
9 saying that he requested clarification
10 because it impacted the way he addressed it.

11 So I don't want to speak for members of
12 the Commission, but I -- and he's not
13 sitting at his desk right here so I can't
14 say, Could you please respond to that?

15 MS. JAMESON: That was bad timing on my
16 behalf.

17 MS. JOHNSTON: But he asked for
18 clarification. The Commission is discussing
19 the clarification. There's been a
20 substitute motion. So this is all part of
21 the discussion. But I don't think there's a
22 legal question in that.

23 I think you can proceed with the
24 discussion toward the vote and make the
25 determination whether it's going to be the

1 subcommittee that makes the determination or
2 the full Commission.

3 COMMISSIONER JAMESON: Thank you.

4 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: I guess it's more a
5 parliamentary procedure in that regard, is
6 the Commission as a whole providing
7 direction with regards to a vote that's
8 already been taken within a subcommittee.

9 MS. JOHNSTON: Well, again, through the
10 Chair. Was the Chair of the committee
11 asking the question of the Commission?

12 So I didn't hear it as a move for
13 reconsideration. I think it was a
14 clarification, so...

15 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: All right.

16 COMMISSIONER JAMESON: Thank you. And
17 with that, I do support the motion -- excuse
18 me -- the substitute, that each subcommittee
19 should be able to determine their own
20 priorities. I do not think that this is
21 solely for our subcommittee. I think that
22 this is, again, for each subcommittee, and
23 those decisions made at your subcommittees,
24 that's where that should stand.

25 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Mr. Denton.

1 COMMISSIONER DENTON: I may be wrong,
2 but I thought this conversation started when
3 Mr. Schellenberg brought it up and said that
4 the Chair of the committee, Judge Swanson,
5 had ruled in the committee that they could
6 not take up this topic.

7 So I don't think there was a vote of the
8 committee. Like him, I can read votes --
9 count votes, so there -- it may end up being
10 fruitless. But I don't think there was an
11 actual vote of the subcommittee 'cause it
12 didn't come up.

13 So the substitute motion would -- as I
14 understand it, would put this topic back
15 on -- make clear that it is part of -- can
16 be, can be, part of the subcommittee's
17 charge if the subcommittee chooses for it to
18 be. And if that's the case, then I'll
19 support the substitute. That would then put
20 it to a vote in the committee.

21 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Commissioner Baker.

22 COMMISSIONER BAKER: To clarify, I don't
23 have our minutes in front of us, but I do
24 believe that we had consensus. We did not
25 take a full vote, but we had consensus in

1 our subcommittee meeting to not take up OGC.
2 And if I'm wrong, please let me know.

3 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Commissioner McCoy.

4 COMMISSIONER McCOY: The consensus was
5 to go with what the Judge said, that -- or
6 based on his thought process of the body had
7 decided not to take it up, then that we were
8 not going to take it up. That was the
9 thought process; that the bullet points were
10 our charge, and that was like our box that
11 we had to play in, because we didn't have
12 consensus necessarily on whether we're going
13 to take up OGC. It was just a matter of how
14 he viewed it.

15 I know this because I definitely would
16 have voted to take up OGC. So we wouldn't
17 have had consensus on it.

18 COMMISSIONER BAKER: Okay. Yeah. I
19 agree with that.

20 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Mr. Schellenberg.

21 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Yeah. I was
22 just going to echo Mr. McCoy again. Thank
23 you.

24 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: All right.
25 Mr. Hagan.

1 COMMISSIONER HAGAN: I was just going to
2 call the question.

3 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Call the
4 question?

5 COMMISSIONER HAGAN: Yes.

6 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: You got to
7 get a second.

8 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Second.

9 UNKNOWN: Second.

10 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: There is -- Judge
11 Swanson is on the cue.

12 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: No. No.
13 Sorry. But Swanson --

14 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Hold, hold. If you
15 have a point of order, sir --

16 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: I've got a
17 point of order.

18 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: -- please raise it
19 as a point of order --

20 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: I've got a
21 point of order.

22 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: -- and maintain
23 decorum.

24 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: I've got a
25 point of order.

1 Ms. Johnston, what happens when there's
2 a vote to call the question and a vote?

3 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: There has not been
4 any ruling that we will not call the
5 question. I simply made the statement.

6 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: I thought
7 someone said -- he said, I call the question
8 and it was seconded. And I was asking
9 Ms. Johnston what happens next.

10 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: I know what happens
11 next. We take the vote.

12 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Okay.

13 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: I'm simply making
14 the observation that Judge Swanson, who is
15 the Chair of the subcommittee, who had been
16 out of the room, returned to the room, and
17 put his name on the cue after being updated
18 as to what had happened.

19 That then allows for withdrawal of the
20 call of the question to allow him to speak
21 if he desires, or we can proceed.

22 Then we will proceed to call the
23 question.

24 COMMISSIONER McCOY: I'm sorry;
25 Mr. Chair. I second the motion. So can I

1 withdraw my second so he can --

2 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yes, you can
3 withdraw your second.

4 COMMISSIONER McCOY: I'll withdraw my
5 second so that Commissioner Swanson can
6 speak.

7 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Thank you.

8 COMMISSIONER SWANSON: Thank you.

9 I'm just going to clarify. What
10 happened at this subcommittee was that we
11 did address by vote whether or not to take
12 up the issue of General Counsel.

13 As Chair, I presupposed that we were
14 constrained by virtue of two things that had
15 happened at the Commission as a whole. One,
16 there was a separate subset of General
17 Counsel that was prioritized down below the
18 things that we addressed. But, more
19 importantly, two -- and I felt like this was
20 critical -- the issue of General Counsel, by
21 affirmative vote of the Commission as a
22 whole, had specifically been removed from
23 our tasking.

24 That second issue, in my mind, gave the
25 subcommittee a sense of the Commission as a

1 whole that we should not proceed. And I,
2 based upon a vote at the subcommittee level,
3 ruled that we would not proceed with issues
4 concerning General Counsel.

5 But Mr. Schellenberg felt strongly about
6 the issue, and I, as a chairman of the
7 subcommittee, told him -- or I think it was
8 the sense of the committee -- subcommittee,
9 that he could bring the issue up to the
10 Commission as a whole if he felt that that
11 was an issue that we should pursue, absent
12 my exercising the discretion of the Chair --
13 as the Chair to go down that route.

14 But, again, I do believe that the Chair
15 has great discretion on these issues. In my
16 mind, that discretion was addressed or
17 trumped by a specific vote of the Commission
18 of the whole, which precluded me from
19 allowing the subcommittee to pursue that.

20 I hope that's been of some benefit to
21 clarify. Thank you.

22 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: All right. Anyone
23 else? Do I hear a second?

24 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Second.

25 UNKNOWN: Second.

1 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: All right. We had a
2 motion, a second to call the question. All
3 in favor of calling the question, raise your
4 hand.

5 (Inaudible.)

6 MS. JOHNSTON: Can I explain what
7 calling the question means --

8 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay.

9 MS. JOHNSTON: -- just so everyone is
10 clear?

11 So you're voting on a motion to call the
12 question. You're not voting on the
13 question, which is the substitute motion.
14 You're only voting on whether you want to
15 stop discussion and go back and vote on the
16 substitute.

17 So I just want to make clear what
18 everyone is voting on. So when you're
19 calling the question, if you're in favor of
20 stopping discussion and moving forward to
21 considering the substitute motion, then you
22 would vote yes to call the question.

23 If you still want to discuss this matter
24 or you have other items you want to add,
25 then you would vote no.

1 So then after that, if that is
2 successful, if the question is called, then
3 you'll go back to the substitute.

4 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: All right. Now,
5 I've got two people that have come up on the
6 cue, but we've already got a motion and a
7 second to call the question.

8 So we're going to vote on calling the
9 question. All in favor of calling the
10 question, raise your right hand.

11 (Inaudible.)

12 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Got it. Good. So
13 the question has been called.

14 Now the vote is on the substitute
15 motion.

16 MS. JOHNSTON: Yes. And how about you
17 just remind everyone again what the
18 substitute is so everyone is on the same
19 page.

20 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: The substitute
21 motion is to send it back to the Government
22 Structure subcommittee to vote on its
23 priorities, as has been clarified through
24 discussion here today; correct?

25 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Whoa, whoa,

1 whoa.

2 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Does everybody
3 understand that that is the motion?

4 Okay. So do we need to open the ballot
5 or do this by hand or how?

6 MS. JOHNSTON: It's a hand vote.

7 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Hand vote.

8 MS. JOHNSTON: But I'm going to stand up
9 just so I can count.

10 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay. So everyone
11 in favor of the --

12 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Sir, I'm on
13 the cue. I just want to clarify what you
14 just said.

15 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay. You have a
16 question?

17 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: I have a
18 question on -- the substitute is to allow
19 the Chair to decide to take up OGC or not.

20 MS. JOHNSTON: No.

21 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: The substitute is to
22 allow the subcommittee to vote on its
23 priorities, given the discussion that we've
24 had here today.

25 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Okay.

1 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: All right.

2 Everybody understand the substitute motion?

3 We're now voting on the substitute
4 motion. All in favor raise your hand.

5 MS. JOHNSTON: Nine in favor.

6 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Nine? So the motion
7 is substituted.

8 MS. JOHNSTON: Yes.

9 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: And now --

10 MS. JOHNSTON: So now you're going to
11 vote on the motion as substituted.

12 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Now vote on the
13 motion itself as substituted.

14 MS. JOHNSTON: Which is the same thing
15 that you just voted on, but procedurally
16 this is how it occurs because of the
17 substitute motion.

18 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay. So we voted
19 to approve the substitute. Now we're voting
20 on the motion as substituted.

21 Is this a hand vote as well?

22 MS. JOHNSTON: Yes.

23 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay. All in favor
24 of the motion as substituted, please raise
25 your hand.

1 MS. JOHNSTON: I've got 10, sir.

2 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Ten? Okay. So the
3 motion carries as substituted, and it goes
4 back to the subcommittee for the vote on
5 priorities.

6 And, Judge, as I mentioned, I will
7 provide you with what Research has given me
8 of the printouts of the transcript and the
9 minutes of our October 25th meeting.

10 Ms. Baker, I see you on the cue.

11 COMMISSIONER BAKER: Yes. To not
12 continue this discussion further, Mr. Chair,
13 I just would like to have you state on the
14 record that it is your -- or not your
15 intention that issues -- that these broad
16 topics that we prioritized, that were not in
17 the top four, will not be taken up in other
18 subcommittees because it is not under their
19 broad topic, which was voted on as a
20 Commission of the whole.

21 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: The statement I made
22 to that I think I've already made. The
23 statements are in the transcript.

24 And the only point of clarification,
25 which is what I said in through here, is

1 that it should be related to your topic. It
2 should be related to your topic. And as I
3 repeatedly said, this is going to provide
4 the guidance for the Judge's chair of that
5 subcommittee when the issue comes up.

6 Public comment.

7 UNKNOWN: Thank God.

8 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Mr. Scott.

9 MR. SCOTT: Yes. Stanley Scott. I'm
10 with the African-American Economic Recovery
11 Think Tank. My address -- first of all, I
12 want to touch bases on strategic planning.

13 I understand the rules. I've got 40
14 years of understanding these rules. But
15 when you get to public comment, if your
16 presenters speak on any subject in that
17 subcommittee, then I have a right to make
18 comment on what he said.

19 Now -- but moving forward -- Hey, it's
20 very important here, this General Counsel.
21 I'm appalled that the General Counsel is not
22 the subject of the day. I have been through
23 two -- I apologize. Like I said, I haven't
24 had my breakfast yet.

25 But the Charter review is set up to

1 address issues in the community. You have a
2 10-year gap. If you do not deal with the
3 most important issues at this moment, then
4 you're not doing your job.

5 The General Counsel, as far as I'm
6 concerned you have a problem and it needs to
7 be addressed. If it was up to me, you would
8 not be talking about anything but General
9 Counsel because too much power. That is too
10 much power to not bring that in on what we
11 call, in my neighborhood, meaning bring it
12 into order where you have a solid
13 foundation. So everybody will be on the
14 same page.

15 You're not able to change a City of this
16 nature away in the wind of this country,
17 without having your General Counsel in the
18 right perspective. And right now you do not
19 have that. You got a discombobulation going
20 on. You've got some evil. Thank you.

21 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Mr. Nooney.

22 MR. NOONEY: Hello. My name is John
23 Nooney, 8356 Bascom Road, Jacksonville,
24 Florida 32216, City Council District 4,
25 (inaudible) District 3, House District 12,

1 (inaudible) Congressional District 4.

2 You've got to love the rogue committee.

3 You know, what I wanted to share with
4 you real quick -- and, you know, I've tried
5 to make as much of these meetings. But two
6 days ago this is the agenda for the Council
7 on Elder Affairs. Two days.

8 And under presentations, I've got on the
9 agenda, you know, John Nooney, Resolution
10 for Pledge of Allegiance on the agendas for
11 all the board and the Commission.

12 Now, 10 years ago, you know, ethics got
13 put on. You know, the whole thing really
14 with this Charter Revision Commission is
15 just restoring the public trust because it's
16 been crushed.

17 Now, you know, I'm just refocusing.
18 And, like I said, I supplied a handout. You
19 know, one thing that I really miss is the
20 court reporter. You know, when you're --
21 and one of the biggest things about it is we
22 don't have money for her. Well, that's not
23 -- just not true. You know, 10 years ago,
24 God bless the court reporter. That's really
25 what saved it. Like I said, you go upstairs

1 and look at it, the very first meeting. You
2 know, funding with these three
3 subcommittees.

4 You know, did, you know, Mr. Hand, to
5 all three subcommittees, when we talked
6 about funding, mention the doubling of the
7 JEA franchise fees? You know, Hey,
8 there's -- you know, there's tons of dough
9 out there.

10 But right now I'm only just down to a
11 minute, but the biggest thing, and this is
12 going to be a national news story, really
13 the Pledge of Allegiance.

14 You know, I -- you have four agendas
15 that -- and I'll bring them, you know,
16 not -- you know, too numerous -- through the
17 committee meeting, this is the biggest issue
18 right now, in my opinion.

19 Like I said, just two days ago, the
20 greatest generation, the Council on Elder
21 Affairs, right there. They have the Pledge
22 of Allegiance. And, to me, that should be
23 the easiest Charter Revision Commission
24 recommendation that you can just make.

25 And I would say that the Governor, the

1 Mayor, you know, Sam Newby, he's the liaison
2 for this, I mean, how hard would that be?
3 You know, you want to have people say come
4 and visit Jacksonville. But you know what?
5 We don't do the Pledge of Allegiance.

6 So thank you for listening.

7 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Thank you. And with
8 that we are adjourned.

9 (End of meeting.)

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

C E R T I F I C A T E1
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 transcribe the foregoing
9 proceedings from a **digital recording**; and that
10 the transcript is a true record of the
11 proceedings.

12 I further certify that I am not a relative,
13 employee, attorney or counsel of any of the
14 parties, nor am I a relative or employee of any
15 of the parties' attorney or counsel connected
16 with the action, nor am I financially interested
17 in the action.

18 Dated this 29th day of November, A.D., 2019.

19
20 
21
22
23
24
25