



OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Matthew J. Lascell

Inspector General

Office: (904) 255-5800

Fax: (904) 255-5813

231 E Forsyth Street, Suite 470
Jacksonville, Duval County, FL 32202

Website: www.jacksonville.gov/oig

Email: InspectorGeneral@coj.net

Inspector General Selection and Retention Committee (IGSRC) Meeting Minutes

Note: Below is a summary of the meeting as required by Florida's Sunshine Law; See AGO-82-47

Date: October 8, 2025

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

Call to Order: Chair Chambliss called the meeting to order at 9:02 AM

Pledge of Allegiance: Chair Chambliss opened with the pledge of Allegiance.

Roll Call – Committee Members present:

- Lt. Col. Keshan Chambliss, Chair, TRUE Commission, and Chair of the IGSRC
- Cecilia Birk, Court Counsel, designee for Chief Judge Lance Day, the 4th Circuit
- Tracey Polson, Director of State and Federal Advocacy and Public-Private Partnerships, designee for the Honorable Donna Deegan, Mayor
- Dr. Erich Freiberger, Chair, Ethics Commission
- Charlie Cofer, Public Defender for the Fourth Judicial Circuit
- Stephen Siegel, Assistant State Attorney, designee for the Honorable Melissa Nelson, State Attorney for the Fourth Judicial Circuit

A quorum was met with six members present:

- Chris Miller, City Council Member, excused absence

Office of Inspector General (OIG) Staff Present:

- Matthew J. Lascell, Inspector General
- Khalilah Watts, Executive Assistant
- Christina Gatto, Investigative Coordinator/Accreditation Manager
- Richard Samples, Deputy Inspector General for Investigations
- Derronne Nins, Investigator

Office of General Counsel (OGC) Present:

- Ashley Smith, Assistant General Counsel

I. Old Business

A. Approval of September 10, 2025, Meeting Minutes

Chair Chambliss asked the Inspector General Selection and Retention Committee (Committee) if there were any questions or corrections to the September 10, 2025, meeting minutes.

Ms. Birk moved to approve the September 10, 2025, meeting minutes as circulated. PD Cofer seconded the motion. **Motion passed unanimously.**

II. New Business

A. Inspector General annual evaluation (follow-up discussion)

IG Lascell explained at the prior meeting that the OIG and Employee Services were tasked with reaching out to comparable OIG offices to research their evaluation process for Inspector Generals. IG Lascell stated the OIG contacted the following OIGs: Broward County, Miami-Dade County, and Palm Beach County. He noted the research aligned with what he recommended at the last IGSRC meeting which is to utilize the OIG annual report as the basis of his evaluation. He reiterated his old evaluation tool was a self-evaluation that did not add any depth to the evaluation process. Director of Employee Services (ES), Leah Hayes, confirmed that the information the OIG reported is the norm for IGs as per the research her office conducted. Ms. Polson asked for the research and Ms. Hayes stated she had emailed it to Karen Bowling.

Dr. Freiberger initiated conversation regarding who is responsible for determining the IGSRC meetings. IG Lascell explained that it is determined by the OIG and the availability of the Committee. Dr. Freiberger stated he was concerned because at the last meeting the Committee was up against a deadline regarding retention of the IG. He explained he felt there was no choice but to approve IG Lascell's renewal. Dr. Freiberger added he was not sure if it is appropriate for the office being evaluated to also be the ones issuing the invitations to the Committee.

Discussion continued throughout the meeting regarding who would be handling administrative tasks for the Committee as there is no staffing for the Committee. IG Lascell explained there is one OIG staff member that coordinates the meeting schedule, does all the meeting minutes, and everything else that goes into planning for IGSRC meetings. IG Lascell stated Ms. Gatto will still probably do all the leg work for the meetings, but from a process perspective it makes more sense for the Committee to be the ones responsible for getting the input and agenda for the meetings that they desire.

Ms. Polson inquired if there was a way to slow the IG evaluation process down or if they were unable to do so due to the Ordinance Code. Ashley Smith, OGC, stated he was not aware of anything in the Code that would prevent the Committee from slowing down the IG evaluation to develop the process they want to use going forward to evaluate the IG.

PD Cofer stated the way evaluations have been done in the past for the IG were not good since it was a self-assessment. PD Cofer added going forward if the retention decision needs to be made six months before the contract ends, he proposed that eight months before the expiration of the contract that comment should be invited from each of the following: Mayor's Chief of Staff,

Sheriff, Clerk of Court, Property Appraiser, Tax Collector, Supervisor of Elections, OGC, City Council President, and each of the City independent agencies.

PD Cofer suggested that a letter would go out from the OIG to each of the groups inviting comment to the Committee on the performance of the IG. He acknowledged his suggestion is not due to the current IG and it is because the Committee was completely blindsided by the prior IG. PD Cofer explained how the Medical Examiner (ME) is chosen for their position and that Florida Department of Law Enforcement (FDLE) sends out invitations for comment to different agencies that are impacted by the ME.

There was discussion amongst the Committee and IG Lascell regarding who would reach out to the entities to solicit comments about the IG. IG Lascell reflected Dr. Freiberger's earlier point and stated that the OIG should not be tasked to reach out for input about himself for his own evaluation. IG Lascell also acknowledged PD Cofer's earlier explanation regarding how the ME is chosen as FDLE reaches out to the other agencies, and not the ME themselves. He added if the Committee has interest in obtaining additional information, then the Committee should take on the responsibility, not himself.

Ms. Polson initiated discussion regarding the meeting minutes from June 4, 2024, which included a prior discussion where then City Council President Salem had questioned where complaints about the IG go, with the response being that they are directed to the head of ES. Ms. Polson inquired if complaints about the IG are solicited or if they get reported. She also asked how the Committee would know if complaints about the IG are reported. Ms. Hayes explained the complaints come to ES and they have not had any complaints about the IG. Ms. Polson asked how often ES gets asked about IG complaints, and Ms. Hayes responded this is the first time since she has been in her role.

Dr. Freiberger motioned for a policy to be established if there are any complaints about the IG that they be reported to this Committee. Ms. Polson seconded. **Motion passed unanimously.** IG Lascell requested clarification if the motion applies to complaints just for the IG or includes the employees of the OIG. Chair Chambliss deferred to the Committee for further discussion and clarification. Dr. Freiberger stated the IG has the right to run his own office, and the Committee's concern is his execution of that function; the Committee was in agreement.

Dr. Freiberger requested the Committee to make a decision on the IG evaluation process. Chair Chambliss acknowledged IG Lascell stated he would complete the old evaluation, mentioned PD Cofer's earlier suggestion, and requested further suggestions from the Committee. Dr. Freiberger suggested the Committee moves to adopt the earlier suggestions by PD Cofer. Ms. Polson explained she spoke previously with Carla Miller who will be sitting on the Committee as designee for the Mayor's Office due to the departure of Karen Bowling. Ms. Polson stated Ms. Miller requested the IG evaluation discussion to be slowed down as she wants the opportunity to do some of her own research regarding IG evaluations, have conversations with Ms. Hayes and IG Lascell, and reconvene with the Committee. Dr. Freiberger agreed since they are discussing an evaluation that would not take place for another four years, that more time for research is acceptable.

Chair Chambliss requested any further conversation or concerns. Mr. Smith referred to the Ordinance Code and read, "The Committee shall on a yearly basis evaluate the performance of

the Inspector General." Mr. Smith asked if that was performed at the last meeting or prior to that meeting. Mr. Smith requested clarification if the evaluation process being discussed is for the annual evaluation or a future contract renewal evaluation in four years.

Dr. Freiberger explained they are discussing two processes. The Committee voted to renew IG Lascell's contract by virtue of the Code. The Committee did not engage in an evaluation for the IG, and they could be in position to do this at this meeting, but in order to do it properly they need to come up with their own criteria evaluation and mentioned the process should be slowed down if the Code permits it. Mr. Smith said he was not aware of anything in the Code that would prevent the Committee from slowing down the IG evaluation to develop the process they want to use going forward to evaluate the IG.

Mr. Siegel inquired when the last IG annual evaluation was conducted, and IG Lascell responded in June of 2024. Mr. Siegel acknowledged he has been on this Committee since 2023, and he explained the timeline of Committee meetings being changed or postponed in the past due to previous Committee members voting to come back for another meeting which slid the meetings further. IG Lascell explained that historically this has been the problem with the Committee, that every time there is a decision to be made, the decision is to delay it and to do it at another date.

Mr. Siegel stated in terms of the annual evaluation, the Committee should discuss when that should be completed so there is not more than a year period from the prior evaluation. He suggested when they get to the four-year retention period for an IG, cumulatively the annual reports will inform what the retention decision would be and there may be some additional solicitation for the contract renewal process. The annual reports inform the Committee what the IG has been doing for the year. If the Committee wants to add additional criteria whether it is to interview members of OIG staff or people in the community that are stakeholders that deal with OIG, that is certainly something the Committee needs to figure out internally how to create the process. Mr. Siegel also brought to attention that there cannot be sub-committees due to the Sunshine Laws.

IG Lascell stated he is not opposed to the Committee taking as long as they need to, but a process needs to be put in place by the Committee, and the OIG can still handle the administrative aspects if no one else can. IG Lascell requested that the timelines are put in place and stuck to going forward as decisions have not been made in any of the meetings put in place. IG Lascell reiterated he brought his evaluation process up at the last meeting because no one else in the City is evaluated, and he is the only required to write a fourteen-page evaluation about himself as opposed to the Committee objectively evaluating him on what he does and how he does it, and there should be an objective process on how to do this. Chair Chambliss appreciated IG Lascell and his patience with this process and asked for further discussion from the Committee.

PD Cofer stated in terms of evaluations, the critical things he looks for are the timeliness of IG Lascell's process and moving cases through. PD Cofer acknowledged when IG Lascell took over, there was a huge backlog from the prior office which IG Lascell had addressed. PD Cofer stated the second thing he reviews are the OIG reports that IG Lascell has the courtesy to send out, and how he deals with the complaints that are presented to the OIG. PD Cofer concluded that he is happy with this and the thoroughness of IG Lascell, and this is how he evaluates how IG Lascell has been doing.

IG Lascell stated this is the exact process that the other offices, Miami-Dade, Broward, and Palm Beach, utilize. They look at how the office is doing business, the quality and timeliness of the investigations, and that is the metric of how the office is run. IG Lascell acknowledged the OIG has 180 changes with how they have been doing business, and the reputation and credibility of the office is above reproach.

IG Lascell addressed the Committee and explained he thinks the Committee has to decide on two separate things regarding IG evaluations: 1) what to do on an annual basis as required by the Code, and 2) what an evaluation would look like for the IG retention discussion when the four-year contract term is ending. PD Cofer stated his earlier suggestion of seeking comments is more relevant to the retention portion every four years. For the annual process, PD Cofer is comfortable with monitoring how the IG is currently doing, keeping up with the OIG cases, and if IG Lascell has the staffing and resources to address the issues coming to the OIG. He would not want to beleaguer the City Departments and Constitutional offices every single year for the annual evaluation.

Regarding annual IG evaluations, IG Lascell proposed that on an annual basis if decided by the Committee, they use the office annual reports and input from ES if there are any complaints against the IG personally; that should be the starting point of the evaluation. After that occurs, the Committee can ask for whatever additional information they may want.

IG Lascell proposed for the four-year retention evaluation, this would involve the Committee reaching out to all the stakeholders from the City to receive their input on the IG. He added that the Committee can coordinate with the OIG to reach out to the stakeholders on behalf of the Committee.

Dr. Freiberger motioned for the Committee to reconvene in a month and consider Ms. Miller's review and suggestions. The Committee can approve of the four-year evaluation in light of the annual evaluation and set the criteria for the annual evaluation. Ms. Polson seconded the motion. **Motion passed unanimously.**

Ms. Birk informed the Committee she will be retiring and won't be at the next meeting.

B. Inspector General new contract terms determination

Ms. Polson inquired if the contract in question is the proposed contract or current contract and IG Lascell responded it is the current contract. Mr. Smith stated from the Ordinance Code section in relation to the contract, that "The Chair of the Committee, in coordination with the Office of General Counsel, shall negotiate a contract of employment of the IG. The IG shall be an appointed employee, exempt from civil service and shall be entitled to all rights and benefits normally accorded to appointed employees." Mr. Smith suggested, if the Committee has recommendations or preferences as to what the terms of the renewal contract would be that they express those and maintain the chair's ability to negotiate, as necessary.

Chair Chambliss asked Committee for concerns and discussion. PD Cofer asked if OGC or IG Lascell have any recommended modifications of the contract. IG Lascell explained his only concern is to change the dates of contract term and his salary amount in the new contract as both have changed. IG Lascell asked for the top pay scale due to thirty-five years of public sector experience

and an impeccable track record during his last four years as IG. He also added he does not receive any other benefits from the City.

Ms. Polson asked for IG Lascell's current salary and IG Lascell responded with approximately \$251,000. He added his salary is comparable with other IGs across the state. Ms Polson requested a salary survey of other IGs in Florida or in the country. IG Lascell stated that his request is not outside of his current pay scale range, and he is requesting the maximum high end.

Ms. Polson stated she had a brief discussion with Deputy Chief Administrative Officer, Kelli O'Leary, regarding salary and she explained that the 3% City increase is what was budgeted. IG Lascell explained the OIG generates revenue which goes into the operational functions of running the office. Mr. Lascell stated the OIG caseload and recovery from the City should bear merit in this discussion, considering one case last year generated enough to basically fund the OIG for a year.

Dr. Freiberger stated IG Lascell made a good argument but until the Committee establishes evaluation criteria, he does not feel comfortable voting for salary. He requested that the salary component discussion be conducted at the next meeting. Mr. Smith stated he was not aware of a deadline for the salary decision, only that the renewal contract needs to be in place by March 2026 to avoid expiration of the current contract. He added the decision can be made at the meeting scheduled for next month.

PD Cofer suggested the Committee reviews other paygrades comparable to IG Lascell's, and he acknowledged he feels comfortable where the City has him budgeted for now. Mr. Siegel understood IG Lascell's explanation and thinks the compensation discussion should be paused for at this juncture. (*Chair Chambliss stepped out of the meeting at this time.*)

PD Cofer motioned for OGC to prepare a contract that deletes the prior salary and range and adds the present salary and range. And if IG Lascell approves of the new contract that the City prepares IG Lascell can sign off on it. Dr. Freiberger seconded the motion. PD Cofer asked for further discussion and public comment. There was none. **Motion passed by majority vote.** (*Chair Chambliss was not present during the vote.*)

III. Any Other Business

Ms. Gatto requested clarification for her role in continuing scheduling and planning for the Committee meetings; it was agreed by the Committee to continue the role.

IG Lascell inquired if the next meeting will determine the IG evaluation or if there will be further discussion. Chair Chambliss stated Ms. Miller will provide her input and the Committee will decide on the evaluation. IG Lascell asked if the salary discussion component will still be part of the annual evaluation. Dr. Freiberger stated he did not see why it couldn't still be part of the process. He added they can discuss Ms. Miller's research, and they could have a decision at the next meeting. They can set up timelines, so they do not run into these issues in the future.

Ms. Hayes asked for clarification regarding the salary survey and whether her office will be tasked with this piece. The Committee agreed and requested a list of everyone's salary in the City who is in the same salary paygrade as IG Lascell and for it to be prepared for the next meeting.

IV. Comments from the Public

There was no public comment.

V. Adjournment

Chair Chambliss adjourned the meeting at 10:04 AM.