

CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION MEETING

DATE: Friday, January 31, 2020
TIME: 9:05 a.m. - 12:03 p.m.
PLACE: Council Chambers
First Floor
City Hall at St. James Building
117 West Duval Street
Jacksonville, Florida 32202

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

Lindsey Brock, Chairperson
Ann-Marie Knight, Vice Chairperson
Jessica Baker, Board Member
Frank Denton, Board Member
William W.C. Gentry, Board Member
Charles Griggs, Board Member
Nick Howland, Board Member
Heidi Jameson, Board Member
Emily Lisska, Board Member
Betzy Santiago, Board Member
Hon. Matt Schellenberg, Board Member
Hon. Ronald V. Swanson, Board Member
Chris Hagan, Board Member
Celestine Mills, Board Member, telephonically

ALSO PRESENT:

CRC Staff:

Jessica Matthews, Chief of Legislative Services
Jessica Smith, Legislative Assistant
Juliette Williams, Legislative Services
Kendra Meeks, Legislative Services
Jeff Clements, Chief of Council Research
Anthony Baltiero, Council Research
Paige Johnston, Office of General Counsel
Steve Cassada and Melanie Wilkes, Information
Systems Administrator.
Paige Johnston, Office of General Counsel

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: All right. We will
3 get the meeting started. It's 9:05. This mic
4 is really hot.

5 So good morning, everybody. Lindsey
6 Brock. Happy to see everyone here. We have --
7 do we have a copy of the minutes or have they
8 been circulated previously? I don't see a copy
9 here.

10 MS. SMITH: We will get them.

11 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay. We will get
12 them. Okay. Then we will defer the approval
13 of the minutes until after that.

14 We have Ms. Mills on the phone. Very
15 good.

16 All right. So since we're going to defer
17 approval of the minutes, we go to public
18 comments. I don't see any speaker cards or
19 anyone here.

20 I do recognize Council Member Boylan. I
21 appreciate you stopping in to watch us. I'm
22 sure we will probably hear from you a little
23 bit later.

24 That takes me to my portion on remarks
25 from the Chair, timeline, and Charter

1 revisions. And you have -- I'm trying to sift
2 through because I've got my copies. There we
3 go.

4 Do you have these two items right here,
5 everyone? It says "draft." You've got a
6 redline version, and then you've got a clean
7 one that says draft. Everybody got that?

8 So we had meeting last week, and
9 Ms. Baker was there and we had staff. We kind
10 of went through this. Remember, what we
11 started with was the Ordinance provision that
12 related to the Charter Revision Commission and
13 how it's created and its responsibilities. We
14 took that and converted it over to being a
15 section of the Charter -- creating a new
16 section of the Charter.

17 When we first discussed it, there was, I
18 believe, a concern about, number one, requiring
19 that some action take place for our
20 recommendations. As it stands now, there is no
21 requirement that the Council take any action.

22 One of the other concerns was the idea
23 that it was happening in over two different
24 Council presidencies and the concern about
25 political winds blowing one way or the other.

1 I had then thought that, Well, then we'll
2 stretch it or we'll condense it and move up the
3 appointment process so that we can get it all
4 in one Council year. But there were some folks
5 last time I presented that that said maybe
6 that's not the best idea.

7 So then we thought, Okay, we moved it
8 back into that and believed that the concern
9 over the political winds shifting one way or
10 the other are solved when we require action by
11 the City Council.

12 So the redline shows the changes from
13 that original draft. And what we have here --
14 and I'll just kind of walk you through the
15 various provisions in here.

16 The first section, 17.101, has the same
17 time, that we meet within eight months from the
18 date of the first meeting, and then we present
19 to the Council. This was a change because
20 before we had it going to the Council and the
21 Duval Delegation. We thought we would leave
22 that whole issue up to the Council because the
23 Council will likely -- would simply just do a
24 resolution for the Duval Delegation to make any
25 changes at the state level that are required

1 with regards to our Charter.

2 So making it to the Council for any
3 changes, recommendations, or amendments to the
4 Charter, related laws, and other special acts
5 of the legislature. After presentation to the
6 Council -- and then here's where the required
7 action is -- the president shall, within the
8 next legislative cycle, submit one or more
9 appropriate pieces of legislation to the
10 Council for the adoption or rejection of the
11 recommendations. The Council shall vote on the
12 legislation in the regular course of its
13 business. After the vote on the legislation by
14 the Council, the memberships, duties, and
15 powers of that appointed Commission shall
16 cease. The provisions of Chapter 50 shall
17 apply to the Commission.

18 So what that means is that all of the
19 sunshine stuff and everything that relates to
20 the Commission is still going to be enforced
21 until the vote so that we can come and meet and
22 speak as a body to the Council if there's any
23 questions. I say we, them doing this. But --
24 so that was how that was one was done up.

25 Then we go to Section 17.102, and I'll

1 just kind of read through it.

2 The Council President shall file
3 legislation in April 2029.

4 So that would be ten years from now and
5 keep being this idea of doing the appointment
6 -- we're doing it a little bit early because we
7 recognize that sometimes there are delays like
8 we had at the start of ours. So we moved it up
9 a little bit early.

10 April 2029 for the appointment of not
11 less than 11 nor more than 15 members -- that's
12 the same as in the statute -- recommended by
13 the Council President and appointed by the
14 Council. The Chairman of the Commission shall
15 be recommended by the Council President and
16 appointed by the Council.

17 Now, that's a change from the statute --
18 from the Ordinance, because it was kind of --
19 it was weird. It was saying that the Council
20 would recommend the Chair and the president
21 would approve. So we thought it just made it
22 more streamlined to simply have the Council
23 President recommends the Chair and the City
24 Council then approves it.

25 Okay. Vacancy, according to the terms,

1 can be filled upon recommendation of the
2 Council President appointed by the Council for
3 the unexpired term.

4 That's the same as in the statute.

5 The membership of the Commission, there
6 shall be included at least one member who
7 resides within each School Board district.

8 That's the same as the Ordinance.

9 A member may be removed by a 15 Council
10 member majority vote approving such removal.

11 There wasn't really any provision in
12 there for removal, so we decided to put that in
13 there.

14 Commission shall thereafter be
15 reappointed every ten years during the month of
16 April in the year prior to the taking of the
17 U.S. decennial census.

18 And that's essentially the same time
19 period as in the Ordinance and, again, keeps it
20 moving up to April. It was in May, so we
21 decided to move that up.

22 And then the powers and duties, and
23 that's in Section 17.103.

24 The Commission shall commence its first
25 meeting no later than July 31st of the year

1 appointed.

2 So we wanted to put something in there so
3 that there was a definite timeline so that we
4 could -- the Commission could commence its
5 meetings and have enough time to get it to the
6 Council by the end of March so that we weren't
7 looking at it right during the holiday period
8 or anything like that.

9 The Commission shall make recommendations
10 to the Council concerning those provisions in
11 the Charter, related laws, and other special
12 acts of the legislature affecting the
13 Consolidated City of Jacksonville. In making
14 its recommendations, the Commission shall
15 consider all relevant factors to the structure
16 of the relationship between the state and local
17 units of government and the Consolidated City
18 of Jacksonville, which are best calculated to
19 fulfill the needs of the citizens of the
20 Consolidated City of Jacksonville.

21 And we condensed and focused that wording
22 specifically to really talk about the -- when
23 it comes to the Charter and the related laws
24 and special acts related to the Consolidated
25 City of Jacksonville, that this Commission

1 focus on that structure, that it's not a policy
2 board or we're not a policy Commission. We're
3 not setting policy, but we're creating the
4 structure so that the policy can be determined
5 and the policy can be implemented effectively
6 and efficiently and transparency --
7 transparently for the citizens of Jacksonville.

8 And then the final one is the Commission
9 secretary, and that remains unchanged from the
10 legislation.

11 So I've talked a lot. Is there
12 anybody -- yes. Mr. Gentry.

13 COMMISSIONER GENTRY: Yes, sir. Is this
14 on?

15 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: I believe so. He is.
16 I have the luxury of this very hot mic.

17 COMMISSIONER GENTRY: You know, this is
18 bad when they change this stuff on me. It took
19 me about three months to figure out the old
20 system.

21 I want to first thank you, Mr. Chairman,
22 for taking this on and weaving your way through
23 this. One week you get one recommendation, and
24 then next week you do it, but that's the
25 process I guess because you have to kind of see

1 it.

2 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Exactly.

3 COMMISSIONER GENTRY: I have a number of
4 observations and really kind of some
5 alternatives that I'm sure you've considered
6 that I want to throw out there and ask about as
7 we walk through this. The first one -- the
8 last thing -- I'm going to work backwards here
9 and first jump to the last provision.

10 I am concerned about the way this last
11 sentence is articulated. It says: In making
12 its recommendations, the Commission shall
13 consider all relevant factors to the structure
14 of the relationship between the State of
15 Florida and local units of government in the
16 Consolidated City of Jacksonville, which are
17 best calculated to fulfill the needs of the
18 citizens.

19 I think it's a tremendously limiting -- I
20 mean, that says the structure of the
21 relationship between the State of Florida and
22 the local units. And I don't know even know
23 what a local unit is. I guess it's the various
24 authorities and agencies and things. But I
25 just think --

1 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Well, it's in the
2 original statute. It's in the original
3 ordinance, that little bit.

4 COMMISSIONER GENTRY: I get that because
5 it's not redlined. But as I read it, you could
6 make a very strong argument that we're very
7 limited in what we're doing.

8 For example, strategic planning, that has
9 nothing to do with the relationship with the
10 State of Florida. It has to do solely with our
11 internal operations of the City of
12 Jacksonville. The structure of the
13 relationship between the state and local units
14 of government in the Consolidated City of
15 Jacksonville.

16 If that's the way it's always been, it's
17 very -- potentially limiting. I think we've
18 construed everything to be broad and anything
19 that's really important to the City's
20 operation. As I look at it, I think we
21 probably ought to address that. I know that
22 really wasn't what you were focusing on. But
23 as I read it -- and you read it to me today --
24 I said, Wait a minute. That would really --
25 most of the things we're doing and we

1 recommended would not -- I could make an
2 objection that it's out of order because it
3 doesn't fall within the purview of what the
4 Charter permits us to do.

5 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: So what if we took
6 that little phrase there, local units of
7 government, and we changed that sentence and we
8 move it up into the structure.

9 So here's how it would be: In making its
10 recommendations, the Commission shall consider
11 all relevant factors to the structure of the
12 local units of government in the Consolidated
13 City of Jacksonville and the relationship
14 between the state and the local units of
15 government and the City of Jacksonville.

16 COMMISSIONER GENTRY: That's broader and
17 I think probably picks up more of what we're
18 doing.

19 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay. All right. I
20 will make that -- I will make that change.

21 COMMISSIONER GENTRY: And I know,
22 Mr. Chairman, that wasn't your job to deal with
23 that. As you read it, I was like, Wait a
24 minute. We need to fix that.

25 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: No. That's a --

1 that's a very good observation, and I think --
2 does everybody like that? I mean, you'll just
3 kind of --

4 COMMISSIONER LISSKA: Could you restate
5 it?

6 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Sure. So the last
7 sentence would now read: In making its
8 recommendations, the Commission shall consider
9 all relevant factors to the structure of the
10 local units of government in the Consolidated
11 City of Jacksonville and the relationship
12 between the state and local units of government
13 in the City of Jacksonville, which are best
14 calculated to fulfill the needs of the citizens
15 of the Consolidated City of Jacksonville.

16 COMMISSIONER LISSKA: Thank you.

17 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Everyone, consensus?

18 COMMISSIONER GENTRY: State of Florida.

19 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: State of Florida?

20 Put the State of Florida in there?

21 COMMISSIONER GENTRY: Yes. I'm sorry.

22 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay. Okay. So now
23 it will read: In making its recommendations,
24 the Commission shall consider all relevant
25 factors to the structure of the local units of

1 government in the Consolidated City of
2 Jacksonville and the relationship between the
3 State of Florida and the local units of
4 government in the Consolidated City of
5 Jacksonville, which are best calculated to
6 fulfill the needs of the citizens of the
7 Consolidated City of Jacksonville.

8 COMMISSIONER GENTRY: Thank you,
9 Mr. Chair.

10 And now, if I could, I would like to go
11 to the first section.

12 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Here we go. But
13 wait. There's more.

14 COMMISSIONER GENTRY: Yes. Well, that
15 was one that was not anticipated because I
16 didn't catch that the first time.

17 And this is -- and you may have talked to
18 people about this, and I'm sorry that
19 Mr. Schellenberg isn't here today.

20 The provision provides for one or more
21 appropriate pieces of legislation to the
22 Council. And what occurred to me is, if this
23 is sent up as one piece of legislation with
24 adoption of all recommendations, is it less
25 liable -- will it create a problem with the

1 fact that they may like one piece but not all
2 pieces as opposed to sending up legislation, a
3 piece of legislation, for each recommendation?

4 That's purely a political issue. I don't
5 know the answer to that. If you sent up one
6 with all of them, I assume you can move to
7 amend it, strike this, strike that. It seems
8 like it would be cleaner to send up legislation
9 for each recommendation. That's the question.

10 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: So we discussed that.

11 COMMISSIONER GENTRY: Yes, sir.

12 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: And we even had
13 counsel there as well. By leaving it this way,
14 it gives them the leeway to where if -- you
15 know, you've got one subject. So if we have
16 one or more appropriate pieces, then that gives
17 you that leeway to where, Hey, if it's all on
18 one, we can give one piece. But if it's
19 something that we're concerned is going to
20 violate the one topic rule, then you can do two
21 or more or however many you need to do. So we
22 specifically worded it that way to allow the
23 flexibility for exactly that concern.

24 COMMISSIONER GENTRY: Okay. Thank you. I
25 should have known that you addressed it.

1 The other thing is -- and this, again, is
2 the will of this group. I just, in
3 consideration -- which, again, I'm sure you've
4 given to it already -- and that is passage or
5 rejection by -- or rejection by a supermajority
6 as opposed to a simple majority. I mean, does
7 it come up with some presumption of correctness
8 after all these months of work and should it
9 only -- and should it go on the ballot unless
10 rejected by supermajority of the Council? I
11 didn't know if that matter had been considered.

12 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: I hadn't. I think --
13 so you're saying require a supermajority in
14 order to defeat?

15 COMMISSIONER GENTRY: Right. It would
16 only be rejected if two-thirds of the Council
17 voted to rejected it.

18 I'm throwing that out for the body to
19 think about. I mean, a lot of work has gone
20 in. We're doing months of work and great
21 analysis, and so should it come up with some
22 presumption of correctness and some weight so
23 that it's not simply rejected by one more than
24 half?

25 And that's simply a question I'm asking.

1 Maybe it's something we ought to mull over and
2 address later.

3 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay.

4 COMMISSIONER GENTRY: Well, I'm sorry. I
5 didn't mean to offend. I got cut off.

6 Anyway, I'll move on to the other
7 thoughts. I mean, maybe that's a thought
8 point.

9 Okay. And then in Section 17.102, the
10 appointment process -- and I presume this is
11 the way -- you did flip it around but basically
12 the way it was before, that -- where did it go?

13 Okay. Recommended by the Council
14 president and appointed by the Council.

15 As that reads, it's just automatic
16 appointment, and I was wondering if, to make it
17 have some review, it should say subject to
18 appointment by the Council. Because as it
19 stands now, it's just automatic, and the
20 appointment by the Council is irrelevant.

21 Recommended by the Council president and
22 appointed by the Council. It doesn't say and
23 subject to appointment by the Council, which
24 would mean the Council has review as opposed to
25 appointment.

1 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: What if we changed
2 appointed to approved?

3 COMMISSIONER GENTRY: Approved would be
4 fine.

5 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Approved by the
6 Council?

7 COMMISSIONER GENTRY: Yes, sir.

8 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay. Everybody good
9 with that change in there?

10 Okay. So it would be -- where it says
11 appointed by the Council in the first sentence,
12 it will say approved. And where it says
13 appointed in the next sentence, that will be
14 approved. I think that's -- well, the
15 reappointment, that's just the whole
16 appointment process in the last sentence. Oh,
17 wait. And vacancy by approval.

18 Got it. Okay.

19 COMMISSIONER GENTRY: And the last
20 observation or question is, there doesn't
21 appear to be an end date for the Commission to
22 issue its report.

23 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yes. It is in
24 17.101.

25 The Commission shall, within eight months

1 from the date of its first --

2 COMMISSIONER GENTRY: Okay. I see it. I
3 was looking down at the last paragraph.

4 All right. Well, those are my
5 observations. Thank you.

6 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: All right. Thank
7 you.

8 Mr. Griggs.

9 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Thank you,
10 Mr. Chairman. Great job working through this
11 document.

12 And I only had really one observation,
13 and I think Mr. Gentry covered a lot of the
14 information that I sort of had in the back of
15 my mind but I hadn't really formulated.

16 Mine is an issue with timing. And I know
17 that in here it reads that we want the Council
18 to take action within the first -- within the
19 next legislative cycle. To me, that would
20 require -- just looking at the timing of it, if
21 the recommendation is going to come in at the
22 end of March -- right -- the next Council cycle
23 is probably going to be through probably
24 mid-May; right? If we adopted ours and made
25 our presentation --

1 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yeah.

2 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: -- it would be
3 through mid to late May.

4 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: So it would be the
5 end of March would be when we would present,
6 and then it would be introduced the second week
7 in April. And then it would go second reading
8 at the end of April. Then it would be third
9 reading of the second week of May, which would
10 be the time that it would be voted on.

11 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Okay. So my
12 concern there is that unless the Council is
13 doing their due diligence along side of the
14 building -- or the recommendations, they may
15 not be prepared to take action, you know, in
16 that one cycle. They may want to have more
17 time to kind of look over everything.

18 So my recommendation would be that we say
19 that instead of in the next cycle, that they do
20 it by the end of June 30, by the time they're
21 done with their Council midterm. So they're
22 going to be bringing in a new president and all
23 that. Do that before that president cycle is
24 over. I guess isn't that June 30th?

25 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: That's June 30th,

1 yes. And that's why -- that's the reason we
2 had it that it has to go in, you know, because
3 there's going to be the presentation and then
4 it gets presented. And, I mean, it's no
5 different than every other piece of legislature
6 because once it's introduced, it will go to
7 committees, you know, and get vetted through
8 the regular process, same as any other piece of
9 legislation.

10 So I guess I don't know how we could --

11 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Well, it's been my
12 experience that Council members would probably
13 hold a piece of legislation that they're going
14 to present until they get all of the
15 information before they submit a piece of
16 legislation or if they're not ready, they're
17 working in concert with the administration,
18 they typically wait until they're fully
19 prepared for that legislation to go through the
20 full cycle.

21 I just don't want -- I don't want to, you
22 know, handicap them if they haven't been really
23 following our work along the way to give them
24 as much time as possible to be prepared for it.
25 In other words, we're giving them maybe another

1 extra week or two. You know, an extra --

2 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Well, I mean, it says
3 in the regular course of their business.

4 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Okay.

5 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: So if someone needs
6 to defer it, then they have the latitude to do
7 that.

8 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Okay.

9 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: I mean, that's -- I
10 understand now -- you know, there's nothing
11 that requires that they rush through it. It
12 just simply says in the regular course of their
13 business.

14 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Okay. So with that
15 being said, they must take action by when then?
16 Because if they deferred it, then they defer it
17 and defer it, you know, whatever committee. So
18 some type of action. Maybe perhaps we need to
19 say whatever -- you know, a deadline for the
20 action. That's where I was kind of trying to
21 figure out a way to have a -- conclude. The
22 way you have it written, the Commission doesn't
23 conclude its business until the action has been
24 taken.

25 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Correct.

1 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: And if there's a
2 piece here where it's taken up separately or as
3 a group that needs deferral, then we're sort of
4 in limbo until that action is taken.

5 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yes. So then -- yes.

6 COMMISSIONER BAKER: I just wanted to ask
7 Ms. Johnston. I'm not sure if we can tell
8 Council or have the Charter say they must
9 approve or disapprove something. I think that
10 issue has come up before, and I just wanted to
11 ask her.

12 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yeah. Can we require
13 some action no later than June 30th?

14 COMMISSIONER LISSKA: Point of order,
15 Mr. Chair.

16 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yes.

17 COMMISSIONER LISSKA: I'm trying to
18 figure how we have permission to speak at this
19 point. How is it working now?

20 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: I've got you next on
21 the queue.

22 COMMISSIONER LISSKA: I just didn't
23 understand how it was working.

24 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yeah. It is. I've
25 got you on the queue.

1 COMMISSIONER LISSKA: Thank you,
2 Mr. Chairman.

3 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yes.

4 MS. JOHNSTON: I had to make sure it's
5 on.

6 Yes. I don't think the Charter language
7 could require that the Council take certain
8 action. However, you can put a time frame
9 parameter recommendation, I suppose. But --
10 and you can explain when you issue your report
11 how you're envisioning the next process to work
12 if it were in the Charter. So you could give
13 them those recommendations and those ideas for
14 how you got to those time frames and what you
15 would like for them to do.

16 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay.

17 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Mr. Chairman,
18 wouldn't your recommendation, if it was a
19 Charter amendment, be then that action that
20 requires them to take action on this -- on the
21 work that we're doing?

22 You're actually putting this in the
23 Charter now that they must take action for
24 future Commissions, Charter Revision
25 Commissions.

1 MS. JOHNSTON: So if I can just kind of
2 explain further.

3 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yes.

4 MS. JOHNSTON: There's a general premise
5 that an existing Council can't bind a future
6 Council. If this were approved in the Charter,
7 if the Council approved this through an
8 ordinance, they'd be binding a future Council.
9 So that's kind of where the element -- the
10 legal element comes in and where it would be
11 more appropriate to make recommendations and
12 explain how you would envision it to go.

13 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Well, Mr. Chairman,
14 if that's the case, then I would recommend that
15 you maybe amend your recommendation to include
16 a no action clause for if no action is taken.
17 Because I think the point of this whole
18 recommendation is that the work that we're
19 doing as a Commission does not get lost, you
20 know, in the ethers as we've been kind of
21 explaining. So maybe we need to have something
22 in here that says you're recommending that they
23 take action during the first cycle, and no
24 action by a certain time would be considered no
25 action, and we can record that as --

1 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yeah. This has
2 opened up a whole other -- I've got a question
3 for Ms. Johnston.

4 So as this is crafted right now of
5 requiring them to -- to take a vote one way or
6 the other, can we do that or has this all been
7 an exercise in futility?

8 MS. JOHNSTON: Rather than answer off the
9 cuff, I'd rather talk to some more people in my
10 office and get their take on it --

11 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay.

12 MS. JOHNSTON: -- for if this rises to
13 any constitutional level. I hadn't quite
14 gotten that far in the analysis when I had
15 reviewed this. But when Mr. Griggs asked that
16 question, it kind of prompted me to think a
17 little more about it. So, if you wouldn't
18 mind, I would like to question some people in
19 my office and get their thoughts on it before I
20 give you an answer.

21 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: I think that would be
22 excellent.

23 And so I've got four other people on the
24 queue. If you are on the queue for this, I
25 would say let's hold off because I don't want

1 to spend any more time on this if the ultimate
2 answer is we can't require them to take action.

3 COMMISSIONER GENTRY: Mr. Chairman, may I
4 respond?

5 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Sure.

6 COMMISSIONER GENTRY: What we're being
7 told makes no sense. This existing law
8 requires: The Council President shall file the
9 legislation for the appointment --

10 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: No. That's new.
11 That's -- requiring action is new, but I -- I
12 don't understand how we could not be able to do
13 this because the law requires the --

14 COMMISSIONER GENTRY: Commission --

15 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: -- Commission to be
16 created.

17 COMMISSIONER GENTRY: That's what I was
18 trying to get to. Maybe the language is
19 different, but the law requires a Commission to
20 be appointed. If you can't require anything,
21 then you can't have a Commission.

22 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: So then let's go
23 ahead and hear everybody else's. We're going
24 to assume that we could do this. And I want to
25 get -- I was going to table it, but let's go

1 ahead and hear this.

2 Ms. Lisska, you're next.

3 COMMISSIONER LISSKA: I have no idea. I
4 instructed students on how to use this system
5 yesterday. I know you feel insecure about
6 that.

7 Nonetheless, my two areas have been
8 covered. The definition of the next
9 legislative session. I mean, we're going to
10 work that out. And, also, I was going to ask
11 our Council can we require acceptance or
12 rejection. And the rejection was -- just the
13 way it's worded. Not so much what we want them
14 to do, but the wording. And it's just
15 basically from reading Roberts Rules of Order
16 and sitting through our Council meetings time
17 and time again. It went exactly where it
18 probably needed to go. Thank you.

19 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay. Ms. Jameson.

20 COMMISSIONER JAMESON: What did I do now?
21 Am I on?

22 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yes.

23 COMMISSIONER JAMESON: Thank you. Sorry.

24 My question about this piece is I
25 think -- one thing that you're trying to

1 accomplish is to have the Commission under the
2 same Council president; correct?

3 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: We -- we were
4 originally, and then we got some pushback on
5 that. So we thought that the concerns over it
6 spreading between two Council presidencies are
7 addressed by requiring action to be taken on
8 the recommendations.

9 COMMISSIONER JAMESON: Got it. Okay.
10 And I guess my question -- and not to steal the
11 thunder from Commissioner Baker in our upcoming
12 conversation.

13 But if we were to change the timing of
14 our elections, that would ultimately change
15 when our Council comes in, so likely a January
16 date. And so, again, I'm not sure if the dates
17 in here would need to be adjusted at that time
18 or if this is fine with that new proposal.

19 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: I think we talked
20 through that, and this works either way.

21 COMMISSIONER JAMESON: Okay. Got it.
22 Thank you.

23 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: It's one size fits
24 all in that respect.

25 Judge Swanson.

1 COMMISSIONER SWANSON: Just a very narrow
2 comment concerning supermajority issue.

3 A, I think that might impose a
4 requirement on the City Council that removes a
5 certain level of discretion from them, and I
6 don't know that -- I'd have to think that
7 through.

8 But, secondly, I think the General
9 Counsel should look at that issue at the same
10 time to the extent that whether we can impose
11 that on the City Council.

12 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay. And,
13 Mr. Gentry, you're still in the queue.

14 COMMISSIONER GENTRY: Yes, I am.

15 Going to Mr. Griggs' point, which is what
16 we started with.

17 I think the point is well taken that the
18 legislation requires the president to submit
19 legislation, and it requires that they will
20 either adopt or reject it, but it doesn't put
21 any timeline. And so they could -- I mean, I
22 know this is terribly cynical and assuming the
23 worst case scenario in every case.

24 But they could theoretically defer it
25 forever and not -- they're not adopting or

1 rejecting. And they're considering it, but
2 they're not voting on it. So I think to avoid
3 that possibility, you really probably need
4 to -- it needs a provision they shall adopt or
5 reject within 90 days of submission so that
6 there's a timeline. Was that the point that
7 was being made?

8 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: (Nods head.)

9 COMMISSIONER GENTRY: So, anyway, I agree
10 with that. To be complete and make a full
11 circle, we say when it should be submitted and
12 probably say a period of time in which the
13 Council should accept it or reject it so it
14 doesn't linger around forever.

15 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: And what I was -- I'm
16 sorry.

17 COMMISSIONER GENTRY: I'm through with
18 that.

19 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: You're holstering
20 your microphone there, so I will assume that
21 you're done.

22 In response to Mr. Griggs' concern and
23 where I was looking at making an addition would
24 be in Section 17.101. And if you go to the
25 third line from the bottom, the sentence that

1 begins: The Council shall vote.

2 And it would then read: The Council
3 shall vote on the legislation in the regular
4 course of its business, but no later than June
5 30th of the year -- you know, that Council
6 year, or June 30th -- I guess we could just say
7 June 30th.

8 So it requires the Council that receives
9 the recommendations will be the Council that
10 votes on those recommendations so that we don't
11 carry it over to another new Council that could
12 possibly be coming in.

13 COMMISSIONER GENTRY: Makes sense.

14 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Does that make sense?
15 Good everybody? I'm seeing nodding heads. All
16 right.

17 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Just a quick
18 question.

19 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yes.

20 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: What happens if
21 they don't? I'm sorry.

22 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: You know what? We'll
23 let the electives figure out that. You're in
24 violation of the Charter sounds like a good
25 campaign to run against somebody.

1 COMMISSIONER GENTRY: So if the Office of
2 General Counsel allows you to.

3 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Exactly. That's
4 right. We'll go after them. That's right.
5 File a writ of mandamus.

6 COMMISSIONER KNIGHT: I think
7 Commissioner Griggs made an earlier point that
8 by not responding could be the response. So
9 could we say that? Earlier you made that
10 comment. In that sentence, that if you don't
11 reply by then, that is your response. At least
12 it makes it -- I thought that was a really good
13 idea.

14 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: That, to me, creates
15 a lot of -- a lot of constitutional Charter
16 issues because then someone would have to go
17 and take the initiative to actually place it on
18 the ballot.

19 COMMISSIONER KNIGHT: Right.

20 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: And if you have a
21 Council that -- I want to go with the
22 presumption that the Council will act in good
23 faith with this. Call me altruistic. Call me
24 a Polly Anna.

25 COMMISSIONER KNIGHT: Altruistic.

1 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: I want to believe
2 that they will -- that they will act in good
3 faith with regards to the recommendations.

4 All right. But no later. I'm going to
5 add that in.

6 COMMISSIONER DENTON: I'm not sure the
7 "but" is necessary.

8 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: We'll say "and." How
9 about and?

10 Okay. So what I'm going to likely do is
11 as soon as we get the -- when Ms. Johnston has
12 the answer for us, I will try to poll the group
13 and see when folks can meet that are -- that
14 have an interest in this section. And we can,
15 you know, get together again because I know --
16 you know, we have more than just me and
17 Ms. Baker working on this. Ms. Santiago was
18 there as well, and so I appreciate feedback.

19 Okay. We've been given the minutes for
20 the December 13 meeting. Everyone take a
21 moment to look through them.

22 And I will entertain a motion to accept
23 the minutes.

24 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Motion.

25 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: A second?

1 Is there a second to the motion to
2 approve the minutes?

3 COMMISSIONER BAKER: Second.

4 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Thank you.

5 All in favor?

6 COMMISSIONER HOWLAND: Real quick,
7 Mr. Chair. One comment is excused. That
8 should read Commissioner Howland is not there
9 on December 13th.

10 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: It should be Howland.
11 Okay.

12 All right. Now, with that correction,
13 all in favor of approving the minutes?

14 COLLECTIVELY: Aye.

15 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Any opposed?

16 All right. The minutes are approved.

17 Okay. Now, we are on subcommittee
18 updates and discussions.

19 Before we do that, I just want to remind
20 everybody we need all of the subcommittee
21 recommendations in final form by our next
22 meeting on the 28th of February. That will
23 allow time for myself and research to put
24 together our final report. And I intend to
25 submit the report to the Council president and

1 the Duval Delegation as it's currently set in
2 there. And then if they want a presentation, I
3 will simply tell them that if you want a
4 presentation, we're happy to come and give it.
5 And we can bring the, you know, chairs and each
6 commissioner in on something and we can do
7 that. I was not planning on asking and
8 requesting a time at the podium on this.

9 So just want to let you know that that
10 was my thoughts in going through there. Also,
11 I think we'll see the more complete version of
12 the draft prepared by Ms. Baker, and it is a
13 very good example of what would be excellent to
14 receive from each -- from each committee on our
15 recommendations. But we will get to that.

16 Let me find my agenda.

17 Now, I'm through with my Chair remarks,
18 and we will go to Urban Core update and
19 discussion.

20 COMMISSIONER KNIGHT: Thank you. Good
21 morning, everyone.

22 Good morning, colleagues.

23 Good morning.

24 COLLECTIVELY: Good morning.

25 COMMISSIONER KNIGHT: I just want to make

1 sure I have your attention for a couple of
2 minutes.

3 Before I share a status, I hope you will
4 bear with me in a little moment of reflection.

5 So it's been a little while since we've
6 all been together. But as I recall, when we
7 had sessions as a full group, we had several
8 leaders and stakeholders come before us and
9 comment about our time commitment, comment
10 several times about the thankless work we have
11 all agreed to do, and I hope the thanklessness
12 will be addressed in the things we just talked
13 about.

14 I'll share with you that last night our
15 subcommittee met with the community through a
16 town hall meeting. Small representation of the
17 community, but I would say impactful
18 nonetheless. The comments that were shared
19 were similar to the town hall that we had as a
20 group some months ago. But there were a couple
21 of opportunities or presentations that really
22 stung me as my colleagues could probably tell
23 you on the side.

24 There was a woman that presented and
25 talked about a business that she owned and that

1 how it changed over time and zoning and so
2 forth, and she seemed pretty helpless in how
3 she can now revive her business. We talked a
4 little bit about zoning and so forth.

5 The one that really stuck with me, as my
6 colleagues know, was an 88-year-old gentleman.
7 I think he was 88. He talked about visits by
8 the mayor -- or mayors -- excuse me -- and
9 other leaders in his community to his
10 neighborhood and to his home. And as I sat
11 there listening to him, I couldn't help just
12 look into his eyes and think about the things
13 that he's seen in this life nationally and
14 locally.

15 Another woman, who we've seen here
16 several times, talked about this past weekend
17 two women beng hit -- elderly women, 80-plus
18 years old, being hit by a car on Soutel Drive
19 and actually having to be peeled off of the
20 cars. You know the kind of the descriptions we
21 got. One of those elders did not survive the
22 incident, and the other is apparently
23 hospitalized today. So the conversation from
24 her were around things we've heard before,
25 speeding, lights, and a perceived lack of

1 reaction from our city.

2 If you think back a couple years ago -- I
3 couldn't find the year -- but on San Jose
4 Boulevard there was, I believe, a woman and a
5 child that were hit by a car. And I think, if
6 I recall correctly, at least one of them passed
7 away. And it was prominently --

8 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: That's
9 correct.

10 COMMISSIONER KNIGHT: Pardon me?

11 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: That's
12 correct.

13 COMMISSIONER KNIGHT: It was prominently
14 in the news. And I remember personally being
15 struck by that as a mom, and it was heavy. It
16 was heavy then to me as I saw it on the news as
17 it was last night about the two elders. And I
18 also remember that, we, as a city, reacted to
19 that incident on San Jose Boulevard. And I
20 believe, if I recall correctly -- I didn't want
21 to stay up until one this morning trying to
22 find it. But I believe that there was things
23 done to address that street.

24 This is exactly the kind of thing that
25 this community, the Urban Core community, is

1 referring to, in my opinion. This is me
2 speaking. I didn't pass my notes to my
3 colleagues before sharing. This is where they
4 get that feeling of racism, disparities,
5 inequity, and the like.

6 I think you know I'm blessed to be here
7 amongst all of you. Right. But this is where
8 our city needs to recognize that our processes
9 and policies that we are adopting are applied
10 equitable -- equitably across our community.

11 I used the term last night, and I won't
12 recall it -- the potential of structural
13 racism. And that doesn't mean that someone is
14 intentionally being racist, but maybe through
15 unconscious bias that policies are being
16 adopted that negatively impact a class or group
17 of citizens, unintentionally or intentionally.

18 So each of us have joined this work, and
19 we've been doing it just about since August
20 1st. Taking time away from work, retirement,
21 and the like. And I suspect we join for a
22 variety of reasons to include -- I'll say it --
23 maybe political pursuits, maybe leveraging
24 relationships, and serving as a voice for
25 others on their behalves. Maybe we just want

1 to do what we individually believe is right for
2 this community, and I applaud that. I hope all
3 of us together, regardless of our underpending
4 interest, are hoping to contribute to the
5 fabric of this community.

6 I've said it before. I've retired to
7 this community, and I chose Jacksonville. I
8 could have went anywhere. I chose it, and I
9 think we all have chosen our community because
10 we believe in what it can be for our children.
11 So we, our city, are only as good as the sum of
12 our parts, period.

13 Our Commission is divided into three
14 subcommunities, but I challenge those of you
15 who are going to present today on the other two
16 subcommunities to think about your work as it
17 impacts the Urban Core of this community. Both
18 of those other subcommunities have
19 opportunities to impact their services.

20 I'm going to skip a little bit because I
21 know we need to get to others.

22 I'm honored to say that our subcommittee
23 is rich with experience. We collectively
24 possess intimate knowledge of the community,
25 firsthand, some of my colleagues, a strong

1 understanding of the city resources available
2 to effect change and a deep knowledge of
3 policies that were and are in place and,
4 finally, a clear understanding of how the lack
5 of social services and infrastructures will,
6 without addressing them, further hurt our
7 community. The framework of our work consisted
8 of a methodical approach of four steps. These
9 steps felt a bit slow.

10 I actually watched one of the tapes with
11 the full commission when I had to be out of
12 town, and there was a comment that our
13 subcommittee is looking at a lot of data. We
14 need to move on. Yeah. You're right.
15 Particularly in our earlier meetings, I would
16 say our colleagues and I, on top of the data as
17 a full commission, we saw a lot more data.
18 However, it was essential for us. And more so
19 for those monitoring transcript and video to be
20 reminded of the significant data available that
21 demonstrates a need for action.

22 So I won't say it was orchestrated to
23 just share with others, but it is an
24 opportunity for those watching the stage, so to
25 speak, to be reminded of the plethora of data

1 around the problem in the Urban Core.

2 So our steps consisted of, November,
3 historical fact gathering; December, assessing
4 our current state; January, understanding and
5 divining our opportunities; and, finally, as
6 said, Chair, summarizing and developing and
7 submitting a proposal.

8 We are comfortably at our fourth step.
9 After individually reviewing all of our
10 materials from the full Commissions and
11 information presented to us during subcommittee
12 meetings, we each developed individual
13 recommendations and discussed them yesterday.
14 Delightfully, there is consensus amongst us for
15 the most important elements, and we are in the
16 mist of fine-tuning the details and on track to
17 present our recommendations to the full
18 Commission on February 28.

19 Highlights of our recommendation include
20 the following: Our number one recommendation
21 is going to be to create an Urban Core
22 Development Authority similar to the Downtown
23 Investment Authority. So note the difference
24 in name because that is one of the points we
25 will make at a later date.

1 The geographic area of focus. If you're
2 familiar with the health zones, it was
3 presented to you earlier in our process. Our
4 city is divided into six health zones.

5 Six Commissioner Griggs; correct?

6 Six health zones, and Health Zone One is
7 the area that has the largest health
8 disparities. And, coincidentally -- really
9 not -- totally aligns with the infrastructure
10 needs that we talked about. So Health Zone One
11 includes 32202, 32204, 32206, 32208, 32209, and
12 32254. However, our proposal will include some
13 adjustments to address the overlap with the
14 Downtown Investment Authority and potentially
15 includes comments and recommendations for
16 consideration for phased work outside of Health
17 Zone One.

18 Our report will include proposals
19 regarding funding sources and some references
20 to the type of work needed to have equity in
21 the matters of quality of life and, thereby,
22 reducing disparities in health and the
23 wellbeing across our community.

24 We are also mindful to draw attention to
25 the pros and cons of our recommendation. There

1 isn't a simple solution. I would hope that if
2 there were a simple solution, that this would
3 have been addressed at least 40 years ago.

4 So my fellow Commissioners and I would be
5 happy to take any questions you may have. We
6 will be totally ready with our proposal. One
7 of the neat assets or one of our many assets on
8 our subcommittee I've bragged about -- and I
9 will continue -- sits to your right. And with
10 Commissioner Denton's help, we are making sure
11 that our voice is one and that we clearly
12 communicate our recommendations and the matters
13 we know are included, plus the pros.

14 So I defer any comments to my colleagues
15 on the subcommittee if they would like to
16 share.

17 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: All right. Anyone on
18 the subcommittee?

19 All right. Mr. Denton.

20 COMMISSIONER DENTON: Let me see if I did
21 that. No. I didn't do it right.

22 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: There's a switch.

23 COMMISSIONER DENTON: I was so proud of
24 getting the switch up there on. I've been
25 rehearsing this since Ms. Lisska.

1 I just want to add at the town hall last
2 night, we had about 20 people from the
3 community come. And I've been in a lot of
4 meetings like that. I was struck by this one.
5 If -- if a cynic went there and heard some of
6 the things they brought up, they might think,
7 well, you know, they're pot holes all over the
8 city and there's speeding all over the city,
9 and any one of those could have been dismissed
10 or sent somewhere.

11 But my take away from it after two hours
12 of listening to people and when someone would
13 make a relatively minor complaint or talk about
14 that traffic accident, 20 heads would bob. And
15 what I took away was the perception that these
16 folks were angry, but also frustrated after
17 having many years of feeling neglected and they
18 really don't feel like they're part of the
19 city. That's my take away from Soutel Drive
20 last night.

21 And, to me, anyway -- and, of course, we
22 haven't talked about it. But, to me, that just
23 added more -- more reason for what we're
24 going -- what we'll be recommending before your
25 deadline. So it was kind of an emotional

1 evening for me listening. You know, this city
2 is better than that.

3 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: All right.
4 Mr. Schellenberg.

5 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Okay. Thank
6 you. A couple questions I have.

7 Who is the City Council representative
8 for this area?

9 COMMISSIONER KNIGHT: For?

10 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: The areas in
11 which you mentioned, 02, 4, 5 -- 02, 4, 6, 8,
12 10.

13 COMMISSIONER KNIGHT: It's multiple, I
14 think.

15 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Gaffney, Dennis, and
16 Presley Jackson.

17 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: All three of
18 them have oversight or part of those boundaries
19 going forward?

20 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yes.

21 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: And I assume
22 the federal person is Al Lawson. And who is
23 the state rep, both the state senator and the
24 rep?

25 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: I believe the senator

1 would be Audry Gibson.

2 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Okay.

3 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: And the state rep
4 would likely be Kimberley Daniels. No?

5 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: I think it's Davis.

6 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: You think it's Davis.
7 Okay.

8 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Tracey Davis.
9 Okay. Great. I guess my question would be:
10 Have you reached out to any of them?

11 COMMISSIONER KNIGHT: So thank you for
12 bringing that up. I forgot to mention this.

13 COMMISSIONER MILLS: I would like to --

14 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Ms. Mills?

15 COMMISSIONER MILLS: Yes. Hi, everybody.
16 Happy New Year. What I would like to say in
17 speaking on -- it was said last night and it
18 was said a lot that there is no representation
19 there. When they ask for a meeting, the
20 council person does not show up. So I think
21 they have made the necessary steps. I've
22 received emails when they have asked a council
23 person to come to the meetings or to cooperate
24 or just to give some visibility, so I'm not
25 sure what the breakdown of communication is

1 between the residents and the district and
2 their council person.

3 So maybe, you know, they can get on one
4 accord with that and that can help things out
5 as opposed to them reaching out to
6 Representative Daniels or the senator or
7 Representative Davis. I don't know that
8 they've taken those particular measures to do
9 that, but perhaps that could be communicated
10 and, you know, they would do that. But right
11 now, I just think it's a breakdown in
12 communication and people need to start talking.
13 We are elected by the people. Now let's
14 represent the people.

15 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: All right. Thank
16 you.

17 Yes.

18 COMMISSIONER KNIGHT: So to answer your
19 comment from our subcommittee, what I haven't
20 done is reach out to the state colleagues, so
21 that's a great point. But I've reached out to
22 every city councilman individually by email
23 requesting time with them on our subcommittee.
24 I've met with -- I can't do the names by
25 memory, but I would say I've met with a little

1 bit of a third.

2 I've sent second emails again asking if
3 they have an interest on this topic and if they
4 would be willing to have a conversation around
5 this particular body of work that we're
6 involved in. And, to date -- I will
7 double-check to see if they're scheduled on my
8 calendar when we start chatting again.

9 To date, I have not met with the
10 colleagues, the City Council members that
11 you've mentioned. Everyone received an email
12 or should have received an email from me in
13 mid-November asking for a meeting with them
14 individually.

15 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: My purpose is
16 not what you did or did not. But if you're
17 going forward and you're going to be presenting
18 this to the Council president, you need a
19 leader in that group to charge going forward,
20 and so you need to find somebody.

21 Now, I'm going to regress a little bit
22 and I think that one of the things you should
23 look at -- and it did not come ten years ago.
24 But we're going to have redistricting next year
25 because of the census this year. I was on the

1 redistricting ten years ago, and I specifically
2 tried to do away with minority access
3 districts. I tried to put community of
4 interest and make them compact.

5 What you have in the ZIP codes that you
6 have is minority access districts that are
7 gerrymandered to accomplish a single goal,
8 which I think we no longer need to apply. It's
9 40 years old. But if you had a compact
10 district, compact community of interest, you
11 would have probably one City Council person
12 representing a vast majority of the ZIPS that
13 you just described. So that's what you should
14 also recommend.

15 You can agree with me or not about my
16 minority access districts. But think of it
17 this way: We've had an African American
18 sheriff and mayor and many other elected
19 officials citywide, Kimberley Daniels and Audry
20 Gibson, et cetera. So we have to look at the
21 fundamental way in which we elect these people
22 to represent the areas that need a person going
23 forward.

24 Now, you -- in my opinion, this is what
25 you need. The reason why they've been

1 neglected is because there's not one person
2 that represents that area, and that would come
3 out. And I'm not sure if you get it past this
4 Committee, much less the Council, but this is
5 something that you could look at going forward.

6 One other thing. I'm not as familiar
7 with the ZIP codes that you just described.
8 But if I could have a map, that would be very
9 helpful, I think, for all of us to understand.
10 We probably understand northwest quadrant. And
11 also I understand where Dennis' district is. I
12 know all those. But I don't know specifically,
13 so a map of those ZIP codes would be very
14 helpful to me, I think, as well as the
15 Committee.

16 COMMISSIONER KNIGHT: That would be
17 included. I didn't provide it today as an
18 attachment because it's been presented to us in
19 the past, but I certainly will make sure it
20 will be in our final proposal. Thank you.

21 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Mr. Griggs.

22 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Ta-da.

23 I wanted to thank my colleague and
24 subcommittee chair. She's done an excellent
25 job of leading us through this process and

1 keeping us on task because, you know, we can
2 easily run away with our ideas and get caught
3 up emotionally as we have been from time to
4 time and normally do.

5 But I'm going to push back on
6 Mr. Schellenberg's recommendation a little bit.
7 With all due respect, this district -- sorry --
8 this area, Health Zone One, is represented by
9 multiple people. And I think it's an advantage
10 to have more hands in the pot as it relates to
11 representation in order to, you know, help move
12 things along. I think that once we get beyond
13 this point, if we are able to have the support
14 of this body once the recommendation comes out,
15 then the advocates -- this entire body should
16 be advocating for the recommendation and not
17 just the people who live in that particular
18 area in Urban Core.

19 And that's the beauty of what this
20 Commission is all about. We hope and look
21 forward, when all the recommendations come out,
22 that all of us stand behind those
23 recommendations because we believe, as a group,
24 they will strengthen the Charter. And with
25 this recommendation, once it's completed, we

1 think that we'll be taking steps in the right
2 direction of arresting some of the conditions
3 and some of the errors that we've made over the
4 past 50, 60 years in this community.

5 Thank you.

6 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Mr. Schellenberg for
7 the second time.

8 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Mr. Griggs --
9 whoops -- I agree with you. But for one thing,
10 that area has been neglected. We've had three
11 basic elected officials for 50 years and
12 nothing has happened. Having a representative,
13 passionately, in this area or the vast
14 majority, 80 percent, he can't hide. The
15 other -- if your position is correct, then
16 something should have happened because you
17 always have three people advocating for this
18 area. And if those elected officials have been
19 that poor over 50 years, shame on them, and
20 shame on them that they're not doing anything
21 right now.

22 My strength is -- my point was, one
23 person having this deal, that every day is
24 involved in these problems, focusing on these
25 problems versus -- I know -- I got the Health

1 Zone Z -- One. It clearly -- those districts,
2 there's two of them that go from downtown all
3 the way to Nassau County. And you have two of
4 them that parallel that go all the way from
5 that area to Clay County.

6 They're unfocused on the area, and they
7 believe they can get re-elected even if they
8 don't focus on that. It's clear to me that's
9 exactly what's happening.

10 So the fundamental -- agree with -- I'm
11 just offering an idea that one person represent
12 this area as I did in Mandarin. I focused on
13 Mandarin and also saw the overall community.
14 But I never really saw a lot of things coming
15 from those three representatives to elevate
16 that area substantially.

17 Thank you.

18 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Ms. Jameson.

19 COMMISSIONER JAMESON: Thank you.

20 I just have a question about the overlap
21 between the district here of the Urban Core
22 Development Authority and the Downtown
23 Investment Authority, how those two could
24 potentially work together or maybe what
25 challenges it might bring. I would just be

1 curious in that context.

2 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Mr. Griggs.

3 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: I'll respond to
4 that, Mr. Chair, since it was my recommendation
5 that we address pulling them out separately is
6 that we felt like it would be an opportunity
7 for them to work together versus one having
8 more power or -- you know, more power than the
9 other one. Right now the DIA has a lot of
10 momentum behind it. And I would imagine that
11 if an Urban Core Development Authority came in,
12 you know, would be big brother, little
13 brother-type situation.

14 We did look at that and we're going to
15 make recommendations on how those authorities
16 should work together because we feel like there
17 should be some continuity in how development is
18 addressed in those areas, where they meet,
19 where those lines meet.

20 COMMISSIONER JAMESON: Thank you.

21 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay. I don't see
22 anybody else on the queue.

23 Mr. Gentry.

24 COMMISSIONER GENTRY: Let me just say
25 that I disagree with Mr. Schellenberg's notion

1 that this is some kind of balkanized city where
2 only the council person from one area can
3 really speak for them and carry the ball.
4 Whether or not we should have minority access
5 or not or have three representatives or one,
6 this is a problem for the City of Jacksonville.
7 This so-called One Jax that our mayor touts --
8 and it's been a stigma in this city for the
9 last 50 years.

10 I applaud this Committee and what you're
11 doing. This may be -- at least this will be
12 that entity that will give that focus and a
13 constant voice, but I think this is a problem
14 not for the elected representatives of this
15 area. It is a problem for the whole community;
16 for the elected at-large members, for the guy
17 from Mandarin, for the guy from the beaches.
18 This city cannot continue to go forward the way
19 we've been doing. It's recognized by everyone.

20 And so I am disappointed that the people
21 from this -- the representatives from there
22 have not been engaged with the Committee.
23 That's not acceptable. We can't do anything
24 about that. We can only ask them to come. So
25 I applaud what you're doing, and I think this

1 will give the focus it needs to have.

2 Thank you.

3 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: All right. I will
4 echo Mr. Gentry's, you know, comments, that I
5 believe in the work that you're doing and the
6 focus that we can have on the Urban Core area
7 has perhaps -- I don't think it's overstating
8 it to say that some of the greatest fundamental
9 change in our community because it does correct
10 a lot of broken promises and neglect that's
11 happened over the 50 years of the
12 consolidation. No one can say that
13 consolidation has lifted that area of the city
14 as it has others. So that is why I'm excited.

15 And forgive me if I keep pushing to get
16 something real and hard and concrete, because I
17 think if we do that and we have something that
18 says, Look, here's a way to try to fix it. It
19 may not work, but it is at least telling this
20 community, You're important and we want to make
21 sure that this city is focusing on this area
22 and in that community. And that's why I say I
23 think it has some of the greatest opportunities
24 of long-standing impact in the community.

25 And with regards to supporting

1 recommendations, I will go back to something
2 that I said before, is I hope that all of us
3 are going -- once these recommendations get
4 presented to the Council that all of us are
5 going to be filling up Council members
6 calendars with meetings and saying, Hey, we
7 really need to get this. We really need to
8 make sure we are getting approval and action on
9 these items. It's incumbent upon us to pick up
10 that banner and charge the hill on that and
11 continue to keep our recommendations in focus
12 on that.

13 So thank you to all of the Committee
14 members, Ms. Mills on the phone as well. I
15 appreciate your efforts on that.

16 Okay. Next we have government structure.

17 COMMISSIONER SWANSON: Thank you,
18 Mr. Chair. And, if I could, just briefly,
19 before I get to my committee comments, I would
20 like, through the Chair, to make a comment to
21 Ann Marie.

22 The people are lucky to have you here,
23 and I can't say how proud I am of what you're
24 doing for us. Thank you.

25 Our subcommittee has addressed several

1 different topics, three of which we're ready to
2 present to you today, very briefly. Ms. Baker
3 is going to present on the issue of timing of
4 local elections. That topic and the memorandum
5 and the support of that topic from the
6 subcommittee has been provided to everybody.
7 And that topic is in final form with the
8 recommendation from the subcommittee in final
9 form as to what we would suggest the Commission
10 as a whole address.

11 I also intend to assign Ms. Baker an
12 additional responsibility, which she has not
13 looked at, but deals with the numbers of
14 members on the Commission and the at-large
15 positions. And it seems to me, based on what
16 Ann Marie has said today, there may be
17 something that we can look at in our Committee
18 in terms of modification of the structure of
19 the City Council, specifically the at-large
20 position, that may address some of the issues
21 that you've pointed out today that we could
22 consider collectively. But I'm going to task
23 Jessica with doing that in our next
24 subcommittee meeting, and I think it's
25 something that we'll discuss further.

1 But, with that, my intent is, with the
2 permission of the Chair, to have three brief
3 presentations on three topics. The first topic
4 is final. The other two topics will be final
5 soon, and we'll submit documentation for
6 consideration within the next couple weeks.

7 And then Mr. Schellenberg has asked to be
8 recognized for a specific point.

9 So, with that, Ms. Baker.

10 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yes. Ms. Baker.

11 Does everyone have the draft?

12 COMMISSIONER BAKER: Thank you, Judge.

13 And good morning, everyone.

14 The document you have in front of you is
15 the timing of elections, which was approved by
16 our subcommittee yesterday. And so I'm just
17 going to go through it quickly. I'm sure
18 you-all have read it before, I think. It was
19 distributed.

20 So with that, the first amendment: Amend
21 the Charter requiring that all local elections
22 currently held in the spring, City Council
23 Members, Mayor, Property Appraiser, Sheriff,
24 Supervisor of Elections, and Tax Collector, be
25 held in the fall of the off year in between the

1 presidential and Florida gubernatorial
2 elections, and then for the Charter to provide
3 for the newly elected City Council Members,
4 Mayor, Property Appraiser, Sheriff, Supervisor
5 of Elections, and Tax Collector, to take office
6 on the first of January following their
7 election.

8 There is a couple large paragraphs
9 supporting those two Charter changes. But,
10 generally, changing the election to the fall
11 would result in greater opportunity for those
12 elected officials to have more time in the
13 budget process, which cannot be changed, and is
14 held through the spring and then presented by
15 the mayor July 1st, and then the Council takes
16 over.

17 As well, we also thought moving it to the
18 fall in the odd year would potentially increase
19 turnout of voters because they are used to
20 voting in August and November, although it is
21 in the odd year. I think -- I think from the
22 past we've kind of seen that argument being
23 made over and over again.

24 Going to the second page: Amend the
25 Charter to require that such change in the

1 timing of the elections shall take place in
2 year 2031, such that the four-year term for the
3 elected officials taking office on the first of
4 July, 2027, shall be extended by six months
5 from the 31st of June, 2031, to the 31st of
6 December, 2031.

7 So the idea behind this change happening
8 so far in the future is that it will not
9 impact -- if it's approved by the voters and
10 the Council this year, it would not impact any
11 current elected officials who are in office
12 right now.

13 They -- I've spoken with our Jeff over
14 here, who has a lot of background and history
15 of the Council, and they've actually tried to
16 adopt a change in the elections 10 to 15 times,
17 a lot -- 12 or 13 and it had has failed. And
18 one of the reasons that he recalls is that
19 Council members are concerned about having that
20 change take place while they're in office.

21 So the idea is to push it really far
22 forward, that way it has no impact on anyone
23 voting on it. It will not impact anyone in
24 office. And so that's that.

25 The final recommendation is an Ordinance

1 Code amendment. Amend the Ordinance Code to
2 require that local elections, which currently
3 take place in March and May, shall take place
4 in August and November of the same off year.

5 Amend the Ordinance Code -- currently it
6 says March and May in the Ordinance Code.

7 Amend the Ordinance Code to require the
8 general election be held on the first Tuesday
9 after the first Monday in November, and then
10 the Ordinance Code to require the first
11 election be held on the Tuesday 11 weeks prior
12 to the general elections.

13 So we looked at the current Ordinance
14 Code language, which, actually, there's only
15 eight weeks between the first election and the
16 run off. The Florida Statutes does give 11
17 weeks. So we, as a subcommittee, went back and
18 forth on whether to go with the kind of eight
19 weeks or eleven weeks. We decide to be
20 consistent with the Florida Statutes. That
21 would just make it easier for voters, and
22 that's why we went with that recommendation.

23 So thank you very much. I'd love to hear
24 your thoughts on any edits, changes --

25 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay.

1 COMMISSIONER BAKER: -- from the
2 Commission.

3 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Mr. Gentry.

4 COMMISSION GENTRY: Just one. I know we
5 all hate the idea of putting this off until
6 2031. I mean, I understand the considerations
7 and I know it's been debated in short and
8 lengthy. I won't second guess that, but it
9 hurts.

10 I was wondering in that regard -- and I
11 think the math -- and I'm glad you're doing
12 this, Jessica, and not me because math is not a
13 strong point, for sure, for me.

14 It says no Council member approving this
15 recommendation would be in office for the term
16 starting the 1st of July, 2027, and ending
17 December 31.

18 Well, no one is going to be in office as
19 of the 1st of July. Why don't we start it in
20 July of 2027 since the people voting on it will
21 not be running for re-election. And then as of
22 that July 2027, there would be nobody running
23 for election that have voted on it. So why put
24 it off another four years?

25 COMMISSIONER BAKER: So to answer your

1 question, I did consider that. The reason I
2 pushed it out further was because although
3 those people will be -- will not be getting
4 re-elected to the same position, they might be
5 seeking office in other offices in the local
6 elections, maybe the state. I mean, I don't
7 know. And potentially they might look at it
8 the same way as what I stated in here, that
9 they would risk, in future elections, opponents
10 painting them as a term violator and they kept
11 themselves in office six months later.

12 So that -- do you see what I'm mean? It
13 still just kind of impacts the current Council,
14 so that's why I just took it away from them
15 entirely.

16 COMMISSION GENTRY: Well, if I may, from
17 my prospective, I think we're being overly
18 concerned about that issue. I think it's a
19 really weak issue, and it would argue that
20 because someone cleaned up this mess and kind
21 of extended it six months that they shouldn't
22 get re-elected. But I understand the argument.
23 I get that. But now they're not even in office
24 anymore and the fact that two or three of them
25 may run for another office and eight years ago

1 voted to clean up the Council.

2 COMMISSIONER BAKER: Well --

3 COMMISSIONER GENTRY: I don't see that as
4 being -- I really don't think that's a real
5 viable concern. I understand why you would
6 think of it. It's good to know it.

7 COMMISSIONER BAKER: So --

8 COMMISSIONER GENTRY: And I think getting
9 this thing moved back four years will be very
10 helpful. And I don't think this Council is
11 going to not vote for it because, you know, I
12 might run for Tax Assessor and if I did, then
13 might -- you know, I think they'll vote for it
14 just as well for 2027 than for 2031. Anyway,
15 that's my thought.

16 COMMISSIONER BAKER: So, just to be
17 clear, those have just been elected in 2019, if
18 they are re-elected in 2023, then they would be
19 voting to extend their term by six months
20 because they would get re-elected in 2023 and
21 normally would be expired -- am I reading this
22 right? Yeah.

23 So that was the concern. But whatever
24 the full Commission -- whatever pleases the
25 full Commission at this point.

1 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: All right. Next up
2 Mr. Schellenberg.

3 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: I'm want to
4 touch base on what W.C. said in regards to
5 people that are voting even now on this thing
6 could actually be voting to -- because you only
7 have to skip an election cycle to be back in.
8 So I understand what -- I understand what W.C.
9 said and I understand -- obviously I've been
10 debating -- we voted it out unanimously out of
11 the Committee.

12 The fact that you push it out that far, I
13 think people don't read so much into it, and
14 I'm not sure if people really care if people
15 got six months extension going forward. So I
16 tend to agree with W.C. I would bring it
17 forward because, clearly, those that are going
18 to be out in '23, the next election cycle they
19 can actually run in '27 going forward. So I
20 would agree with W.C. that moving it --
21 bringing it back to '27 would probably be
22 better. The sooner we do this, the better.

23 And one reason -- and I don't think
24 Jessica heard it -- but it's because of the
25 budget. The budget -- you get elected. You

1 get an office July 1st. The new mayor comes
2 in. He's got to present a budget by July 15th.
3 And then the Council auditors get it, and the
4 actual City Council knew -- start looking at
5 it, and you have to do something by September
6 30th.

7 By doing the election cycle as stated by
8 Jessica, they have the full seven months of
9 engagement. It brings a little bit more power
10 back to the legislative body to making sure
11 that some of the projects they have in their
12 district going forward are actually in the
13 budget. Because in that short window, it's
14 very hard to get anybody's attention going
15 forward.

16 So I'm in favor of moving the election.
17 I have been in favor of it since I got elected.
18 But I also believe that the primary reason is
19 the budget, to make sure everybody knows about
20 the budget and it gives people ample
21 opportunity to engage in the process going
22 forward.

23 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Mr. Griggs.

24 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Thank you,
25 Mr. Chair.

1 I think this is an excellent argument for
2 moving it and changing the dates and -- but I
3 think the trade off for doing this in 2027 is
4 they get an extra six months. So I would
5 probably recommend that we try it that way
6 because whoever is in office, even though they
7 may be concerned about what they're going to do
8 next, they get an extra six months. And they
9 could use that any way they see fit to
10 contribute or, you know, prepare for the next
11 one or what have you. I would use that as a
12 trade off perhaps.

13 I recommend with W.C. and
14 Mr. Schellenberg in trying to get it in in
15 2027.

16 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: All right. Judge
17 Swanson.

18 COMMISSIONER SWANSON: Just a point of
19 worth. We have submitted this to the Chair
20 from the subcommittee, and I think that the
21 subcommittee would obviously not have any grave
22 objections to the consensus of the Commission
23 to change the date. The question is -- the
24 point of order question is: Do you intend to
25 address this today to have closure on it, or

1 would you like to refer it back to the
2 subcommittee for further reflection, or do you
3 just want to just let this percolate a little
4 bit?

5 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: I would like to get
6 one in the can, if we can.

7 COMMISSIONER SWANSON: Well, then --

8 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: So let me, you know,
9 address that. If we are going to take this up
10 as a final recommendation, then we would need a
11 motion for that.

12 COMMISSIONER SWANSON: That's where I was
13 heading. Yep.

14 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: And then we can have
15 discussion as to an amendment --

16 COMMISSIONER SWANSON: Yep.

17 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: -- that can be
18 proposed and we can vote on that amendment, and
19 then go forward -- that's what I would suggest.
20 With that in mind, I move that we approve the
21 recommendation from the subcommittee on the
22 topic of moving elections.

23 All right. Oh, okay. Yes. We have to
24 have public participation. Do we do that
25 before the motion or --

1 MS. JOHNSTON: Before the vote.

2 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Before the vote.

3 Okay. She reminded me that we have to have
4 public participation on this.

5 So we've got a motion. We've got a
6 second that I heard. So now we are discussing
7 it still. And is there --

8 COMMISSIONER SWANSON: If I could --

9 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Sure.

10 COMMISSIONER SWANSON: If I could be
11 recognized on the issue. I don't think the
12 subcommittee has a strong feeling either way
13 about the suggestion to move that date up a
14 little bit. The consensus at the sub --

15 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Point of
16 order. He's got to get a second to discuss the
17 bill. He made a motion. He needs a second --

18 COMMISSIONER SWANSON: I thought it was
19 seconded.

20 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: It was seconded.

21 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Oh. I didn't
22 hear it.

23 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: I'm sorry.

24 COMMISSIONER SWANSON: I'm sorry.

25 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Go ahead.

1 COMMISSIONER SWANSON: May I proceed?

2 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yes.

3 COMMISSIONER SWANSON: So I think that if
4 the consensus of the Commission as a whole is
5 it would be in the best interest of the
6 community to move it up, I don't think we have
7 a strong opposition to that at the subcommittee
8 level. I think that when Ms. Baker worked
9 this, she was very sensitive to the fact that
10 we had received input that some of the
11 objections from stakeholders earlier -- in
12 earlier votes was they did not want it
13 portrayed to the community that they were
14 moving elections so that they could get an
15 additional six months in office.

16 To the extent that your point is, Hey,
17 this is a greater issue that's more in the best
18 interest of the community and we think we can
19 get this approved, even irrespective of that
20 concern, I think we would agree to move it up.

21 So that was the linchpin issue of
22 discussion at our level. If the consensus of
23 the Commission is that's not a show stopper,
24 let's amend it and move it up.

25 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay. Well, then, in

1 that regard, we would need a motion to amend to
2 change the date, the recommended date, to 2027
3 from 2031.

4 COMMISSIONER GENTRY: Well --

5 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: You're making that --
6 well -- do we -- no -- stop. We first have to
7 have a motion to amend this.

8 COMMISSION GENTRY: That's what I'm
9 trying to do.

10 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Well, you said you
11 wanted to speak on it, but I need you to say --

12 COMMISSION GENTRY: That's why I said I
13 want to speak.

14 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay.

15 COMMISSIONER GENTRY: I have to use my
16 voice to make that motion.

17 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: All right. I thought
18 you were speaking --

19 COMMISSION GENTRY: No. I wanted to
20 move --

21 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: My apologies.

22 COMMISSION GENTRY: Excuse me. I wanted
23 to move to amend the resolution -- or the
24 recommendation to change the operative date --
25 effective date to July -- to 2027 from 2031,

1 whatever the appropriate date is. I'm trying
2 to find it here.

3 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: '31 to '27.

4 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yeah. '31 to '27.

5 COMMISSIONER BAKER: Yeah. If I may
6 speak, Mr. Chair. There would be a few
7 changes. It would read: Amend the Charter to
8 require that such change in the timing of local
9 elections shall take place in the year 2027,
10 such that the four-year term of elected
11 officials taking office on the 1st of July,
12 2023, shall be extended by six months from the
13 31st of June, 2027, to the 31st of December,
14 2027.

15 COMMISSIONER GENTRY: Thank you.

16 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Second.

17 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Second. All right.
18 So, normally, if it was the person that made
19 the motion, you can consider that as a friendly
20 amendment and we don't have to have a vote?

21 No. We have to have a vote?

22 MS. JOHNSTON: We don't do friendly
23 amendments.

24 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: We don't do friendly
25 amendments. We've got no friends.

1 Okay. So then any discussion on the
2 amendment of the dates -- I'll just call it
3 from '31 to '27. I've got a lot of people on
4 the queue here.

5 Mr. Howland, are you on the amendment?

6 COMMISSIONER HOWLAND: No.

7 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Ms. Jameson, are you
8 on the amendment?

9 COMMISSIONER JAMESON: Yes.

10 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay. Ms. Jameson.

11 COMMISSIONER JAMESON: I've got a
12 clarifying question. If we were to move this
13 recommendation through us and it goes to City
14 Council, if the Council does not see 2027 to be
15 fit for some reason, could they then change
16 that back to 2031?

17 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yes. Yes. They can
18 amend -- they can amend whatever they want to.

19 COMMISSIONER JAMESON: Thank you.

20 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Mr. Schellenberg, are
21 you on the amendment?

22 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: No, sir.

23 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay. Mr. Griggs, on
24 the amendment.

25 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Thank you,

1 Mr. Chair.

2 I just want to say this: I don't want to
3 take Judge Swanson and Ms. Baker's
4 recommendation for '31 lightly. If -- if you
5 feel like we have a better chance of getting
6 this over because of the concerns that Mr. --
7 that you discussed with your resources, then
8 I'm not going to support the amendment. But
9 only if you feel like this isn't going to be a
10 deal breaker for the bill -- I mean, for the
11 recommendation.

12 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Ms. Baker, would you
13 like to respond?

14 COMMISSIONER BAKER: Yes. Thank you,
15 Commissioner Griggs.

16 So my thought -- because of the history
17 and this has been filed as legislation numerous
18 time, 12 or 13 times over the past 20 years,
19 and it has never been -- I don't believe it's
20 ever been pushed as far out in any of the
21 historical bills. They were always affecting
22 someone who was voting potentially; right?

23 MR. CLEMENTS: Yes.

24 COMMISSIONER BAKER: Yeah. We'd have to
25 look on that.

1 But I guess my concern is it would be the
2 same exact thing since it's already happened 12
3 or 13 times. And as they can change it, if
4 we -- they could change it back and they could
5 change it forward, too. If we recommend 2031
6 and they think that's too far out, they can
7 change it to 2027 themselves. I don't know if
8 that's worse or better for them or for us.
9 But, I mean, there is -- I do see the arguments
10 for moving it -- for moving it closer. I do
11 see the benefits, but, again, it's kind of
12 just -- it's just weighing the pros and cons.
13 Right.

14 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay. Mr. Gentry on
15 the amendment.

16 COMMISSIONER GENTRY: Yes, sir. I really
17 want to -- I'm not so sure I go quite as far as
18 Mr. Griggs. But I wanted to really say pretty
19 much the same thing.

20 You know, this Committee has looked at
21 this at great length. I hate to micromanage
22 what they've done. They've done it for good
23 reasons. I don't personally see this as
24 being -- would be a big deal breaker because
25 it's so far out I can't imagine it being. And

1 I think when we go talk to them, we can -- we
2 would argue that if there's any reservations
3 about it, we would recommend doing 2031.

4 I think it's highly unlikely if you start
5 at 2027 they're going to move it out. But if
6 you do 2031, they're going to move it back.
7 That won't happen. I can't see that. I can
8 see the Council if -- to get the votes, if they
9 needed to, amending it from '27 to '31. I
10 think this is something we could probably
11 manage if it became an issue. So I would
12 really love to get that four years. But with
13 all respect to the Committee because I know
14 they looked at this closely, and I'm reluctant
15 to do it, but I think it's important.

16 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: And I would tend to
17 say to go with the '31 and here's why: In all
18 of those other options, all those other times
19 that it was presented to the Council, there was
20 never an effort to move the date out so that it
21 wouldn't affect them. So, yes, it's far out,
22 but that would give the current Council the
23 cover of saying, There is no possibilities that
24 this will taint me or any of my fellow Council
25 members if I vote to approve this. And the

1 fact that in all the other 12 to 13 times that
2 this has been proposed that no one said, Well,
3 hey. Here's an easy fix. Let's just push the
4 date out.

5 That never happened. I don't see why we
6 think it would happen this time. And
7 instead -- yes, it seems an overabundance of
8 caution. However, it does eliminate the
9 concern. It doesn't make it small as the move
10 to '27 does. But at '31, it eliminates it.
11 And that's my thoughts on the amendment.

12 Ms. Baker, you came up again. Do you
13 want to speak again?

14 COMMISSIONER BAKER: Yeah. I'll just say
15 I would not approve the motion. I would like
16 to stick with the date of 2031.

17 COMMISSIONER GENTRY: I'm convinced.

18 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Are you withdrawing
19 the motion?

20 COMMISSIONER GENTRY: I'll withdraw.

21 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay. We have the
22 motion withdrawn.

23 Mr. Schellenberg, you're on the original
24 proposal?

25 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: No.

1 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: No. All right. Do
2 we need to put this -- do we have any public
3 participation? Does anyone wish to speak on
4 the timing of the elections?

5 All right. No one has come forward.

6 So do we put this on the ballot and
7 record the vote?

8 MS. JOHNSTON: I think you can.

9 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: We just do a hand
10 vote?

11 All right. Then all in favor of
12 accepting the recommendation on timing of
13 elections from the government structure
14 subcommittee, please raise your hand.

15 Ms. Lisska, are you voting?

16 COMMISSIONER LISSKA: No, I'm not, but I
17 might as well.

18 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: I'm sorry.

19 Okay. And all opposed?

20 COMMISSIONER LISSKA: Well, maybe I
21 misunderstood the final motion. It's a
22 possibility.

23 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay. The final
24 motion was -- the motion to amend had been
25 withdrawn.

1 COMMISSIONER LISSKA: Okay.

2 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: So we are at
3 approving the timing of elections as proposed
4 by the Council -- by the Committee.

5 COMMISSIONER LISSKA: Excuse me. Where I
6 got confused in the order was when W.C. -- I
7 thought he was withdrawing something else
8 because I did not recall W.C. making the
9 original amendment, but I guess he did.

10 COMMISSIONER GENTRY: I did.

11 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yes.

12 COMMISSIONER LISSKA: And did the
13 seconder -- did the second person, did they
14 have to do anything --

15 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: You need the
16 microphone.

17 COMMISSIONER LISSKA: I'm sorry. I don't
18 know.

19 Anyway, I have nothing else to say than
20 that. I just missed the vote unless you would
21 like -- I can request -- let's see -- there's a
22 re-ballot since I didn't understand where we
23 were in the process.

24 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Well, now that we've
25 corrected the point of order that you've

1 raised, so you know that we are voting for
2 approval of timing of local elections as
3 proposed without amendment, we'll take a vote.
4 Everybody please raise your hand again.

5 All right. Ms. Mills, are you still --

6 COMMISSIONER MILLS: I'm here.

7 MS. JOHNSTON: She can't vote.

8 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Oh. Sorry. You
9 can't vote.

10 COLLECTIVELY: (All hands raised.)

11 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: All right. The
12 motion carries.

13 We've got one done. Excellent. You guys
14 have made me so happy.

15 Now, Judge, who is our next presenter?

16 COMMISSIONER SWANSON: The next person in
17 the queue is Ms. Jameson. Let me ask her a
18 question.

19 Ms. Jameson, when we finalized our
20 discussion on your topic yesterday, did we vote
21 as a subcommittee to approve it or we deferred
22 until we had the final recommendation
23 concerning language from you?

24 COMMISSIONER JAMESON: We deferred until
25 next week, but --

1 COMMISSIONER SWANSON: Okay.

2 COMMISSIONER JAMESON: I was going to
3 talk about the topic and give just a brief
4 overview.

5 COMMISSIONER SWANSON: Right. Right.

6 Here's where we were on this for the
7 Commission as a whole: Ms. Jameson has been
8 delegated responsibility for putting together a
9 consensus or recommendation from the
10 subcommittee in so far as it pertains to
11 nonpartisan elections. We at the subcommittee
12 level have consensus on the topic, but we have
13 not yet voted on the final written format.

14 What I would propose today is that she --
15 recognizing that there is consensus of the
16 subcommittee but that we don't have the formal
17 work product to submit, that she report on what
18 the topic is, what the consensus is, and that
19 we will then submit a formal written document
20 for consideration by the Committee as a whole
21 before the next meeting. We would not expect
22 her to make further report concerning the
23 written document. That would be in a form
24 ready for the Chair to take up with the
25 Commission as a whole without further report

1 from the subcommittee.

2 Does that sound fair?

3 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Sounds very good.

4 COMMISSIONER SWANSON: Okay. So with
5 that in order, with that background then, I
6 defer to Heidi.

7 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: I think you're on.

8 COMMISSIONER JAMESON: Am I?

9 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yes.

10 COMMISSIONER JAMESON: Thank you.

11 So we felt, as a subcommittee, that it
12 was very important to examine the idea of
13 nonpartisan elections. This was raised by
14 several of the speakers that came here at the
15 full Commission, several that came for our
16 subcommittee, and several here within the CRC
17 that have had robust discussions on the topic.
18 So we felt it was very important for us to
19 examine this.

20 And I think, ultimately, our conclusion
21 will be that we actually do not recommend going
22 that path, and the reasons being, most
23 importantly, our unitary election is very
24 unique.

25 And in 1995 when we ultimately voted to

1 move forward with the unitary election, the
2 main reason for that was voter participation.
3 We do not have closed primaries here in the
4 City of Jacksonville because of the unitary
5 election. And with that, again, you don't have
6 to vote with your party. Everybody can
7 participate. If you are a NPA, a nonparty
8 affiliated voter, you can participate.

9 And also with that it was to, again, have
10 more voter participation, more voter turn out,
11 with that election. With that election, as
12 many of you know, it's a 50 percent plus one
13 threshold, that if you get that, then there's
14 not a run off or second election. But if you
15 do not, then the top two finalist go to that
16 second election.

17 So most of the proponents for nonpartisan
18 elections are really getting at that voter
19 participation issue that we might have again
20 with the closed primary. So we did feel that
21 the unitary election really does address that
22 problem for the most part.

23 And then there were also other concerns
24 raised or questions raised, actually, from some
25 folks that are proponents of having partisan

1 elections, or at least having your party
2 affiliation next to your name, just because
3 that does give some additional education to a
4 voter that they might then understand what
5 values or positions that you might have.

6 In your marketing materials about
7 yourself, you can still use keywords. It is
8 public information in the State of Florida as
9 far as what party you are affiliated with. So
10 as a citizen you can still go look up what
11 party somebody is affiliated with. So, again,
12 that piece of education actually might be very
13 important for more voter participation.

14 We also had a question raised as far as
15 if we had nonpartisan elections, could you
16 still say what party you're affiliated with due
17 to the First Amendment. So could you still say
18 I'm a democrat, I'm a republican, I'm a green
19 party, what have you? Even though there's not
20 that letter next to your name on the ballot,
21 can you still, as you're out campaigning, say
22 that?

23 And then also with that we had a very
24 interesting Supreme Court case this year in the
25 state that came out of Orange County in the

1 Orlando area that maybe does not quite apply to
2 our government structure, but it is very
3 important for everyone to kind of understand
4 the impact of that. Orange County, through
5 their Charter Commission, a similar concept,
6 decided to move forward with nonpartisan
7 elections for their constitutional officers.
8 Ultimately, the Florida Supreme Court came out
9 and said that you actually have to have
10 partisan elections for those particular
11 officers. So that was a very interesting case.
12 So, again, now Orange County has to maintain
13 those partisan elections.

14 For us, we have looked at what that means
15 for the City of Jacksonville. I don't want to
16 put Paige on the spot, but her and many folks
17 at OGC really did give us a lot of really
18 interesting feedback on that piece. Because
19 our Charter is so different that that might not
20 actually apply to us, so maybe we could proceed
21 with partisan elections. But I do raise that
22 because I think it's very important.

23 And, obviously, as we look at maybe some
24 potential barriers to any of our changes for
25 our Charter, I think that this one is one that

1 could potentially face litigation. So I just
2 wanted to raise that as an important piece that
3 came out this year -- I'm sorry -- last year in
4 April that could impact this or could not
5 impact this.

6 And then also with that, again, I think
7 the main reason that most people seem to be
8 pushing nonpartisan elections again is that
9 voter participation aspect. So we do feel that
10 our unitary election addresses that issue.

11 And so with that, we don't think that we
12 will be recommending to go to nonpartisan
13 elections, but we felt that it was very
14 important for this Commission as a whole and
15 the subcommittee to comment on this. When you
16 look back at the Blueprint, the Task Force, as
17 well as the CRC from 2009, they did not comment
18 on this issue. Maybe they did examine it and
19 decided not to proceed. But we felt that if
20 there's something that was this important that
21 was raised at this full Commission several
22 times -- I know subcommittee several times --
23 and if we did go down the path of having robust
24 discussions and debate on the topic, we felt it
25 was important to comment.

1 So I'm going to have a document that's
2 very much in draft form right now, but really
3 outlining and going through several of those
4 topics that I've already discussed and
5 ultimately putting forward that that
6 recommendation maybe we not pursue this. But,
7 again, we felt that it was very important to
8 have something in our report that said we spent
9 a lot of time looking at this topic, and here's
10 what we ultimately decided.

11 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Thank you.

12 I would agree that it's important to put
13 out some work product even if our decision is
14 to take no action explaining how we came to
15 that action. So I think that's very good.

16 I don't see any other speakers. So,
17 Judge, who would be next?

18 COMMISSIONER SWANSON: I'm next. And,
19 again, before we leave that topic, what we
20 envision happening is a circulated draft of a
21 recommendation from the subcommittee to the
22 Commission as a whole that would be our
23 position for comment in the final report -- for
24 what would be the final comment in the final
25 report. So hopefully that will expedite the

1 discussion at the next section.

2 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Prefect.

3 COMMISSIONER SWANSON: I'm going to
4 address ranked-choice voting, and I'll try to
5 do it very briefly.

6 On the issue of ranked-choice voting, our
7 end product is going to be the same in format
8 as what Ms. Jameson just discussed. We're
9 going to recommend -- identify what
10 ranked-choice voting is. We're going to state
11 that we've examined it. We're going to explain
12 the process involved with ranked-choice voting.
13 But our recommendation, ultimately, will be
14 that we not proceed from the Charter
15 Commission -- Revision Commission with the
16 recommendation for ranked-choice voting, and we
17 will say why.

18 Just very briefly, and I know you have a
19 lot on the agenda, so I'm going to make this
20 very brief.

21 Ranked-choice voting has been -- there
22 were many in the community that are supportive
23 of it. It is a method of voting that's been in
24 existence in Australia and New Zealand for over
25 40 years. New York City has just adopted

1 ranked-choice voting for their next city
2 elections. There are many states that have
3 moved -- I think at least Maine has moved
4 towards it. So it is a method of voting that
5 is being examined and adopted by other
6 jurisdictions, internationally and within the
7 United States.

8 What ranked-choice voting is, it is --
9 the best way to think about this is, let's --
10 I'm going to use just an example to help get
11 our arms around it.

12 Hillary Clinton, Donald Trump, and a
13 green party candidate run for president and the
14 ranked-choice voting -- nobody gets the
15 majority in this election, hypothetical
16 election. Donald Trump gets -- or Hillary gets
17 49 percent, Donald Trump gets 48 percent, and
18 the green party gets three percent. Nobody got
19 a majority. You do not go to a run off. What
20 you would do is you would drop off the lowest
21 vote, and the green party candidate got three
22 percent. That drops those voters. Then you
23 look to their second choice, and their second
24 choice hypothetically, the majority of those
25 voted for Hillary Clinton. So although Hillary

1 Clinton was 48 percent, Donald Trump was 49
2 percent, the green party candidate voters now
3 hypothetically go to Hillary Clinton. She wins
4 the election without a run off later.

5 So that's an example of what
6 ranked-choice voting is. There's many pros and
7 cons for it. We will lay that out for you, and
8 I think it would be more appropriate for
9 further discussion at that time.

10 One hitch in the getty-up for the
11 ranked-choice voting is that it was passed in
12 2007 in Sarasota. The State -- Secretary of
13 State has taken the position, in so far as
14 Sarasota is concerned, that ranked-choice
15 voting is not consistent with the Constitution
16 of the State of Florida and might be unlawful.
17 I think that it may have a different
18 applicability in our situation because of the
19 Charter. And I've asked General Counsel to at
20 least give us an informal opinion on whether or
21 not we could progress to ranked-choice voting.

22 With that in mind, we'll have a written
23 recommendation at the next session, which we
24 will circulate well before the next session.

25 That concludes the comments on the three

1 topics that we were ready to present today. I
2 anticipate --

3 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Excuse me.

4 COMMISSIONER SWANSON: -- we'll also
5 address term limits and the size of the City
6 Council.

7 I do think that it would be a benefit for
8 Ms. Baker and Ann Marie to coordinate somehow
9 concerning the issues that would pertain to
10 that in so far as both are concerned. I don't
11 know how we would do that. Maybe noticed
12 member-to-member meeting to do that because I
13 think some of the things Ann Marie brought up
14 would impact our discussion in terms of the
15 at-large positions and the size of City
16 Council.

17 With that, I have nothing further to
18 report, but I did want to -- Mr. Schellenberg
19 asked to be recognized at this point for some
20 comments from the subcommittee.

21 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: My screen has gone
22 blank here. So I don't know -- is there anyone
23 who wanted to -- by blank, it just went away --
24 anybody want to talk or speak on the
25 ranked-choice voting? I don't know if there

1 was anybody on the queue or not. I just wanted
2 to make sure --

3 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Me.

4 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yes, Mr. Griggs.

5 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: It's more of a
6 process request probably. We've heard two
7 explanations about recommendations that they're
8 going to bring to -- from the subcommittee to
9 the full Commission that they're going to
10 recommend that we not move on. Would that
11 require any action from us?

12 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yes. What I would
13 like is, yes, for us to all -- on each of the
14 recommendations that we all vote and then that
15 will be put together in that final one. So if
16 you disagree and believe there should be action
17 taken, then you can express that at our next
18 meeting when that comes up for voting.

19 Oh. I'm back up. Thank you.

20 So Mr. Schellenberg asked to be
21 recognized.

22 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Thank you,
23 Chair.

24 Before I go further, I didn't want to
25 interrupt. But, Judge, next time you pick, I

1 would not pick the presidential because that
2 would be an electoral college issue.

3 But I was a Council liaison to JEA for
4 two years. And I guess over the last 60 days,
5 90 days -- I'm trying to figure out as this --
6 as Rick Mullaney said yesterday -- and probably
7 has said on TV that you could watch on Sunday
8 at 9:00 and it's going to be replayed at 11:00
9 on WJXT.

10 Basically he said that what's happened at
11 JEA potentially could be the biggest swindle in
12 Jacksonville, Florida. And it happened, I
13 think, because somehow we really weren't paying
14 attention to the behind-the-scenes stuff and we
15 weren't engaged or there are a lot of people
16 engaged behind the scenes or whatever. I don't
17 have a solution, but do need -- I want -- I
18 think we need a notice of meeting again to talk
19 about it.

20 And some of the things that -- I'm going
21 to ask Michael Boylan come up because he has a
22 workshop.

23 Michael, come on up because you have a
24 workshop.

25 There's so many things that I want to

1 discuss that we will not be able to do in the
2 time frame we're going for, but we should at
3 least opine because we're right in the middle
4 of something as -- I hate to be repetitive --
5 Rick Mullaney has said about the scandal. I
6 heard him at a breakfast at Meninak on Monday,
7 and he said, If you think -- it's going to get
8 worse. And it's worse because of the players
9 involved, and there are players that haven't
10 been identified.

11 I don't know how to proceed except that
12 we need to look at it, and I have listed ten
13 things. I'm not going to deal with those items
14 at this point in time.

15 But Michael Boylan on Monday said, Is the
16 CRC going to do anything?

17 I know he's talked to you, Mr. Brock.
18 For the last six weeks I've been totally
19 frustrated because we haven't had meetings, per
20 se, and this is the first joint meeting. But
21 we, as a body, to ignore what's going on at JEA
22 and the unintended consequences, both in trust
23 that has been broken with the citizens of
24 Jacksonville, is enormous both currently and
25 potentially in the future.

1 So, through the Chair, can I have Michael
2 Boylan -- Councilman Michael Boylan say a few
3 words?

4 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yes. And, before
5 that, I recall that we had asked for Mr. Zahn
6 at the time to come and address our group and
7 received a polite, Now is not really the
8 appropriate time letter in that regard.

9 You're correct. Councilman Boylan has
10 reached out to me and indicated that he has
11 some ideas that we perhaps should look at or
12 the Council directly.

13 So the Chair recognizes Councilman
14 Michael Boylan.

15 COUNCILMAN BOYLAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

16 Again, Michael Boylan, Council member,
17 District 6, 1829 Melrose Plantation Drive.

18 Before I comment, a couple things. First
19 of all, I really enjoyed sitting through and
20 watching a number of your meetings. I wanted
21 to tell you, first and foremost, I very much
22 appreciate the hard work and the dedication of
23 the time. You're making a commitment. It
24 really truly is appreciated. As many voices to
25 the table as much as possible is always

1 encouraged. It's one of the lessons I've
2 learned already in my six or seven months on
3 the Council.

4 Second, I was one of the persons that
5 Ms. Knight met with. We had a very engaged
6 conversation. I think -- to Mr. Gentry, as the
7 guy in Mandarin, I do very much care about our
8 entire community, as evidenced of the fact for
9 the past two-and-a-half years I've Chaired the
10 Long-term Recovery Organization, which are
11 helping families in the Ken Knight area,
12 Ribault City Drive area, getting their homes
13 and lives back together again. And as
14 Mr. Griggs knows, for the past 12 years working
15 with Young Black Males Initiative to help get
16 our teenage boys educated and graduated.

17 As you well know, the Council has been
18 embroiled in the situation of JEA for the past
19 four or five months. And for us newbie's, it
20 was an awful lot of fast-tracking in terms of
21 learning.

22 Very quickly I'll give you a short
23 history. As the pension issue came before us,
24 there was a lot of conversation at the Council
25 level about engaging our own counsel to help us

1 in this process. I was sitting down and
2 drafting what's called -- what's the phrase for
3 it -- the scope of services that we were
4 looking for counsel to provide us. And as I
5 was having conversations with industry experts
6 across the state, I came to realize I didn't
7 know what I didn't know through that process.

8 So when we had our notice of meeting to
9 talk about this, I asked the president of the
10 Council if we could expand our role to be
11 focusing on fact finding. So at the time the
12 idea was to explore the various options that
13 JEA was exploring.

14 Now, we have subsequently learned there
15 was truly one option on the table that was
16 being discussed or explored in earnest, despite
17 Mr. Zahn himself telling me that wasn't the
18 case. Nonetheless, we moved forward with the
19 process and we got to where we are today.

20 Those fact-finding workshops were
21 scheduled to run through May as we explored
22 each and every option in great detail. We were
23 looking forward to the board and management of
24 JEA to bring forward those options and share
25 them with us for us to reach outside JEA to

1 find out just what was happening in the
2 headwinds for other municipally-owned
3 utilities.

4 As you know, things have played out a
5 little differently over the course of the last
6 two months. And I think we can take some
7 solace in the fact that the workshops and the
8 other work that was done by the auditor brought
9 to bear what exactly was happening over at JEA,
10 and it's very disconcerting.

11 So as we took a look at our workshops and
12 where we wanted to go next, I was a little
13 reluctant to move forward given the fact that
14 they're basically, at this point in time,
15 leaderless in moving forward. However, my
16 colleagues were insistent that we continue with
17 the workshops. We had one scheduled for last
18 Monday, the 27th. And so we sat back and came
19 up with a thought process of saying, you know
20 what, how do we avoid ourselves of getting into
21 this kind of situation again, just as
22 Mr. Schellenberg had referenced.

23 We, as a Council, then spent two hours,
24 an hour and a half, talking about just the kind
25 of things you would want to see, institutional

1 changes we would like to see in the Charter or
2 at the state level that allows us greater
3 authority over the authorities.

4 If you might ask -- you might recall that
5 at our first workshop, that was exactly the
6 point of our conversation. What is the
7 authority of the authorities? Could JEA put
8 itself in a position to sell itself? Did they
9 have the right to do so in that process?

10 So we spent last Monday talking about
11 some of the ideas. And I suspect some of those
12 are on Mr. Schellenberg's list. I have not
13 seen it.

14 We talked about changing the appointment
15 process, talking about putting in minimum
16 qualifications for either the CEO and/or for
17 the board, participants in terms of who might
18 serve there. We even talked about the prospect
19 of paid board members. As you know, major
20 corporations in the private sector, it's very
21 common for them to pay their board members
22 bringing in people with the experience and the
23 knowledge and expertise on a given area. It
24 might be something we should take a look at.

25 So I want to -- and I wanted to apologize

1 to Judge Swanson because, as the Chair
2 mentioned, we did talk. I asked specifically
3 if this would be undertaken by the Commission
4 and he did share with me Judge Swanson's email
5 address. Unfortunately, I never followed up.
6 But I did, for the record, apologize to him on
7 Monday for not connecting with him before our
8 meeting this past Monday.

9 But I do want to encourage this group
10 because, as I started this conversation by
11 saying I really -- it's important to us that we
12 hear from as many people as possible in this
13 process, so if the CRC does have specific
14 suggestions you would like to see the
15 authorities -- the Charter change to reflect
16 some change to the authorities in terms of
17 their oversight and/or the qualifications of
18 their membership.

19 Some of that is a little difficult to do.
20 As you know some of the authorities are state
21 operated or co-state operated in how they work.
22 But it's certainly something worth taking a
23 look at, and I appreciate the opportunity to
24 hear from this group if you choose to take on
25 the challenge of exploring it.

1 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

2 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: I do have a question.
3 Is -- are there any specific Charter
4 recommendations that have come through -- come
5 out of your workshops?

6 COUNCILMAN BOYLAN: Well, we are in the
7 process of doing two things. It's arrogating
8 them right now. And what I've asked Ms. Sidman
9 to do -- which she has already started to work
10 on -- is put together a matrix of what they all
11 look like because there are a number of
12 different ideas and whether or not they require
13 a Council vote of two-thirds Council vote
14 and/or a referendum.

15 I think to this point in time, the one
16 that has probably some traction with some of my
17 colleagues specifically that we're going to be
18 considering in a noticed meeting next week is
19 the appointment process, the idea of perhaps
20 splitting the appointments, three to Council,
21 four to the mayor's office. As you know
22 probably, right now, the mayor's office
23 appoints all seven members of the JEA board and
24 then we, through the Rules Committee, vet them
25 and approve them at the Council level. So I

1 would say that's certainly high in the list.

2 I think another one that has some
3 traction as well -- I think we were all taken
4 aback by the amount of money and the number of
5 consultants that JEA retained to that process.
6 It was a surprise to us, as I'm sure as it was
7 to all of you. The idea of putting some kind
8 of throttle on that so that any of the
9 authorities that want to do some consulting --
10 retaining of consultants, counsel, et cetera,
11 that there's a threshold number of above which
12 they need to bring forward to the Rules
13 Committee and forward it on to Council for
14 their approval.

15 I think those are two that we're taking a
16 look at. There were half a dozen or so others
17 that were also there.

18 To your point of Mr. Zahn, there's also
19 some issues with respect to if we take a look
20 at -- as we will do down the road -- at the
21 diversity of revenue opportunities for JEA,
22 that may require some Charter changes in order
23 for us to accommodate that opportunity.

24 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: And I've got a lot of
25 people building up here on the queue, so you're

1 probably going to be standing there for a
2 minute.

3 COUNCILMAN BOYLAN: Okay. Glad to do so.

4 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: The reason I asked if
5 there were any specific ones because we are
6 trying to get our final report. We do have to
7 present it by March 31st. We're hoping to have
8 everything in place by the 28th so that we can
9 put our final report together. So certainly,
10 you know, any of them where you, you know,
11 think there's some consensus that could be
12 presented to our group, I believe, you know --
13 we would be willing to look at it. It's just a
14 short window for us.

15 COUNCILMAN BOYLAN: I certainly
16 appreciate that, and I would -- not to elongate
17 your process because we are Johnny come lately
18 to this process.

19 Certainly forward them to me directly
20 because what I'm hopeful to do -- and I'm
21 trying to get -- will be getting Council
22 Wilson's permission to have these all actually
23 funneled through the Council at the workshop
24 level that we've been doing. It seems to have
25 been a good vehicle to get to where we are and

1 get some consensus to it. So it would be our
2 own CRC for JEA, if you will.

3 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay.

4 COUNCILMAN BOYLAN: So I'm not tasking
5 you to take on this responsibility.

6 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: All right.

7 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Mr. Chairman,
8 I got a question or two. I'm still on the
9 queue; is that correct?

10 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Actually, I don't
11 have you on the queue, but go ahead.

12 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: Well, I
13 gave -- I wanted to talk --

14 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Certainly.

15 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: So if you
16 don't mind, as you get the information from
17 Ms. Sidman, if you could forward that on to the
18 Committee. And there's certain things that we
19 could, in a short period of time -- I'm not
20 sure why. We could probably go beyond February
21 28th and have a discussion after that.

22 But maybe we can identify certain things
23 that we can all agree on. Not all of them, but
24 certain things that we think are important
25 going forward.

1 And I don't know if you discussed it --
2 if Ms. Sidman has these, but it might be
3 helpful that historically -- I mean, not
4 historically. All the members of the board,
5 the JEA board, had to be Duval County
6 residents. Maybe we should say if you're a
7 customer of JEA, you can be on the board. Or
8 since they deal -- and St. Johns County, Nassau
9 County, Clay County, any of those might be
10 available to be on the board to expand the
11 thing.

12 The other thing that we might touch base
13 on is certain minimum qualifications. They
14 have some -- something. I don't know.

15 Michael that's all.

16 May I just add one thing. I started off
17 with Rick Mullaney's comment about scandal.
18 Now, these are his numbers and he's repeated
19 them multiple times on Monday and I saw them
20 yesterday, and he repeated them on the show
21 that will be on Sunday.

22 So just to give you an idea of what --
23 I'm hopefully quoting Mr. Mullaney correctly.

24 This is the scandal. There were 100,000
25 units available. They were valued at \$10. The

1 allocation was 30,000 of these for JEA staff,
2 employees, et cetera. However, from what he
3 has read, most of these employees didn't
4 understand it, probably wouldn't participate,
5 so the 30 would go to the executives, which are
6 about 12 of them.

7 But there's also an allocation of 30,000
8 units, and I don't think he used this word.
9 But basically it only had to jump over two
10 hoops. And I think Aaron Zahn was one approval
11 and then somebody else. I can't remember who
12 it is. That they could allocate \$30,000 units
13 to anybody. Anybody. So if you bought 1,000
14 -- if you -- according to him -- \$1,000, if you
15 invested, would be worth a million dollars if
16 JEA was sold for over \$6,000,000,000. That's
17 what he's talking about.

18 Obviously, when I was liaison, they were
19 doing everything behind the scenes and all of a
20 sudden in July -- the board didn't do their job
21 in actually investigating exactly how
22 potentially dangerous and scandalous that could
23 be going forward.

24 So those are my comments. I probably
25 would like to have a noticed meeting,

1 Mr. Chair, to specifically talk about this.

2 And, Michael, thank you very much for the
3 workshop, and you are a great representative of
4 Mandarin -- of District 6.

5 COUNCILMAN BOYLAN: If I may respond to
6 the two comments or questions and suggestions.

7 Number one, the minimum requirements is
8 something we are -- we had in our conversations
9 already. Certainly we can expand that to
10 include rate payers as opposed to just citizens
11 in Duval County.

12 Thank you.

13 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay. Thank you.

14 And I've got three people on the queue,
15 and I do want us to try to wrap this up because
16 we still have another subcommittee to report.

17 So, first, Judge Swanson.

18 COMMISSIONER SWANSON: I remember when I
19 was little my mom used to tell me, if you want
20 it bad, you get it bad.

21 There is no question that we have issues
22 in this community related to JEA, but I'm not
23 sure we are in the posture, either by virtue of
24 time or structure or many other institutional
25 issues, to take this on. The City Council

1 has -- as I understand it, Rory Diamond is
2 going to lead an inquiry into the matter. And
3 these things are going to develop over months,
4 not days.

5 I'm just -- I'm not reluctant to take on
6 the issue. I'll take on any issue. But I'm
7 reluctant for this Commission at this point in
8 time and this posture to take on this issue.

9 If I could ask Paige a question through
10 the Chair, this might help me formulate some
11 thoughts.

12 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Certainly.

13 COMMISSIONER SWANSON: Paige, do we have
14 the discretion to ask the City Council to give
15 us more time in terms of our structure and
16 function to report out, or are we on a deadline
17 that is fixed in cement?

18 MS. JOHNSTON: Through the Chair, your
19 deadline is established in the Ordinance Code.
20 And, therefore, in order to go beyond that, the
21 Council would have to waive that. So you don't
22 necessarily have discretion unless the Council
23 were to allow it, and that would probably be
24 through some waiver process.

25 COMMISSIONER SWANSON: With that in mind,

1 my input to the Chair would be it's too big,
2 too important, and too significant for this
3 Charter Commission at this time to take this
4 issue on at all unless the City Commission
5 expanded the deadline for our report and tasked
6 us with this issue. If that were to happen,
7 sign me up.

8 But I think, we as a Commission, do the
9 citizens of this community a disservice to try
10 and take this on. There are other entities
11 that are going to look at this, and it's going
12 to go on for weeks and weeks and months. It
13 should be in depth; it should be in detail; and
14 it should be complete; and it should be done
15 without a sense of urgency or a deadline. And
16 to the extent that this Commission tried to
17 take this on, I think it would be a gross
18 disservice to the community and a mistake.

19 Thank you.

20 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Thank you.

21 COUNCILMAN BOYLAN: Mr. Chair, if I may
22 respond. A couple items there.

23 Number one, I do appreciate Mr. Rory
24 Diamond -- Council Member Diamond and his
25 committee looking backwards. We're very much

1 focused in the workshops and what I'm doing in
2 moving forward. I made it very clear to my
3 colleagues I did not want the workshops to be
4 hijacked to do the investigative work. So I
5 very much appreciated Mr. Wilson's -- President
6 Wilson's decision to establish a second body to
7 focus on that.

8 Two things. Number one, as you can well
9 appreciate, all the Council members have our
10 eyes on this. As I mentioned at the workshop,
11 we understand and appreciate, at the end of the
12 day, we, as elected officials, are the ones
13 that are going to be making the decisions,
14 whatever it may be. So we appreciate our
15 responsibility.

16 With that said, if through the Chair, if
17 you choose at the point in time -- it may be a
18 discussion for your next meeting as to whether
19 or not you want to ask for an extension. I
20 would be more than happy to introduce that
21 bill.

22 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay. Ms. Jameson.

23 COMMISSIONER JAMESON: Thank you. I just
24 have a question for you.

25 First of all, I do appreciate Judge

1 Swanson, what you were saying. I am cautious
2 as well as far as our deadline, so I do
3 appreciate that. And I really appreciate the
4 thoughtfulness of all the Council members and
5 everybody that is looking into this.

6 My question for you -- and I know that
7 your workshop is specific to JEA.

8 COUNCILMAN BOYLAN: Yes.

9 COMMISSIONER JAMESON: But would it be
10 something that perhaps we should look at across
11 the Charter for all of our independent
12 authorities if we were to change the board
13 structure or appointments for JEA? Is that
14 something we should consider for all the
15 others?

16 Again, I understand that this is the
17 topic today. But considering this CRC doesn't
18 meet -- we haven't met for ten years. We're
19 not going to meet for another ten. Is that
20 something we should consider structurally
21 across the board?

22 COUNCILMAN BOYLAN: That is -- thank
23 you -- through the Chair, thank you very much
24 for that question.

25 And, actually, it was a point of

1 conversation that we did have. And I think
2 there are some where it's applicable because of
3 the structure and the relationship of some of
4 our other authorities as it relates to the
5 state and their involvement. A little
6 trickier.

7 But I think there are some things in the
8 qualifications of its board members and the
9 appointment process, we can certainly take a
10 look at those. But, yes. We're not going to
11 focus solely on the JEA. We are right now,
12 obviously, but I think that's not where it's
13 going to stop, which would increase the
14 magnitude of your work if you decide to take
15 this on. So I would be sensitive to that as
16 well.

17 COMMISSIONER JAMESON: Thank you.

18 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Mr. Griggs.

19 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Thank you,
20 Mr. Chairman, and thank you Councilman.

21 Much like Mr. Swanson, Ms. Jameson stole
22 my question.

23 I did have a second question. Your
24 workshops --

25 COUNCILMAN BOYLAN: Yes.

1 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: -- and as you're
2 working through your workshops and you
3 understand the things that need to occur, don't
4 you-all have -- from my understanding, the
5 Council has his own power to recommend -- make
6 it's own Charter revisions at any point.
7 Right?

8 COUNCILMAN BOYLAN: Absolutely.

9 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: So you wouldn't
10 need the work of this body to engage that
11 process?

12 COUNCILMAN BOYLAN: That's correct.
13 Absolutely.

14 Quite honestly, that's how we were
15 approaching this, is what changes do we as a
16 Council want to see made in the Charter or
17 whatever so that we can institutionalize so we
18 don't find ourselves in this situation again.

19 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: So what would you
20 need from us to contribute to your process?

21 COUNCILMAN BOYLAN: Well, what I was
22 offering, as Mr. Schellenberg had suggested,
23 some ideas. And if you have some, please feel
24 free, as a body or as an individual, to forward
25 them to me and we will add them to the list of

1 things we want to explore.

2 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Thank you.

3 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Ms. Lisska.

4 You're on.

5 COMMISSIONER LISSKA: Yay.

6 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Congratulations.

7 COMMISSIONER LISSKA: I'll continue to

8 teach the class.

9 Well, we had discussed some of this
10 previously. I'd say, at bear minimum, what we
11 should do as a Commission -- just like it was
12 suggested that ranked-choice voting might be
13 addressed in our report, although a
14 recommendation specifically might not be
15 created, I think, at minimum, we should look at
16 the same thing.

17 I would prefer, frankly, the extension.
18 This -- JEA is such a significant part of our
19 Charter. It takes up a lot of pages in there.
20 And not to diminish, you know, the great point
21 you just made in -- my Commissioner friend just
22 made in that we have issues across the board
23 with the authorities, the appointment issue,
24 all sorts of issues, which brings back the
25 issue of balance of power in government, which,

1 you know, it's been tough -- we hope some of
2 the things we do -- I don't know. Maybe we
3 don't hope that. But I think that was
4 something we initially tried to look at.

5 I just appreciate that this has been
6 brought back to the Commission again, this
7 issue, and other related issues because I know
8 there are a lot of related issues. I'd love to
9 see the Commission take it up.

10 I do understand the extension. And if
11 it's not brought back, I hope in some way we
12 can mention these issues in our final report.

13 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: All right. The last
14 person recognized on this, because I do want us
15 to get moving, is Mr. Denton.

16 COMMISSION GENTRY: Mr. Chairman, I was
17 in the queue.

18 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: I'm sorry. I didn't
19 have you.

20 COMMISSIONER DENTON: This is following
21 up -- Mr. Boylan, this was following up on
22 Mr. Griggs' question. So I was hesitant to ask
23 it, but let me ask it in a little bit different
24 way, which is: Obviously the City Council is
25 all over this issue in many ways. What

1 specifically do you think that this body could
2 offer in a recommendation to the City Council?
3 What could we do or why would we do it? Would
4 it add weight to whatever the Council does, or
5 how would it benefit the process for us to make
6 a recommendation for something you're already
7 working on?

8 COUNCILMAN BOYLAN: Through the Chair,
9 thank you, Mr. Denton, for that question.

10 I think two things to your point. As I
11 suggested earlier on, you might bring some
12 ideas to the table that we've not considered.
13 And, secondly, in answer to your question would
14 it add weight to what we're doing, absolutely.
15 I think it's really important. And I would
16 appreciate having that weight involved in the
17 process, and I will make every effort to
18 communicate through the Chair to all of you
19 what steps we are exploring so that you have
20 that on the table so you could say, we support
21 it, or we've looked to modify it. Spitballing
22 a little bit, but I think that's ways we can
23 find a way to work together in this process.

24 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: All right. I've got
25 some thoughts on that. But final, final,

1 final, W.C. Gentry.

2 COMMISSION GENTRY: Thank you.

3 And thank you, Councilman Boylan.

4 I agree with Judge Swanson. It's kind of
5 like the maxim law, bad cases make bad law.
6 And what that means in you get a really bad
7 fact situation and you react to it and you do
8 something, and then you create all kinds of
9 unintended consequences. I think this would be
10 something important for us to look at. I think
11 there's some discrete issues that arise
12 quickly, such as the appointment process, that
13 could be kicked to us.

14 But, ultimately, we've got an awful lot
15 to do in the next month. I know our Committee
16 still has a lot of work that we're doing. I
17 think we have to get our fundamental job done
18 first. And if there could be an extension if
19 you thought it were valuable, I think we all
20 would be agreeable to that.

21 But what I wanted to talk about before
22 the JEA came up is this, which is interrelated.
23 The one thing that seems to have kind of skated
24 through all this is the Office of General
25 Council. The Office of General Council had to

1 approve that bonus deal. All contracts have to
2 come through the lawyers assigned to them.
3 Also, General Council had to approve those
4 contracts to try to get around the state law
5 that limits the buyouts. That all had to be
6 approved. And so -- and the Office of General
7 Council apparently approved all these lawyers
8 and all these people. School Board can't hire
9 a lawyer to carry out its constitutional
10 duties, but JEA can spend millions on lawyers
11 to carry on this scam.

12 So one thing that came up to us
13 repeatedly when we were doing our initial work,
14 witness -- person after person walked up there
15 and said, We need to do something to restrict
16 the absolute autonomy and absolute control of
17 the Office of General Council.

18 And I wanted to ask Judge Swanson if -- I
19 know that was something that -- we had a hard
20 cutoff only -- at the Chair's request or demand
21 basically that we only do a certain number, and
22 the next one on our priority list OGC. We were
23 all hopeful that it would percolate up. In the
24 time remaining -- and we had some
25 recommendations from constitutional officers

1 about some of the discreet things that could be
2 done to OGC that would help with its absolute
3 autocratic power.

4 I really think, particularly in light of
5 JEA, that it's incumbent upon us to -- in the
6 time remaining to look at what's already been
7 recommended to us about OGC and see if there's
8 something in that area that we need to address.

9 And I guess it's -- Judge Swanson, I know
10 you guys are busy, but I guess it's your
11 committee, but I would ask that we do that.

12 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: I will respond on
13 that in that, you know, we definitely don't
14 have time to go in and look at the OGC. And
15 the issues with the contracts, I think that's
16 exactly one of the topics that Council Member
17 Diamond is looking at because there seems to be
18 a dispute as to what was and what was not
19 approved in that regard, all of which needs to
20 be examined, needs to be looked at. And after
21 that investigation is done and completed,
22 taking appropriate action. I believe that, you
23 know, perhaps some wording that we could come
24 up with in our final report that says we
25 believe this should be looked at, but given the

1 priorities that we established, there simply
2 wasn't enough time and effort to go in there.

3 With regards to JEA, when is your next
4 workshop meeting?

5 COUNCILMAN BOYLAN: Right now, I think
6 we're going to be scheduled to meet on the 24th
7 of February, at which point in time we're
8 bringing in some industry experts from outside
9 the community to talk about the headwinds and
10 what's happening in other municipalities around
11 the state, because I want to see my colleagues
12 and myself get educated about what may be
13 coming to us in the future. I suspect we'll
14 circle back around and have another
15 conversation about these Charter pieces --
16 changes around that meeting or perhaps the
17 subsequent meeting on the first -- I think it's
18 the 9th of March, give or take.

19 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: So what I was going
20 to propose is that we do a noticed meeting of
21 our CRC in conjunction with your workshop,
22 because what it sounds like would be helpful
23 for you is if we can listen in and understand
24 the areas that you're looking at with regards
25 to the workshop and add in a portion in our

1 final report that, again, voices our collective
2 view that restructuring within JEA, as being
3 examined by the workshop, is encouraged and
4 supported. In that regard, if there are some
5 specific things that come out of that that, you
6 know, we could maybe look at.

7 But I tend to lean with Judge Swanson in
8 that we -- for us, as a body, to make that
9 recommendation, we would need to be doing the
10 work that your workshop has been doing over all
11 this time.

12 COUNCILMAN BOYLAN: Right. Absolutely.

13 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: So I think if we
14 could sit in and listen to that, we could lend
15 our support to those efforts in that regard.
16 But I don't see that we could make any specific
17 recommendations either with regards to JEA or
18 with General Council, but I believe we can
19 certainly make a statement of support to
20 examine those areas.

21 COUNCILMAN BOYLAN: Mr. Chairman, I will
22 welcome that. I've worked very diligently with
23 the board manager of JEA all along to talk
24 about a coordinated path going forward. So
25 having your involvement in this process, your

1 intimate knowledge of the Charter, at this
2 point in time, would be very, very helpful.

3 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: And I don't --

4 COUNCILMAN BOYLAN: Thank you.

5 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: And I'm sure it's
6 going to continue on after our report. So
7 anyone who is interested I'm sure could
8 participate in those workshops --

9 COUNCILMAN BOYLAN: Absolutely.

10 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: -- and provide our
11 input --

12 COUNCILMAN BOYLAN: Yes.

13 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: -- through that
14 structure.

15 COUNCILMAN BOYLAN: Yes.

16 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay.

17 Judge Swanson, you hopped on there. Were
18 you on...

19 COMMISSIONER SWANSON: I echo
20 Mr. Gentry's observations. I don't -- for the
21 various reasons we discussed at a prior
22 Commission meeting ad nauseam, my subcommittee
23 -- the subcommittee did not take on the issue
24 of General Council, and those issues were
25 discussed at great length previously. And I

1 suppose in any situation where you have a
2 Commission, this type meeting, there are
3 emergent events that become significant.

4 So I think the Commission has to decide
5 whether we want to address the issues relating
6 to the General Council and JEA or not. If we
7 say, no, we don't have time, that's the end of
8 the discussion. If the consensus or the vote
9 of the Commission is we should, then I think we
10 could only do that if we were extended as a
11 Commission for 90 days. And that would
12 require, in my view, a request to the City
13 Council to extend the Commission for the
14 specific purpose of developing those two
15 topics.

16 So the question is whether or not we, as
17 a Commission, want to do that or not and
18 whether we should or not. And if we do, then I
19 think we need a motion and a second to request
20 an extension of 90 days to take those topics on
21 or not.

22 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: I would ask that we
23 not get into that debate today, again, because
24 we still have one subcommittee to still report,
25 and we've eaten up all that time.

1 COUNCILMAN BOYLAN: I apologize for --

2 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: No, no, no. It's
3 important that we have the discussion. And I
4 greatly appreciate you coming and reporting to
5 us what your workshop is doing, and I really
6 look forward to the opportunity to be able --
7 for us to sit in on those meetings.

8 COUNCILMAN BOYLAN: Chair, if I may end
9 on a lighter note. Per your conversation with
10 respect to 2027 as the election process, I can
11 assure you this will be one Councilman -- if
12 I'm still serving -- that's going to run for
13 office because there will be a murder in
14 Mandarin. My wife will kill me. So rest
15 assured my vote will be of -- purely the right
16 thing to do.

17 Thank you.

18 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: All right. Thank
19 you, sir.

20 COMMISSION GENTRY: Mr. Chairman, to make
21 sure I'm clear, I understood you to say we will
22 be permitted to bring up this matter regarding
23 the extension at the next meeting?

24 MR. SWANSON: You're not on speaker.

25 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: It's -- the short

1 answer is we can bring up whatever -- yes, at
2 our next meeting.

3 COMMISSION GENTRY: Thank you.

4 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Ms. Santiago.

5 COMMISSIONER SANTIAGO: Okay. Good
6 morning, everybody. How fun has this been?

7 So what we have done is we have
8 actually -- I think we've pretty much come to a
9 consensus on what our recommendation is going
10 to be. I would like to ask Commissioner
11 Howland to report out on us. We still do need
12 to put our proposal in writing. But I think
13 we've kind of come up with a consensus.

14 Just for the record, for City Council, I
15 know that we were waiting for one -- and I hate
16 to do this now. But we were waiting for our
17 next meeting dates, and I just wanted this on
18 the record.

19 It will be February the 6th from twelve
20 to two; February the 14th from one to three;
21 and February 21st from twelve to two is our
22 next meetings. So if we need all three of
23 them, we will continue forward. If we can wrap
24 this up perhaps at the next one, then we'll
25 report back out on February the 28 to the full

1 Commission our final report.

2 But, in the meantime, I've asked
3 Commissioner Howland to report today for us.

4 COMMISSIONER HOWLAND: Thank you,
5 Commissioner Santiago.

6 Is that working?

7 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: No. You're not on.
8 You have a nice resonant voice, but it's not
9 on.

10 COMMISSIONER HOWLAND: Thank you,
11 Commissioner Santiago. I appreciate it. And
12 through the Chair.

13 First of all, let me just say as an
14 individual commissioner on the CRC, I'm really
15 excited about the two initiatives that I see
16 coming out of the other subcommittees. Urban
17 Core with the Urban Core Investment Authority
18 idea is going to be fantastic for our city.
19 The government structure and the election
20 change, I got to admit I was concerned about it
21 during that process. But the fact that it's
22 going to be in the off year and all the other
23 changes, I think it's a fantastic
24 recommendation. So kudos to both subcommittees
25 for those recommendations.

1 I also want to say to Subcommittee Chair
2 Santiago. Well done with the Citywide
3 Strategic Planning subcommittee. I think you
4 established a Committee that was organized and
5 informative and a lot of fun. Commissioners
6 Gentry and Hagan and Lisska, you, Ms. Santiago,
7 were a lot of fun to hang out.

8 We as a committee spent November and
9 December focused on trying to understand a lot
10 of local input related to prior efforts with
11 strategic planning and what different folks
12 would want to see. We talked to Chis Hand,
13 Aaron Bowman, Lori Boyer, Don Lockhart, Joey
14 Grevy, Bill Gulliford, Ryan Hughes, a whole
15 bunch of folks, and that was very informative.

16 We spent January focused on benchmarks,
17 other cities that have tried to put strategic
18 plans in place governing their municipalities.
19 We looked at Tulsa; Lexington, Kentucky;
20 Pinellas County; Austin; a little city called
21 London, Canada, and also San Diego. There were
22 some definitive themes coming out of those
23 meetings.

24 First, almost all strategic planning
25 efforts started in the executive branch of

1 those municipalities, many of them starting in
2 the planning or zoning departments.

3 Another theme we found was after
4 implementation of a plan, almost all of those
5 municipalities were nervous about keeping it
6 going, which is really interesting here.

7 A third thing we found is no one else had
8 a consolidated structure like ours, so many of
9 their plans involved their executive and the
10 legislative, but not a number of independent
11 authorities, seldom, if ever, I believe, a
12 school board system. That, in all cases, were
13 tied to the state. So that was unique.

14 So what we're doing -- or what that means
15 is what we're doing is unique in trying to put
16 together a Strategic Planning Commission that
17 tries to ensure the coordination, the
18 uniformity, and the consistency of the
19 strategic goals of all aspects of our
20 consolidated government.

21 So, to that end, we are making a
22 recommendation -- or will be making a
23 recommendation over the next several weeks that
24 looks a lot like what the Task Force for
25 Consolidation and the Blueprint for Improvement

1 put together, but with some certain
2 differences.

3 The main difference being we thought the
4 structure of the Commission needed a little bit
5 of slimming down. We thought it was a bit
6 unwieldy, 13 members in the Blueprint if you've
7 had a chance to glance at that recently. And
8 we also looked at the composition of that
9 Strategic Planning Commission and did a little
10 change.

11 What we're actually thinking -- and this
12 is unique because it's based on lots of
13 discussions that we had, particularly in the
14 last several subcommittee meetings, is we're
15 thinking of a 9 person, not a 13 person
16 Commission. That would have -- be making great
17 use of the five at-large Council members. They
18 would be five of the nine members of the
19 Commission, which we love because those
20 at-large council members generally represent
21 large parts of our consolidated government.
22 And they could represent the Council on the
23 Strategic Planning Commission.

24 That said, we thought that might unfairly
25 balance it to the legislative branch, so we

1 have picked two members appointed by the mayor
2 where we're probably going to recommend one at
3 least be the chief administrative officer and
4 one be the chief financial officer. And the
5 chief financial officer or CAO would be chair
6 of the commission to balance it out. We would
7 also have on board the sheriff and the
8 superintendent of the school boards, so that
9 would bring it to nine.

10 So one of the reasons we really looked at
11 that composition was, again, not only for
12 representation, for balance, but also because
13 taking a little bit of a delve into policy and
14 how the City could move forward, we wanted a
15 focus on making sure we don't leave, as a
16 strategic planning process, parts of the city
17 behind that may have been left behind before
18 over the course of consolidation government.

19 We wanted to make sure we had a
20 representation of crime on that Strategic
21 Planning Commission, which is why we put the
22 sheriff on there and, of course education,
23 which is so important to us, which is why we
24 put the board superintendent.

25 What that means is some of the folks who

1 are on the Task Force for Consolidation
2 recommendation for the Commission fall down to
3 the advisory board. So our Commission shrinks
4 in order to get a strategic plan created, but
5 our advisory board increases.

6 So on that advisory board we would have
7 the same members as on the Blueprint for
8 Consolidation, but also include the members of
9 the independent authorities, the chairs of the
10 independent authorities, the mayors of the
11 three districts, Baldwin and the beaches -- the
12 four, rather. And that was kind of our main
13 recommendation, is smaller commission, larger
14 advisory board.

15 We actually had -- or will probably
16 recommend that the chair of the advisory board
17 be the chair of the Chamber of Commerce. And
18 we do that to ensure that we have good business
19 representation on the advisory committee that
20 easily delves into the Commission.

21 Another change that we have from the Task
22 Force recommendation, we agreed with their
23 tenures revisited -- almost in the same
24 structure as the Charter Revision Commission,
25 ten years revisited. We agreed with their

1 structuring of permanent Strategic Planning
2 Commission staffed by an executive director.
3 And the role in between establishing and
4 updating the strategic plan for that division
5 is in that the executive director is to ensure
6 compliance with it by working across all the
7 members of the consolidated government and
8 reporting on it on an annual basis.

9 But one interesting thing, in so far as
10 timing, that we're probably going to implement
11 in our recommendation or rather recommend in
12 our recommendation is when we kick off the first
13 strategic plan. It just so happens that we
14 have Commissioner Lisska on board who brought
15 to our attention that in 2022 it's the 200th
16 year anniversary of the City of Jacksonville,
17 and we would like that strategic plan to be and
18 launch concurrently with that. So the
19 Blueprint recommended nine months for the
20 Commission to have in preparation for the first
21 plan and launch. We would subtract from that
22 date in 2022 nine months and expect that
23 Strategic Planning Commission meet and have a
24 recommendation concurrent with the anniversary
25 of the city.

1 That is going to -- a little bit more
2 work to do. We are not quite as cooked on our
3 recommendation as the esteemed Councilwoman
4 Baker's election recommendation, but we will
5 get there relatively quickly. And we're pretty
6 sure we've nailed down most of the details.

7 Any fellow subcommittee members want to
8 add to that assessment?

9 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Anybody?

10 Okay. Then I have Mr. Griggs.

11 COMMISSIONER GRIGGS: Thank you,
12 Mr. Chair. Thank you, Mr. Howland, for the
13 presentation.

14 It's been my experience that updating and
15 reviewing strategic plans go stale over a
16 period of time. So my only recommendation
17 would be to move that. Instead of every ten
18 years, every five years. And that would be my
19 only recommendation there. And we look forward
20 to the full finished piece.

21 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Ms. Baker.

22 COMMISSIONER BAKER: Thank you,
23 Commissioner Howland, for that great summary.

24 My question is on the advisory board.
25 Now, would they be a constant advisory board or

1 would they come together during the nine months
2 that the Commission is created?

3 Your thoughts. What it is -- forgive me
4 if you did say that point. I'm not sure.

5 COMMISSIONER HOWLAND: I believe our
6 intention was that they come together at the
7 same time as the Strategic Planning Commission
8 rather than be constant. So these -- both the
9 advisory board and the commission would be
10 convened prior to the renewal of the strategic
11 planning every ten years.

12 Now, the strategic planning division or
13 the executive director of the commission would
14 be responsible for -- they almost have to
15 operate on a standalone basis, if I recall how
16 we discussed it. We haven't formalized the
17 proposed recommendation yet. But that
18 executive director office would operate
19 continuously and be responsible for putting
20 together an annual report that compares or that
21 shows how all the independent authorities and
22 school board, sheriff, everyone is in
23 compliance with the strategic planning. And
24 then that strategic plan gets revisited every
25 tenth year with the stand up of the new

1 commission and the new advisory board.

2 COMMISSIONER BAKER: Just a follow up.
3 So I wonder if you guys took Commissioner
4 Griggs' point to maybe look at the advisory
5 board convening maybe a little bit more
6 frequently with -- so they would work in
7 conjunction with the executive director? Maybe
8 that's a possibility. I'm not sure exactly
9 what the advisory board is going to do or look
10 at, but that's a thought.

11 COMMISSIONER HOWLAND: Yeah. We did have
12 that discussion -- a lot of discussions on
13 timing. Again, the Blueprint talks about ten
14 years. And we initially thought about trying
15 to do it concurrent with our election cycle, so
16 maybe the strategic plan would be every four
17 years, the year after the mayor is elected, and
18 then revisit it. So, therefore, the mayor, the
19 first year, has to report after they're
20 complete with the budget on the compliance with
21 the strategic plan and convene the Strategic
22 Planning Commission in order to revise and
23 update that strategic plan.

24 Then we decided sticking it with the
25 election cycle maybe is not ideal because we

1 wanted to transcend the general turnover of our
2 political bodies. So we talked about then five
3 years or ten years. And there was a whole
4 bunch of discussions we had where we were
5 actually in there with calculators looking
6 at -- probably something similar to what the
7 Election Commission did -- trying to see when
8 dates would fall and how that would affect
9 various cycles.

10 You know, one thing we didn't want to
11 have happen is a new City Council and a new
12 School Board getting hit immediately with
13 having to start up a whole strategic planning
14 process either during the middle of elections,
15 right before an election, or immediately after
16 an election. So the ten-year process ended up
17 giving us better timing. That was our theory.

18 Also, the -- I know Commissioner Gentry,
19 I think he's waiting to say something, and I
20 invite it.

21 COMMISSIONER GENTRY: No.

22 COMMISSIONER HOWLAND: Oh. You weren't.

23 COMMISSIONER GENTRY: I am.

24 COMMISSIONER HOWLAND: Oh. You are.

25 Good.

1 Going ten years spoke to the theory of
2 setting up a strategic plan. Now, in a
3 company -- we talked about this -- you always
4 set up maybe a three-year plan and your budget
5 to align with it. But setting the ten-year
6 timetable really gave -- wanted to give the
7 idea of the strategy some level of permanence.
8 It could always -- I mean, again, one of the
9 themes from the benchmark cities we talked to
10 is everyone is having difficulty in getting
11 adherence to revising the strategic plan on the
12 original timetable. But a lot of them probably
13 don't have the authority that we have to, if it
14 gets put into the Charter, it becomes, you
15 know, a requirement. It's more of something
16 that's kind of created out of one mayor's
17 administration and then doesn't survive the
18 next one. For us, it would be in the Charter
19 so we have do have authority.

20 So that was kind of why we settled on ten
21 years. More for establishing a theory behind
22 the fact that this ten-year strategic plan is
23 something that transcends, changes in offices.

24 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: All right. We've got
25 two people still in the queue.

1 Mr. Schellenberg.

2 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: If you don't
3 mind, I'll wait until after W.C.

4 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: All right.

5 COMMISSIONER GENTRY: Thank you.

6 I think that -- and I understand the
7 questions. The whole issue of how long was
8 something was discussed at some length. The
9 concept is that each year the strategic plan
10 will be reviewed.

11 I know in Pinellas County they require
12 the first meeting sessions that they have a
13 workshop to review it. That concept is to have
14 a staff that drives this throughout the whole
15 time, who collects the data, who reports so
16 there's accountability across all the lies of
17 government which would be reported to the City
18 Council. And the plan can be modified by the
19 City Council, but every ten years you get a
20 total review, refresh as I understand what we
21 were generally trying to do.

22 And the advisory board is created as part
23 of that big process. And so, you know, the
24 strategic plan, the major -- the mission or the
25 major goals are very broad. And then within

1 each goal will be the action items that are
2 undertaken, and those shift as they are
3 completed or successfully ended. This would be
4 part of the annual review by the City Council,
5 to continue adding, but maintaining those same
6 major themes. Maybe the environment, health
7 and welfare, you know, major things, but then
8 every ten years you have a major relook.

9 So you're really doing both of what
10 you're concerned about, not getting stale by
11 sticking with the same thing for ten years.
12 It's a flexibility living document, but every
13 ten years to have a major review where everyone
14 will be convened again and do it. So it's a
15 mixture, as I understand what we're trying to.

16 MR. HOWLAND: Yeah.

17 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Now Mr. Schellenberg.

18 COMMISSIONER SCHELLENBERG: I'm not sure
19 if ten years works, and I'll tell you why. I'm
20 pretty sure that I have an iPhone, and I never
21 considered having it or even thought about it
22 12 years ago. And the world moves a lot faster
23 than government does, substantially.

24 I think ten years ago basically Town
25 Center basically was probably not a cow pasture

1 where it was 20 years ago. Clearly it has now
2 become downtown.

3 So I'm not sure how to address the every
4 ten years. I think that the world moves faster
5 than most governments, period. And what's not
6 addressed, and I think that it's going to
7 impact Jacksonville and the world over the next
8 five years if 5G. How we operate as a City,
9 how people buy cars, how transportation works.
10 So although I'm not a prognosticator at all, I
11 do see that the strategic plan has some basics
12 and there are planning -- in the planning
13 department they do this all the time, but it
14 has some bearing on how we go about things.

15 But if you wait ten years, whatever you
16 looked at will look ancient going forward. I'm
17 not quite sure how to address it. I'm just
18 saying the ten years -- just go back ten years
19 and what you were doing then, and I'm pretty
20 sure you didn't have a QLED TV either.

21 But it is amazing to me as a prior
22 elected official seeing what's happening in a
23 world that is actually available to my children
24 who are millennials and how quickly they're
25 adopting to their lives without government

1 interference.

2 And I'll address it one other way. I'm
3 not sure of banks will exist in 20 years
4 because my children have me on Venmo. I don't
5 even have to use a bank.

6 My point is this: Has everybody used
7 Venmo? Raise your hand. Yeah. Good enough.
8 I'm a 30-day applicant.

9 But all I'm saying is that people are --
10 ten years is a lifetime. Okay. I appreciate
11 you reviewing it. I'm not sure strategically
12 how it works going forward.

13 And one other thing. Thank you ver much
14 for your work, Mr. Howland and Betzy.

15 I would like to know -- you have two
16 boards. I would like to know who's on those
17 boards. You obviously have identified certain
18 going forward, and I greatly appreciate.

19 One final thing: What obligation does
20 the City Council or the mayor have listening to
21 you?

22 So in two years, if this strategic plan
23 is not followed and it's not -- what happens?
24 If they do report, it's a one-day thing in the
25 digital newspaper if they exist. According to

1 Warren Buffet, newspapers are not going to
2 exist at all.

3 But that's another perfect example. Ten
4 years ago who would have thought newspapers
5 were going out of business so quickly.

6 Anyway, thank you.

7 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: So when is your next
8 committee meeting scheduled, Ms. Santiago?

9 COMMISSIONER SANTIAGO: It is scheduled
10 for February the 6th.

11 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: That's right. You
12 gave those. 6th, 14th, and 21.

13 COMMISSIONER SANTIAGO: Yes.

14 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: So for those who have
15 got some questions and some ideas on the ten
16 year, I would recommend trying to make one or
17 more of those meetings so that the ideas can be
18 flushed out so that when we get our
19 recommendation on the 28th, everybody's had a
20 chance to really spend that committee work and
21 time and understanding what the concerns you.
22 I would suggest that on all of the committees
23 in there in that regard.

24 I really like the idea of the strategic
25 plan. And when I was talking with someone,

1 they said, Well, how does that look? What does
2 it look like when it's working?

3 And one of the examples that I saw just
4 recently was JTA coming up with routes that
5 were getting people in food deserts to
6 groceries -- to grocery stores. If we say it
7 eliminates the food deserts is a priority under
8 the strategic plan, then exactly something like
9 that, of engaging the JTA to come up with a
10 solution in there rather than -- or maybe in
11 conjunction with incentivizing adjustments in
12 that area with those types of things. When I
13 envisioned how this would work, that's what I
14 see is that kind of lateral problem solving
15 rather than just expecting something to come
16 down and go through legislative or regulatory
17 process in there.

18 So thank you. Thank you everyone. Oh.

19 COMMISSIONER HOWLAND: Yes, sir. Thank
20 you, Mr. Chair.

21 Just related to that, if people are going
22 to give us recommendations, one thing I do
23 suggest, back to my original point, is all of
24 the interviews we did with local folks, all the
25 benchmarking we did, we came back to that Task

1 Force and Consolidation Blueprint Report and
2 said this really is a good baseline.

3 So, really, some of the changes that
4 we've made are reducing the Commission,
5 increasing the advisory board. But most of the
6 other elements, how the board is convened, how
7 the executive director will manage the office,
8 how they'll revisit, we really liked a lot of
9 those. We haven't firmed up some of them.

10 We had a debate in the last meeting about
11 the focus areas that are listed in the Task
12 Force for consolidation and would we change
13 some of those, would we address them at all,
14 would we just add a include these but not
15 limited to. So if you read that blueprint,
16 you'll know what our recommendation is going to
17 look very similar to when we finally put out
18 our formal proposal.

19 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: All right.

20 COMMISSIONER HOWLAND: Thank you.

21 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Thank you.

22 Again, thank you to everyone who has work
23 so diligently and put in all of the time on
24 this. It shows. And I truly look forward to
25 getting our final report put together.

1 On the other business, Mr. Gentry, you
2 had said that our two meetings that I had
3 initially set in March you weren't able to
4 attend. Is that still true?

5 And here's why I ask: One of the things
6 that I may have staff do is to put out sort of
7 a calendar question and what dates we have
8 available in March so that we can get dates
9 where we have the majority of our members able
10 to attend so that if there are any tweakings of
11 our final report that we can do that.

12 Judge.

13 COMMISSIONER SWANSON: When you do that,
14 could you have the staff also delineate the
15 date and time schedule for all of the
16 subcommittees because there may be some cross
17 pollination that is appropriate at this point.

18 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Well, yes. My hope
19 is that there won't be any more subcommittee
20 meetings after February 28 because I was
21 talking about meeting in March.

22 COMMISSIONER SWANSON: Yeah. I meant
23 before then.

24 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Before that then,
25 yes. We'll go ahead and put out when all the

1 subcommittee meetings are for February. And it
2 may be that we can have another meeting before
3 the 28th. I mean, does anybody think we need
4 that or do you need to spend the time in the
5 committees?

6 Ms. Baker.

7 COMMISSIONER BAKER: I was going to ask
8 you, Mr. Chair, if it was premature to
9 scheduled full Commission meetings in the
10 beginning of March right now as well just so
11 we're not in a time crunch at the end of March.

12 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: I would agree that
13 meeting sooner rather than later is good.

14 COMMISSIONER GENTRY: Mr. Chair?

15 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yeah. I've got
16 Ms. Jameson.

17 COMMISSIONER GENTRY: I'm sorry.

18 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Are you still on the
19 queue?

20 COMMISSIONER JAMESON: Yes.

21 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: All right.

22 COMMISSIONER JAMESON: Thank you.

23 So our next full meeting is scheduled
24 right now for February 28; correct?

25 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yes.

1 COMMISSIONER JAMESON: And that's the
2 date that all of us are supposed to report out
3 all of our recommendations and take votes on
4 those.

5 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yes.

6 COMMISSIONER JAMESON: Okay. It's
7 probably going to be a lot to do in that short
8 period of time, especially considering, you
9 know, how today has gone already a little bit
10 over, potentially.

11 So I guess my thought would be do we need
12 to schedule another meeting? Does that need to
13 be extended? How do you see that going?

14 And then, again, with the March meetings,
15 I would also like to have more in the earlier
16 side of March so that March 31st we're not
17 scrambling.

18 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Yes. So that's why
19 we will get available dates of everyone in
20 March and set those up, because it's likely
21 that we won't be able to get to all of the
22 recommendations on the 28th so that we can do
23 that and get that --

24 COMMISSIONER JAMESON: Okay.

25 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: -- put together and

1 then we can craft a final report and circulate
2 that and have that approved by everybody on
3 there.

4 So that -- I will make sure we get that
5 so that we're able to meet and get a final
6 product.

7 Judge Swanson, are you still in the
8 queue?

9 COMMISSIONER SWANSON: No. I'm sorry.

10 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Okay.

11 COMMISSIONER GENTRY: I was just going to
12 echo asking that we set the next meeting the
13 first week of March. My problem with March is
14 my first queue of grandchildren are on spring
15 break. The second week of March, my next queue
16 of grandchildren are on spring break, and I'm
17 going to be taking them to Colorado, so that's
18 where I'm going to be.

19 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Well, bring them here
20 and let them see how government works.

21 COMMISSIONER GENTRY: Yeah. Right.

22 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: All right. I don't
23 see anyone else on the queue. We do have
24 Mr. Nooney.

25 Sorry. Ms. Jameson.

1 COMMISSIONER JAMESON: Sorry. I had one
2 other question.

3 Have we heard any recommendations from
4 Council members as far as things they would
5 like us to put in our final report or examine?
6 From the conversation that we had today
7 regarding the task works -- or the workshops --
8 excuse me -- I'm curious if we've heard from
9 any other City Council members.

10 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: I have not.

11 COMMISSIONER JAMESON: Thank you.

12 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: I haven't.

13 COMMISSIONER JAMESON: Thank you.

14 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Mr. Nooney.

15 MR. NOONEY: Hello. My name is John
16 Nooney. Address is on file. Thank you for
17 recognizing public comment.

18 Just from, you know, the agenda, I just
19 want to start like I did months ago with -- and
20 I was late to the meeting, so I don't know if
21 you've did it already.

22 I pledge allegiance to the flag of the
23 United States of America and to the republic
24 for which it stands, one nation, under God,
25 indivisible with liberty and justice for all.

1 And I'm just glad to see -- and we have
2 the court reporter back. And I just want to
3 say I swear the testimony that I am about to
4 give is the whole truth and nothing but the
5 truth and not a Charter Revision Commission
6 fib.

7 And, you know, yesterday, I mean, I
8 attended the meeting where, you know, we're
9 going to have an Urban Services District
10 Investment Authority but we're changing
11 investment to development authority. An
12 authority. You know, we have authorities. We
13 have the Port Authority, the Transportation
14 Authority, you know, the JEA.

15 And from day one I was just simply
16 asking -- you know, and if this is the
17 direction that we're going, that -- you know,
18 the whole issue for me has been the waterways.
19 I've got years of things -- if you ever did
20 discovery with me, man, you'd fill up half a
21 room I think.

22 But the point I'm getting at -- and
23 here's the map, you know, that was handed out
24 yesterday and just simply -- and, Chairman
25 Brock, you're on waterways. You put waterways

1 into this subcommittee. You know, people
2 wanted to see testimony from, you know, Kay
3 Ehas, Groundworks Jax; Captain Jim Suber,
4 waterways; Lisa Rinaman, the Riverkeeper.

5 And simply what I would like to see in
6 our charter, especially if we're creating a new
7 authority, is that any waterway that taxpayer
8 money is giving to an entity, that public
9 access to that waterway will be guaranteed for
10 Joe Q. Public.

11 Now, this authority excludes the Downtown
12 Investment Authority. I'll give you one
13 example; Hogan's Creek, you know, and then the
14 Armory for a buck. The Armory was 2013, 384,
15 you know, seven years ago. And now you also
16 have Hogan's Creek and the Historical Society
17 that's right there.

18 The point being -- and also, too,
19 downtown, I believe, is under federal. So
20 you've got -- you know, that's a big, big
21 difference.

22 And, here again, you know, my time is up.
23 But before you submit this --

24 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Thank you,
25 Mr. Nooney.

1 MR. NOONEY: -- please get some clarity
2 on it.

3 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Thank you.

4 MR. NOONEY: Thank you for listening.

5 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: All right. Anything
6 else for the good of the order?

7 COMMISSIONER GENTRY: I apologize. I was
8 slow at the wheel this morning.

9 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Microphone.

10 COMMISSIONER GENTRY: They asked to amend
11 to reflect where it says this -- Commissioner
12 Howland was quicker than me. I was not here
13 because I was out of state and advised the
14 Chair I would like to be listed as excused.

15 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: We will list that as
16 Commissioner Howland and gentry as excused.

17 COMMISSIONER GENTRY: Thank you.

18 CHAIRPERSON BROCK: Anything else?

19 Thank you-all very much. We're
20 adjourned.

21 (Meeting adjourned at 12:03 p.m.)

22

23

24

25

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

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

STATE OF FLORIDA
COUNTY OF DUVAL

I, Tiffany Jones, Court Reporter, do hereby certify that I was authorized to and did report the foregoing proceedings; and that the transcript, pages 1 through 155, is a true record of my stenographic notes.

DATED this 8th day of February, 2020.

Tiffany Jones

Tiffany Jones, Court Reporter