



## OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

APPROVAL DATE 11/16/16

### Inspector General Selection and Retention Committee Meeting Minutes October 14, 2016 1:00 p.m.

*Note: Below is a summary of the meeting as required by Florida Sunshine Law; see AGO-82-47.  
Please refer to the audio file on the City of Jacksonville's website, <http://www.coj.net>, for more detail.*

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

**Called to Order:** Committee Chair Judge Senterfitt called the meeting to order at 1:11 p.m.

**Pledge of Allegiance:** Judge Senterfitt opened with the Pledge of Allegiance.

#### **Roll Call - Committee members present:**

Ywana Allen, Ethics Commission, designee for Joe Jacquot

Ralph Hodges, Vice-Chair of the TRUE Commission

Honorable John Crescimbeni, City Council Vice-President and Vice-Chair of the Inspector General Selection and Retention Committee

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

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

Representatives from the State Attorney's Office and Public Defender's Office were unable to attend.

Also present as "Staff":

Diane Moser, Chief of Talent Management, City of Jacksonville Employee Services

Steven Rohan, Interim Inspector General ("IIG")

#### **I. Approval of the September 19, 2016, Meeting Minutes**

Judge Senterfitt asked whether there were questions or corrections to the September 19, 2016, draft meeting minutes. With none, all voted in favor and the draft meeting minutes were approved as final.

#### **II. Discussion and decision on the next step in the selection process for a new Inspector General**

Judge Senterfitt suggested there were two options in the selection of a new Inspector General ("IG"): Offer the position to the third candidate, or re-advertise the position at the end of January, 2017.

Ms. Stewart asked whether the first candidate who was offered the position (Mr. Hoffman) declined due to a timing issue related to leaving his current job, and if so, what his time frame was. Ms. Moser confirmed that it was a timing issue, as Mr. Hoffman will retire between late spring and early summer of 2017. CVP Crescimbeni stated he also had confirmed with Mr. Hoffman that it was a timing issue, and suggested that re-advertising later may better coordinate with Mr. Hoffman's timing.

Judge Senterfitt asked for discussion regarding candidate Person. Ms. Allen suggested the committee explore all options, indicating she had not received positive feedback regarding Ms. Person from former associates. CVP Crescimbeni agreed. There was no motion related to Ms. Person.

Mr. Hodges inquired about IIG Rohan's opinion of continuing as the interim until June or July, 2017. Judge Senterfitt stated IIG Rohan would stay under certain conditions to be discussed later in the meeting.

CVP Crescimbeni confirmed that all Inspector General Selection and Retention Committee ("Committee") members received a copy of a recent email from applicant Holmgren expressing continued



## OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

APPROVAL DATE 11/16/16

interest in the position and asking to be interviewed on an alternate date, as he was unable to interview on the previously designated date.

The committee discussed whether or not it is appropriate to individually interview Mr. Holmgren. Judge Senterfitt stated that if the job is re-advertised and Mr. Holmgren chooses to re-apply, he could be considered; but an individual interview would be inappropriate.

Mr. Crescimbeni asked whether re-advertising the position a third time would erode interest in the position. IIG Rohan said yes; it's a very public process; the process had to move forward regardless; however, he and Ms. Steckler believed the applicant pool would expand significantly after January 20, 2017. Judge Senterfitt reiterated that Inspector General Advisor Sheryl Steckler felt January or February is a good time.

Ms. Moser listed the various job advertising methods used. CVP Crescimbeni suggested re-advertising the position later rather than choosing a candidate now, and asked whether the salary is fair. IIG Rohan stated the salary is fair, but candidates feel there are serious problems with a small budget and minimal staff per his experience. He recommended finding someone willing to build up an office that is not yet established.

CVP Crescimbeni asked whether to include in the advertisement that the new office had limited resources as it was being created and built up. IIG Rohan agreed this would be helpful. Ms. Stewart indicated Judge Senterfitt previously specifically asked interviewees whether they recognized they were coming to a small office that they would have to build. She felt it was important to indicate this is a young/small office and that they want someone who can grow the office.

Ms. Allen stated adding this verbiage to the job description is fine, but for someone who was passionate about the position, the size of the office would not matter. She asked whether there are other channels for job advertisement that could be used to attract that candidate. Ms. Moser indicated that there were.

CVP Crescimbeni asked Judge Senterfitt whether they could help candidate Hoffman separate from service with the Navy early; perhaps ask Mr. Hoffman whether he's still interested, and if so consider asking the US Navy to free him up. Ms. Moser agreed to reach out to Mr. Hoffman to determine whether this was an option. Judge Senterfitt asked the committee whether they agreed to re-advertise the position January 23, 2017, through February 24, 2017, unless something works out with Mr. Hoffman. CVP Crescimbeni motioned for this. Ms. Allen suggested discussing an estimated timeline for candidate selection and the date of interview into the advertisement. Judge Senterfitt indicated March 2, 2017, for candidate selection, and March 10, 2017, for interviews as an amendment. Ms. Stewart seconded the amended motion. All voted in favor; the motion passed.

### **III. Discussion and decision on whether or not the present Interim Inspector General will continue on, and on what terms**

At Judge Senterfitt's request, IIG Rohan indicated his conditions to remain working in an interim capacity, to wit: To be classified as a part-time employee, to work a maximum of 50 hours per 2 weeks versus the current 60, and to receive a pay increase from the current \$56 to \$85 per hour as the Ethics Officer receives. Additionally IIG Rohan shall be authorized and encouraged to make internal personnel (job) classification and/or salary adjustments as he deems appropriate. He would need Committee support in these areas to effectively run the office, and successfully continue. Mr. Rohan stated if the



## OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

APPROVAL DATE 11/16/16

Committee felt these things were not acceptable, he recommended appointing Lisa Green as quickly as possible to serve as Interim Inspector General, with the appropriate salary adjustment.

CVP Crescimbeni asked for clarification of what positions IIG Rohan intended to change. Mr. Rohan indicated he was considering the Intake Specialist, but primarily the Director of Investigations or Lisa Green's current position.

IIG Rohan said if he remained as Interim and spent less time in the office, he wanted Ms. Green to serve as Deputy Inspector General, giving her more operational oversight. CVP Crescimbeni asked the budgetary impact, stating he felt it unfair to give a temporary salary change/bump for an interim employee who later was bumped back down. Ms. Stewart suggested this was similar to civil servants working in a higher capacity for a period of time and temporarily receiving out-of-class pay, which is then reduced to their normal salary once they step down and stop functioning out-of-class. Ms. Allen asked how much of a pay increase. IIG Rohan suggested a \$10,000 to \$15,000 annual raise, but only for this interim time period so it would actually be less. During the discussion, CVP Crescimbeni asked Ethics Officer Carla Miller whether the Ethics Office could assist with supervisory support. Ms. Miller offered up her assistance but Mr. Rohan stated supervisory assistance from any outside agency was unacceptable given the confidentiality and independence associated with the IGO.

Ms. Stewart agreed with IIG Rohan's requests, stating she did not want the office to stagnate.

CVP Crescimbeni stated he does not want budgeted vacant positions held open rather than filled, then for the Department to later use outstanding budgeted funds for other purposes. IIG Rohan reassured that this is not the intent; as new vacant positions are already being advertised. But Mr. Rohan indicated he was already pursuing filling the positions but that delays were inherent working with Employee Services requirements.

Mr. Hodges suggested that nothing extra could be used from other line items to pay for raises. Ms. Stewart asked that IIG Rohan be respected in allowing him to run his Office effectively. CVP Crescimbeni suggested a 15% maximum pay increase cap per employee be required for changes to existing positions when/if IIG Rohan deems appropriate. Mr. Hodges reiterated Ms. Stewart's concerns of not wanting to tie IIG Rohan's hands.

A motion to retain IIG Rohan, and honor his \$85 per hour salary, part-time employee classification, and management empowerment requests, with the 15% per subordinate employee raise limitation, was passed.

#### **IV. Discussion and decision on whether or not the present part-time Inspector Advisor will continue on, and on what terms**

The committee discussed whether there was funding for fiscal year 2017 in the event part-time Inspector General Advisor Sheryl Steckler continued on. Ms. Moser indicated there were both part-time dollars and part-time hours for Ms. Steckler. IIG Rohan indicated the hours and salary were not set aside in the budget for this, but this could be worked out. Mr. Rohan reminded the Committee that as Interim Inspector General, and under the ordinance, only he could hire Ms. Steckler. He stated that he wanted to accommodate the needs of the Committee and that since the Committee felt like it needed assistance in the selection process, he was happy to accommodate the Committee. Judge Senterfitt suggested it would be appropriate to reach out to Ms. Steckler, let her know what the Committee decided, advise her of the proposed timelines, and request her assistance in formulating new questions.



## OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

APPROVAL DATE 11/16/16

Judge Senterfitt suggested that the March 2, 2017, meeting agenda not only include the Committee selecting candidates, but also include discussing the type of issues Committee members want to cover with the candidates. Committee members would then review the specific interview questions the morning of the interviews on March 10, 2017.

### **V. Additional Matters**

CVP Crescimbeni stated he formally withdrew the resolution in the City Council to move the Office of Inspector General from the Yates Building to City Hall.

### **VI. Comments from the Public**

Citizen John Nooney spoke about the Committee having considered the previous interviewees for the IG position as qualified, and asked why Lisa Green was not chosen. He asked that with a need to restore public trust, why not hire someone 'imminently qualified'? He felt the Committee was more concerned about the personality of the individual being someone able to communicate with Council, versus being someone having actual audit skills. Mr. Nooney emphasized the public wants someone who is going to question spending of taxpayer dollars, and asked them to reconsider Lisa Green for the Inspector General as a motion. He thanked the audience.

Citizen Conrad Markle stated he appreciated the care the Committee has given to this process of choosing a new Inspector General. He indicated this totally independent IG position is going to be the most important government position in the last 48 years. He asked the Committee to please continue exercising due diligence in earning and public trust in government. He thanked the committee.

### **VII. Adjournment**

With no further comments from the public, Judge Senterfitt adjourned the meeting at 2:39 p.m.