

Approved Minutes May 16, 2016
Inspector General Selection & Retention Committee
Meeting Minutes April 18, 2016
2:00 p.m.

Location: City Hall, St. James Building, 117 West Duval Street, Lynwood Roberts Room

Called to Order: Committee Chair Boyer called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. and noted this is the second of such meetings.

Pledge of Allegiance: Ms. Boyer opened with the Pledge of Allegiance, and then asked committee members to introduce themselves.

Committee members present:

Tom Paul, Vice-Chair of the Ethics Commission

Sam Shiver, designee for Public Defender Matt Shirk

Marc Hassan, Chair of the TRUE Commission

Lori Boyer, Chair of the Inspector General Selection and Retention Committee and Jacksonville City Council Vice-President

Kerri Stewart, Office of the Mayor, designee for Mayor Lenny Curry

Patricia Dodson, designee for State Attorney Angela Corey

Honorable Judge Elizabeth Senterfitt, Vice-Chair of the Inspector General Selection and Retention Committee and designee for Chief Judge Mark Mahon

I. Approval of the October 22, 2015 Minutes

Committee Chair Boyer asked whether there were questions or corrections regarding the October 22, 2015, meeting minutes. With no questions, Ms. Boyer requested a motion to approve the minutes. Judge Senterfitt moved to approve; Mr. Hassan seconded the motion. All indicated they were in favor, and the motion was approved.

II. Presentation of Six-Month Status Report, Tom Cline, Inspector General

CM Boyer introduced Inspector General (IG) Cline, Office of Inspector General (OIG). IG Cline reviewed his presentation which had also been distributed in hard copy, to include all talking points. IG Cline introduced his staff members present, Lisa Green, Tina Moody, Jonathan Parrish, Margie Shannon, and Brandon King, as well as Ken Swain who was not present. Questions regarding IG Cline's presentation were invited.

Ms. Dodson asked in looking at the previous six-month report and comparing items labeled as deliverables with costs identified and cost avoidance, whether IG Cline had a similar chart for purposes of comparison. IG Cline stated he hadn't prepared the breakout of costs identified and questioned costs for the prior six months.

CM Boyer asked whether IG Cline had not added to that number in the last six months; whether neither the costs identified nor the costs avoided have changed in the last six months. IG Cline stated that is correct; what was reported six months ago remains the number.

Ms. Dodson asked how IG Cline identified the costs identified and costs questioned on his OIG Impact Report this time in order to calculate the ROI, and asked where the calculations came from.

IG Cline: The \$1,049,081 is the summation of approximately \$100,000 of identified funds plus \$860,000 of questioned costs from the Access to Capital Report in the prior six-month period. Then roughly \$50,000 from the Public Parking report in the prior six-month period, and approximately \$42,000 savings related to the helicopter memorandum. IG Cline had essentially summed up everything regardless of whether it was costs identified, costs questioned, or costs avoided.

Ms. Dodson asked if the costs were identified in the first six months of establishing this office.

IG Cline stated that they were identified in the first year of establishing the office, as the first six-month presentation was given by Sheryl Steckler in April of 2015, IG Cline gave the second in October of 2015, and this is actually the third. Mr. Cline asked if the committee would like more detail of those costs.

Judge Senterfitt indicated that would be helpful.

Mr. Hassan: Regarding costs identified and questioned, you (IG Cline) made recommendations. Are those funds that have not only been identified but returned? Have we followed up on those recommendations; has the money actually come back, if it is the case, where it needs to come back? If that is the case, where did it come back to?

IG Cline described what these “pots” of dollars mean: Costs identified is money that we believe can be gone after, such as the \$100,000 in the Access to Capital Report. Costs questioned becomes more nebulous. Typically this is money that should be recovered through the correct amount of compliance, but you have to pursue it perhaps through a court case or legislative action. Cost avoidance is future savings; it’s looking backward and not forward.

Mr. Hassan stated to the issue identified last time, the TRUE Commission’s interest in the OIG was that OIG would have more teeth than the TRUE Commission. While the TRUE Commission identified instances where there was potential savings, they can only make recommendations. Their interest is in follow-up. He asked what the OIG can do to ensure recommendations are being handled and questions answered. He questioned whether it is called ROI until you see actual dollars returned to the City.

IG Cline stated this is a long-standing practice by OIGs. The OIG can identify dollars as being a ROI; however there is no capability to recover funds, as this requires activity outside the OIG office. IG Cline does follow up and ask, but has no ability to personally recover the funds. This is typically handled through some other entity at the City.

Mr. Hassan asked whether there are plans to follow up on these specific funds.

IG Cline referenced the example of Access to Capital, stating the program is more about needing to decide whether to re-establish and use the funds, or return funds to the department that gave them, or determining who is entitled to keep them because the pot is mixed. The response to this was a commitment to come up with a decision. He doesn't believe the decision has been finalized with regard to that specific program, but the OIG took that as concurrence with their recommendation to do something with the program and that is what the OIG recognized.

Kerri Stewart stated one of the duties and functions is to monitor the implementation of the recommendation. Despite no ability to enforce, what procedure and process is put into place to track these? Is there a tracking mechanism?

IG Cline responded that tracking implementation is done on an ad-hoc basis and while he may need to develop something more automated in the future, he is not sure that it is necessary at this time.

Mr. Paul indicated his day job is internal auditing which involves follow up. He highlights when there's a lack of follow-up. And if that is highlighted to this committee, that can provide the needed initiative for others to act; that can be an open item until it's followed up upon. This drives the action, and he's seen success with this method.

CM Boyer asked whether there were additional questions or comments.

Ms. Dodson stated with respect to duties and functions of the IG, she is aware there's the duty to execute and negotiate agreements and memorandums of understanding (MOUs) with other public entities and partners. Within the last six-month report there was discussion about engaging in discussions with other agencies and partners regarding potential contractor fees coming back to OIG and the City. She inquired about the follow up and status of those efforts.

IG Cline stated there has been some recent activity on the subject of Independent Authorities and Constitutional Officers. As to the matter of the contract fee, the decision was made to wait and address that in the future when the new accounting system was installed. The system is still in the planning stage, so the idea of a fee based on contracts is still in abeyance.

On Independent Authorities and Constitutional Officers, IG Cline spoke with several of them about the possibility of a MOU to establish fees. The reaction was universal--not much interest. Subsequent to that, the OIG realized that Section (S) in the ordinance not only requires negotiation over the memorandums used to take money; it requires negotiation of the authority of the OIG to provide oversight. There's been dialogue with JEA, OGC, and Carla Miller at the Ethics Office. It seems there are dichotomies regarding intent and what is in ordinance. IG Cline stated he has a meeting scheduled with OIG regarding how to fix those issues going forward.

CM Boyer stated that for the benefit of others: Referencing language in the original ordinance that created the IG--that discussed the creation of MOUs with Independent Authorities--which at that time was only to exercise authority over the Independent Agencies because without their consent there was no other way by ordinance that City Council could impose that.

Subsequently, there was a Referendum of the voters in which case the authority was extended to the Independent Authorities. So from a timing standpoint, the Referendum that extended the authority and amended the charter came after the original ordinance. We can debate whether or not the Referendum in reality amended the Ordinance, or whether or not an amendment to the Ordinance is required to delete conflicting language, but in terms of timing I don't want to leave anybody with the impression that the Referendum didn't happen--and that your only authority over the Independent Authorities is to negotiate a MOU. To elaborate on your answer, can you advise when you met with Independent Authorities and on how many occasions with respect to negotiating fees?

IG Cline indicated he held one meeting with them last spring specifically to discuss the idea of, and negotiate fees.

CM Boyer asked whether this was shortly after the Referendum was adopted.

IG Cline corrected, stating he started immediately after coming onboard last July.

CM Boyer asked with whom he met in each case.

IG Cline stated he met with the Sheriff of JSO, the heads of most of the constitutional offices the CEO for JEA, the CEO of JaxPort, JTA, JIA, and often times their staff. He allowed them to decide who they wanted to bring with them.

CM Boyer stated she was trying to understand whether IG Cline had the opportunity to have a conversation at the level he needed to.

Ms. Stewart asked with respect to the specific reporting procedures: As the IG starts to release reports, if there are findings and recommendations for process improvements but the employee that was in the center of the allegation that led to this recommended process improvement—if there was no finding of malfeasance or fraud or anything by that employee--must the OIG put the employee's name in the report?

IG Cline stated while he is uncertain exactly what he *has* to do, what he has done is followed the model that was set up for this office and that he has seen in use at other OIGs. In the course of investigations they do tend to name names, because as in the reports on the website, they are a record of detail including contents of the interviews naming interviewees and what was said about specific individuals. That is what was done prior to IG Cline coming onboard, and that's what is done at the other two municipal offices, Palm Beach County and Miami Dade.

CM Boyer asked IG Cline whether he knew if the Principles and Standards for Offices of Inspector General specify or address that.

IG Cline stated he did not think so, as the Standards are somewhat high level and most likely do not address that detail.

CM Boyer: From her personal opinion, from a human resources standpoint, and managing personnel standpoint, she finds it difficult to read a lengthy report that neither found someone innocent, or guilty, and consequently drags them through the mud without some satisfactory conclusion or recommendation. While she wasn't saying that is not the way the process works, she doesn't know the detail of what you are supposed to do or how to do it. However, in terms of improving the quality of services, efficiency of the City, saving tax payers money, improving morale of our employees that didn't look like it to her and she does not know how to model differently.

IG Cline stated he is happy to take suggestions and vet them against the Standards, vet them against other departments, and find out if he can or should do it differently. Things he has seen at the local level to include Palm Beach County and Miami Dade, are very different than the models he is used to at the Federal Level.

CM Boyer asked whether at federal level they do it the same as in this most recent report.

IG Cline stated he feels the federal level can, however they do not because they have more flexibility when it comes to investigative reports. Many of them that are very detailed in terms of names and events don't get published. This OIG does not have that capability. One of the reasons this OIG includes names in reports is that when we issue an audit or report of investigation, our working papers themselves are public record. Anybody wanting the report just has to send me an email and they can receive it. The OIG does redact personal information, but a person's name is not private information. IG Cline believes names are named in reports of investigation because names are in the file, and the file is public information.

CM Boyer suggested maybe there's something different between having something available as public record and a widespread email distribution.

IG Cline: Perhaps.

CM Boyer asked whether there are additional questions or comments on the six-month report.

Mr. Paul stated he had two questions; one for Ms. Boyer. He thought he saw a letter from the Office of General Counsel (OGC) with an opinion that Chapter (S) did in fact matter, and that the OIG did not have purview over JEA. Has that been recognized?

CM Boyer stated it has not. She received a copy of that last week. It can be handled in new business, and finish the six-month report first. CM Boyer asked whether there are further questions on the six-month report. (None.)

III. New Business:

CM Boyer stated there are a number of items in new business, and asked to start with Mr. Paul's question.

Mr. Paul stated he had two questions; part of it as having not been involved with the committee before so he doesn't have a sense of the committee's basis for evaluating the performance of Mr.

Cline, and that this can be a challenge with his roles and responsibility, and a committee that's somewhat fluid in terms of its participants. That's a challenge in terms of constructive feedback needed for someone to grow in a position. If that's not fully worked this out at this point, it is as an important part of the process to be figured out.

CM Boyer agreed and intends to spend a fair amount of time on that issue. To the point about the Independent Authority, CM Boyer referred to M. Sidman, OGC, (audience) asking if she was familiar with this letter. CM Boyer then asked Carla Miller, Ethics, (audience) if she's familiar with what the letter said. Ms. Miller paraphrased that an opinion from J. Brooks, OGC, two weeks ago indicated JEA doesn't need to allow OIG to come into the Independent Authority without a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) referencing the original statute or code of October 2014, which was a predecessor to the citizen referendum which clearly gave jurisdiction of the Inspector General's Office over the Independent Authorities. Ms. Miller states it all relies on one Section (S) in the 2014 Code which basically says if the OIG wants to go into Independent Authority, they need to have a MOU. She states she was present in City Council meetings when it was discussed, and the reason it was put in there was they didn't want to have the first IG Code to just assume that City Council had jurisdiction over the Independent Authorities so they decided to wait for that and put it into a citizen Referendum which then happened about five months later.

CM Boyer stated the opinion of OGC at the moment was that because the provision in the Code contemplated an MOU and there was a later Referendum that gave the authority, they didn't interpret that as amending the Code, effectively, they said we'll find a way to read them both together and say you still have to have a MOU so that that can be cured by Council action that eliminated that provision of the Code.

Ms. Miller affirmed that yes, it would simply require a City Council bill eliminating Section (S). Ms. Miller thought the OGC opinion was a bit more complex because the charter was amended and it referenced back to the Ethics Code. So it tied back to the Ethics Code and that gave the authority to say we have to refer back to the original Ethics Code.

CM Boyer asked whether based that opinion being out there now, until such time as that conflict of language is resolved in the Code, the IG Office is only allowed to obtain access to records in the Authorities, etc., by permission.

Ms. Miller stated that is correct and means the revision of the code to eliminate that ambiguity needs to be done ASAP on an expedited basis so that we can reflect the citizens' desire to have an independent IG Office that has jurisdiction over Independent Authorities.

CM Boyer asked whether anyone had other questions, and whether all understood where we stand currently on this issue. (Silent)

CM Boyer referred back to Mr. Paul's larger question which goes to the purpose for the creation of the Selection and Retention Committee for the Inspector General. When CM Boyer looked at the statutory basis for the committee and why they meet, it is because the OIG is an independent Office which functions largely out of view, but someone needs to make a decision every four

years whether we renew this contract. She questions how to do that and on what basis they make a good decision.

CM Boyer had contacted Kelly O’Leary, Director of Employee Services for the City, and asked whether it is prudent to establish criteria for annual reviews and recommendations for improvement, so that one can make an appropriate judgement as you would do for other employees. CM Boyer questioned if they as a body are charged with that employee evaluation for the Inspector General, how is that accomplished.

CM Boyer stated they do not have that well defined, and passed out two items. Ms. O’Leary had sent CM Boyer an evaluation form that is used by Palm Beach County, and also provided the Principles and Standards for Office of Inspector General. CM Boyer offered to send a link to this, but provided the first page of the document because it had some relevant information. “By nature of their work OIG’s are held to the same or higher expectations as other government officials...qualitative and quantitative performance measures should be developed....”

After reading, CM Boyer stated her sense is the committee is not in a position to make an evaluation on the spot because they hadn’t had the information, or the opportunity to review it. She would like to discuss things they think are important and set a meeting in a month after reviewing criteria other jurisdictions have used, come up with their own criteria, and perhaps adopt standards so they can properly evaluate and review. She is open to other ideas.

Mr. Paul agreed that this made sense; similar to hiring and retaining the Ethics director. It’s an important part of the process because it’s formal. Anything less than formal means potential gaps in execution and no continuity to make sure this very important function is being helpful to the City as was intended by voter referendum.

Ms. Dodson stated: I feel we don’t know what those performance measures are, and we need someone with that experience to come in and assess and establish some performance measures and maybe a strategic plan. I know that in Palm Beach County there was a strategic plan in place that set forth goals and objectives so committees such as this could determine what outcomes were. I believe that Sheryl Steckler is still an OIG advisor and is currently a City employee. There certainly was a part of the budget established for her to be an advisor to the OIG. I don’t know if it would be appropriate to make a recommendation or move to have her contacted to come in and work with the IG to help establish some of those performance measures or review prioritization of their cases, or what this office should be set up to do. There’s still money in the budget I believe. Is that right?

CM Boyer stated the advantage of Ms. Steckler is that she is an Inspector General, and has some familiarity with our office. People cannot evaluate themselves; the concern is that there needs to be independent criteria and evaluation of executives.

Ms. Dodson offered to motion if appropriate for Ms. Steckler to be advisor with the allocated funds to come in and do an assessment and report back in maybe a month.

CM Boyer asked whether Ms. Steckler would do that for the committee rather than for the office.

Judge Senterfitt stated her understanding was the purpose is to develop criteria for the committee to evaluate whether the office is working as it is supposed to, and the suggestion was for Ms. Steckler to help the committee develop those goals.

CM Boyer stated she believes the intent wasn't to help the office, but rather to help the committee develop the criteria for assessing the office.

Ms. Dodson stated: I'm not sure if you're supposed to be developing the criteria. At some point I thought based on their prior six-month report, and also based on some of the duties and functions that are statutory, that they're supposed to create performance measures and a strategic plan. I don't know if it could be some kind of a dual role where she's helping to establish those performance measures, and in conjunction with the Office and to assist this Committee. I am a little confused because of what was put in the six-month plan. I thought IG was supposed to be establishing some of those performance measures.

CM Boyer stated she believes this is correct and some of this is in original ordinance code and in the guidelines that were adopted previously. She asked to clarify the motion by breaking it into parts: Initially, you're suggesting that bring in Ms. Steckler to assist us in creating criteria for how we evaluate the performance of the inspector general on a regular basis, and that she would work with Ms. O'Leary of Employee Services on that. We would then come back and have our own private meeting where we could discuss priorities for this. For example for me personally, the outreach is important because I want to make sure we're going out to the community and telling them this is available. It doesn't do any good to have it if nobody knows it's there and how to use it. Some of these criteria may be have different guides, but she can interview us and have conversations with each of us individually about our own concerns, whether it's ROI or how we monitor on an ongoing basis, etc., and then help present some criteria that we could adopt as a way to adopt this.

Ms. Dodson asked that before making a motion she be able to ascertain that the funds allocated in the IG budget for Ms. Steckler to be an advisor to the IG can also be used for Ms. Steckler to be an advisor to the committee.

CM Boyer asked Ms. Sidman whether she thought the budget allocation for Ms. Steckler to be an advisor for the IG would allow us to use her in that capacity.

Ms. Sidman advised she was communicating with the Auditor's Office, who was watching the meeting streaming, to inquire about the funds for this year and the permissible purpose, and they are looking at it.

CM Boyer asked the amount of the allocation. Several in the audience responded \$20,000. CM Boyer asked whether there should be a cap on how much to spend on this included in the motion.

Judge Senterfitt suggested thinking in terms of the number of hours Ms. Steckler would need to spend.

CM Boyer asked Ms. O’Leary (audience) how many hours it would take to develop criteria for a performance review.

Ms. O’Leary stated rather than guess she wants to confer with Ms. Steckler as soon as possible to see what her availability is, and think through what needs to be developed.

CM Boyer discussed proper authorization method and amount with several others, to include Council President Greg Anderson (audience).

IG Cline stated he is fully supportive of the process, and as long as it is done legally he will authorize using those dollars to whatever extent needed. He suggested coordinating this with Ms. Steckler.

CM Boyer asked whether the IG has used her services and spent any of the budget for that.

IG Cline stated the majority of those dollars are intact.

CM Boyer asked Ms. Sidman to approach the podium.

Ms. Sidman stated it’s her understanding there is \$20,000 at 250 hours for Ms. Steckler and other needs in the IG budget and if the committee wants to allocate an initial amount based on hours, they can allocate that.

CM Boyer asked whether there is a suggested number of hours or dollars for this effort as an up-to amount.

Mr. Hassan asked IG Cline what his anticipated needs are of her.

IG Cline stated he reserved the money in case of a desperate situation. He does not have a planned need, and offered any portion needed for this exercise with no limits.

Ms. Dodson suggested up to \$10,000 for purpose of consulting with the IG committee.

CM Boyer, Council President Anderson, and Ms. Dodson discussed hourly rates, dollars and hours budgeted. CM Boyer asked if they want to suggest 40 hours.

Ms. Dodson questioned whether Ms. Steckler would be available for more than a week over the next month to work with the committee, if they were hoping for a report back within a month.

CM Boyer: Since we’re doing an up-to amount, and on an hourly basis, perhaps we should do the five which gives you 40 hours and gives us some flexibility. We can see where we go from there. Hopefully it can be done in less than that, but it gives us an opportunity. And then the context of this would be that we would ask her to at least have a telephone conversation, and an actual in-person interview with each of us to discuss our individual concerns as well as the requirements in the current City ordinance to discuss what criteria we should be evaluating. Is that agreeable?

CM Boyer acknowledged the motion and asks whether there is a second.

Ms. Stewart seconded the motion.

CM Boyer asked whether there is further discussion.

Mr. Paul stated the motion sounds great, but suggests refraining from the idea of making a decision for Mr. Cline about his needs. In his opinion it is up to Mr. Cline to determine what he needs, and not for the committee to impose upon that.

CM Boyer requested the vote. All were in favor; none opposed: My anticipation is that we will move forward and try to contact her as quickly as possible following this meeting and try and set that up. I will not actually schedule the next meeting until we know the timeframe of her availability, but I would hope that within 30 to 45 days we could approve criteria for evaluation, and once we've approved those we can each evaluate Mr. Cline based on those and return that information to Ms. O'Leary. We'll figure out the mechanics of how that works in terms of who assembles the information. Since we're sunshine-bound none of us can assemble the information because it would be communicating with each other so we're going to have to have, whether that becomes Ms. Miller or the Office of General Counsel, someone else to assemble the information. Are there any other questions? It was brought up that there are questions about whether we have a strategic plan for our office, and some of the additional performance criteria. I did read somewhere in this National Standards, but I think it's also in our actual code that there is development of performance and evaluation criteria on part of the responsibilities of the Office. Ms. Dodson did you have that?

Ms. Dodson indicated she had that in front of her and was reviewing: If I may it's Subsection R, established policies and procedures to guide functions and processes connected by the offices. I know they have established procedures for inspections and audits and that sort of thing. If I may just add a comment, I think they've done a great job hiring staff, everybody in place is set up to fulfill the functions of this office, but we do need some performance measures and a strategic plan to be able to properly assess the return and the results for the citizens which are ultimately the boss of this authority.

CM Boyer: I would agree. And if they're not spelled out there, this will be our opportunity to spell them out because if we're evaluating based upon those we'll know what they are. Does anyone else have any questions? Is there any new business?

Ms. Stewart asked: Before we meet with Ms. Steckler is there opportunity to get a copy of policies and procedures that have already been established so that we can take a look at them ourselves?

CM Boyer asked IG Cline if these are online.

IG Cline: There is typically on the part of Inspectors General, a bit of a hesitation to resist this for investigations. I have seen OIGs fight the same issue even for audit procedures. I'm not

particularly of that school of thought for audit procedures; I'd be happy to share those. I'd be happy to share any of the procedures we have. Regarding the conduct of investigations I may ask for forbearance on those procedures. But I'd be happy to share operating procedures, how we do things, and reporting procedures; I'd be happy to share all that with you.

Kerri Stewart: Thank you.

CM Boyer asked IG Cline to share something generic: For example, do you have a policy that a correspondence is going to be addressed within so many days? That investigative parties are going to be notified. Can you do that without violating the confidentiality and independence issues? This is the comment I made to you in your office when we were talking and I told you that one of the real hazards of being independent and being located in an independent place is that I have no idea if any of you go to work. We talked about time and attendance. I don't see anybody, so there's no way for me to know that other than the work product. And if you're showing me that in six months we don't have a work product, I don't know what to evaluate. So you're going to figure out how you can articulate what policies and procedures you've adopted. If that's been part of the process for this six months is standing up things, somehow you're going to have to have a way to tell us what you're doing.

IG Cline: I can do that. You have the Standards for the Association of Inspectors General. There's also on our website the Standards for Accreditation for law enforcement specific to Inspectors General. I can also give you my internal documents.

Ms. Miller offered a comment on behalf of public records law: Any document generated from the IG's office is not confidential as part of a specific investigation—any of the policies and procedures are public record. There may be a preference not to give out the investigative standards, but it's a public record. The only thing that's confidential under Florida law in that office is information that pertains to a specific investigation. When Sheryl Steckler was here I remember her going over extensive writing of IG procedures for investigative, audit—for the entire office set up. It was a complete set of IG procedures and policies. They are all public record.

Judge Senterfitt offered comments: I just want to be careful that this group doesn't get too much down in the weeds of the day-to-day of when someone walks into the office, when they take lunch, that sort of thing. What I would like to see, and it seems at the end of the day what the citizens want to see, are what are the goals of the IG's Office? What do they think they can do, change, find, and then the details. And I think we all are looking for more detail on this \$1,049,081? Show me the money; that's really I think what we want to know. How they do their investigation we don't necessarily need or want to know the details of that because we may make the IG's office less useful. We do need to know what are the goals, and where are we really making money?

CM Boyer agreed. I think part of the concern that I heard is that the \$1,049,081 is kind of past-history, and what has happened in those nine months we have been hiring additional people? We have additional staff and additional budget but we don't have any of those savings from this more recent period. And if the answer is we've been working on staff-issued policies or

programs then we need some information on that. If that's not the answer and the answer is we've been working on a number of cases but we don't have any reports yet from them, then that may be the answer. What we don't have is tangible savings in recent history since this budget year started. Anything else?

Mr. Paul commented: In my practice I report up to an independent audit committee. Members of the independent board of directors, and I do use (inaudible) but some of it is green, yellow, and red, we choose that at the time of an audit. And then what's the latest rating, and that focuses on the implementation of changes. And if there is an open item where there's \$200,000 that an agency should go out and retrieve, that would remain that color until it is resolved and that would make it very transparent to this committee that there's an open item that needs to be followed up on. Just as a matter of practice we report on our hours where we spend them by area. We don't spend any real time talking about that, but that's to provide a level of transparency because there's not anyone looking into what we're doing and internally when I report up to the CFO, audit—they tend to kind of leave us alone. So in my opinion there's a level of required transparency that I provide so that a body, much like this body, can be comfortable that they have a look into what is going on and understand the changes quarter by quarter. If that's helpful.

Ms. Dodson asked: I know this is off your earlier report. You commented there were 19 cases that you have draft reports you anticipate having results on in the next few days—was it 19 cases?

IG Cline: No, not that I anticipate reports on in the next few days. I have three draft audit reports that I should issue audits on and final reports on in the next couple of weeks. My contract oversight specialist has 20 projects and I believe we'll bring 5 to 6 of those to report stage in 5 or 6 months

Ms. Dodson stated: I misunderstood and I was hoping if there tangible information and cost savings that would be collected in the next month, that would be considered and reviewed. If there's additional information that comes up and could be shared that would be helpful.

IG Cline: Thank you.

Ms. Boyer asked whether Mr. Mousa had a question.

Mr. Mousa approached the podium, thanked the committee, and indicated that while he had not planned to speak, items discussed during the meeting brought important thoughts and comments to mind. With respect to the \$1.4 million, he strongly encouraged committee members to require the Inspector General to provide a breakdown of that number. He felt that a lot of the money was cost recovery, not money recovered. For example regarding the Access to Capital program, the first Inspector General report issued after getting into office July 1, 2015, and that report was being conducted under the previous Administration. That was not a case of the money was missing but a case where the money was not being properly oversighted. The wrong agency was responsible for overseeing it, but the money was not lost and recovered, nor was it spent. The money was always in the bank, but not being oversighted. Mr. Mousa stated when calculating

ROI from those kind of elements, it is important that all the monies being discussed in these reports be segregated into cost recovery, not properly managed, and perhaps not being put to work in a sufficient (inaudible).

Next Mr. Mousa addressed names in reports, stating many allegations that are coming to the Inspector General's Office are absolutely false. They are derogatory, and end up being personal matters that are not true. This is tough on an employee or anyone when allegations are completely not founded and are disclosed and distributed to the whole world. The Administration does not think this is fair. Mr. Mousa stated he and Ms. Green previously discussed this and at the time she felt it needed to be done, but Mr. Mousa is not sure that it does. He asked the committee to please consider that when the allegations have not been founded, names should not be indicated in the report. Yes, they do become public record and if anyone is really interested in whom that person is, they can put in a public records request and get a copy of it. But he feels it is unfair to automatically advertise this information.

The final item was oversight of JEA and the Independent Agencies. Mr. Mousa reminded the Oversight Committee that the Inspector General's Office is funded by the general fund. To his knowledge there is currently no other funding source for the Inspector General's Office. If the Inspector General is going to enter the Independent Agencies, the Independent Agencies should pay for their time working for the Independent Agencies whether that be by contract fees, or by contribution from the Independent Agencies to the general fund whereby they can continue funding the Inspector General's Office. If, for example, they're going to enter the JEA, the JIA, or the JTA they are going to require far more personnel to do those audits or investigations. The Independent Agencies need to pay for that; it can't be all a general fund responsibility.

Mr. Mousa thanked the committee for their time and taking his comments into consideration.

CM Boyer thanked Mr. Mousa and responded to his last point: I certainly understand with respect to the general funding and the difficulties involved. I know when Ms. Steckler was here and we were just starting this, her argument to the Council was that the Office would show such significant cost savings and benefits to the organizations that they would be willing to enter into the MOU and the fee. I think the problem we have at this point is we're not demonstrating that cost savings aspect yet to the level that those entities are willing to kick in to share a part of the cost. Perhaps if we are able with some time to show how beneficial the Office is to the operation, and how it is saving the entities money, and how they are doing a better job, then they will be willing to participate and they'll want them to be part of the process. Right now it is a challenge when they don't have that track record to show them.

Mr. Mousa apologized and formally introduced himself: Sam Mousa, Chief Administrative Officer for Mayor Lenny Curry. He indicated it was important to note the Administration's working relationship with the Inspector General Office is a good working relationship. They meet at a minimum of once a month to discuss happenings and items which can be discussed without divulging information that they cannot divulge. It is a working relationship that's improving and the Administration hopes to continue that. Mr. Mousa appreciates the cooperation, and thanked the OIG.

CM Boyer thanked Mr. Mousa, and invited further comments. (Silent)

IV. Comments from the Public

CM Boyer opened the floor to any public comments.

Mr. Mantei stated: Yes ma'am thank you, I am Rich Mantei, States Attorney Office, I actually am the person probably who most interacts over the history of our relationship with the office, working with the Inspector General. I have only seen Mr. Cline a couple of times. Lisa Green and I, she has me on speed dial and I have worked with her extensively and most closely because I handle all the integrity complaints of the Jacksonville Sherriff's Office Unit. So when we are investigating a city employee or (inaudible) the Sherriff's office or someone else, Lisa is typically involved at least at the outset some of the conversations. I wanted the council know, wanted this committee to know that have there are several investigations that we have launched and that have we actually come out of those referrals. You won't see a cost savings on any of those, because those resulted in being fired or going to jail. You won't see a big bang for the buck or a return on that investment other than simply knowing that perhaps someone isn't out there committing crimes in the name of the City of Jacksonville. Also, I wanted to say there is another large one, that depending on how, how, I know Lisa has spent an inordinate amount of time involving the animal care and control... (inaudible) a little bit already. There is, there are investigations like that, that I know that they are spending a lot of hours of their time and you can't necessarily summarize or put in a report because they know that we are working on our side of the house. Once it becomes criminal, we tend to keep them out of it, until we finish with our process. So I just want to apologize that on behalf of not being able to give them as much information as I would love to give them. Up until we are done with it, I really can't, so I wanted you all to know that you won't see that reflected (inaudible).

CM Boyer asked: Is it, is it possible to disclose how many current cases that you have either filed charges on that stemmed from IG investigation, I mean can you do that, or I mean is that even a violation?

Mr. Mantei stated he can think of at least four within the last say eight months involve City employees.

CM Boyer stated because it is part of the criteria useful to the committee, Mr. Mantei is correct. If criminal charges result from work that has been done, it may not be a cost savings but it is a very significant thing that they've found someone is engaged in criminal behavior. Somehow this information needs to be fed back to the committee. CM Boyer states she has a sense that IG Cline has done a good job filling the positions on his team, but she does not have enough information to evaluate on other things. She thanked Mr. Mantei for this information and his time.

Mr. Mantei thanked CM Boyer. CM Boyer asked whether there was anyone else.

V. Meeting Adjourned 3:32pm

CM Boyer: Seeing no further comment, we are adjourned. Look for a notice from me as to our next meeting which I anticipate should be in four to six weeks, and before that time we should be contacted by Ms. Steckler.

Note: Above is an overview of the meeting. Please refer to the audio file for complete details.