



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: September 10, 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 9:00 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 IGSR
- Cecilia Birk, Court Counsel, designee for Chief Judge Lance Day, the 4th Circuit
- Karen Bowling, Chief Administrative Officer, designee for Honorable Donna Deegan, Mayor
- Dr. Erich Freiburger, 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
- David Johnston, Deputy Inspector General for Audit
- Derronne Nins, Investigator
- Katie Turner, Investigator
- Bryce Ayers, Investigative Support Analyst

I. Old Business

A. Approval of January 29, 2025, Meeting Minutes

Chair Chambliss asked the Inspector General Selection and Retention Committee (Committee) if there were any questions or corrections to the January 29, 2025, meeting minutes.

Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) Bowling moved to approve the January 29, 2025, meeting minutes as circulated. PD Cofer seconded the motion. **Motion passed unanimously.**

II. New Business

A. Inspector General evaluation

Inspector General (IG) Lascell initiated discussion regarding the Committee devising a different method of the Inspector General evaluation. He relayed the current scaling metric does not reflect a true evaluation and it would be more prudent to utilize the OIG annual report and the office reports as evaluations themselves.

IG Lascell stated the current evaluation template is antiquated and since he does not work with the Committee on a daily basis, he believes the current method is not effective. The current template is a self-assessment where the Committee then assesses him with a score of 1 to 5, which is not reflective of a true evaluation.

IG Lascell added that no one else in the City on his level has an evaluation such as the lengthy self-assessment template that is being used for him, which was created when the office originated by his predecessors. IG Lascell explained the City of Jacksonville Ordinance Code states the IG has to be evaluated but it does not indicate *how* to be evaluated. He opened the floor for Committee discussion.

PD Cofer agreed there are shortcomings with the current matrix evaluation template as it is self-assessed by the IG and the Committee then had to produce scores where they think he stood. PD Cofer stated he has a concern and was not sure if it is appropriate, but he offered the idea to invite various Heads of government to see if they have feedback about IG Lascell and the OIG. PD Cofer added this invitation would include the Mayor's Office, City Council, General Counsel, and other Constitutional Offices. He explained this feedback would be more helpful in case there is something the Committee may not be aware of. PD Cofer also noted that the OIG reports produced are very thorough.

Dr. Freiburger thanked IG Lascell for bringing the IG evaluation topic to the Committee as it was a concern of his as well. He prefers a more robust and stronger evaluation system which is fair to IG Lascell and fair to all concerned. Dr. Freiburger added he did not want to feel as if he was being asked to rubber stamp something without enough information.

IG Lascell agreed and added to PD Cofer's point, that the media news is a good metric considering if the office was in trouble or not being run up to par, the Committee would know about it fairly quickly. IG Lascell continued by explaining the OIG cases and reports are indicative of the quality and scope of the activities the office takes on and the reporting has been robust and has helped

the City save money. He agreed there should be some kind of feedback from the major stakeholders in the City. IG Lascell added to Dr. Freiberger's point, that for him to put words on paper doesn't really show the true measure of how the office is doing.

Dr. Freiberger stated it looks like the IG's office is doing the right thing but from the annual report it is hard to tell what the office is actually doing. He added he does not have insight into how the office is doing and feels it is impossible to evaluate IG Lascell appropriately whilst not knowing what the office is doing. Dr. Freiberger explained he thinks this is something the Committee should consider of how they can develop a better and stronger evaluation system.

CAO Bowling asked IG Lascell if he is aware how other Inspector Generals are reviewed throughout the region. IG Lascell responded he will work on finding out how other IGs are reviewed. He explained his current evaluation form is not a portrayal of what the office is doing and how. The OIG webpage is a more robust way to look at how the office is doing and what working is being conducted.

CAO Bowling stated a good measure of IG Lascell's performance is comparing it to the office's past. The office now is being run professionally and effectively. CAO Bowling added IG Lascell should be getting feedback at each of the IGSRC meetings and they should be reviewing the reports and reviewing if he is doing what he is charged to do.

CAO Bowling asked Leah Hayes, Director of Employee Services, to weigh in as City evaluations have not been done in quite some time due to system issues, but they are looking at restarting that again with a new system. Ms. Hayes agreed the City has not been doing performance evaluations for some time and they are in the middle of implementing a new system. She hopes the second phase will have some funding to implement a better system.

CAO Bowling stated she will work with Employee Services and IG Lascell and come back to the IGSRC with a recommendation of how the IG performance will be evaluated and in what form. She added they will look at other cities and determine other ideas moving forward.

PD Cofer relayed that if there was an issue with a Constitutional Office or Department, they could certainly come to these meetings and provide input. He agreed with CAO Bowling and requested review of how other IGs are being evaluated.

Chair Chambliss agreed with CAO Bowling and PD Cofer, and asked IG Lascell if he has a supervisor he reports directly to. IG Lascell responded he does not have a direct supervisor, and he reports to this Committee. He has daily and weekly interactions with CAO Bowling, City Council members, Directors of the City Departments, and Independent Agencies. IG Lascell added if someone had issue with the way he was doing business, someone would hear about it whether it be the Mayor's Office or City Council.

Dr. Freiberger asked when the next IGSRC meeting will take place to evaluate the IG. CAO Bowling responded the Committee could reconvene for a special meeting specifically about this issue, sooner than later and recommended in approximately 30 days.

IG Lascell asked the Committee what they are looking for in an IG evaluation and if the annual report would suffice, or a narrative from key stakeholders of the City, or both. Dr. Freiburger stated he would need more to supplement his evaluation.

CAO Bowling suggested using the comprehensive annual report and reflection of goals set earlier in the year and adding feedback from Constitutional offices would be a good start for evaluations. CAO Bowling stated in the meantime they need to check with other IGs to see how they do their IG evals.

Chair Chambliss asked for feedback from the Committee and asked for a motion. CAO Bowling motioned she would work with Employee Services to design a new proposal for the IG annual performance evaluation and bring it back to the Committee within 30 days. Dr. Freiburger seconded the motion. **Motion passed unanimously.**

**B. Inspector General contract and retention term discussion per City of Jacksonville
Ordinance Code Sec. 602.305. (b)**

IG Lascell informed the Committee this is the first time for the COJ OIG that the Committee will be discussing the Inspector General retention portion of the City Ordinance Code. IG Lascell relayed his employment contract is set to end in March of 2026. CAO Bowling asked IG Lascell if he wanted to remain IG and he responded he wants to remain in the role of IG.

Dr. Freiburger initiated discussion to the Committee regarding his understanding is they will not be making a determination on IG retention until after they come up with a new evaluation method. CAO Bowling explained they can decide to retain IG Lascell now and complete the evaluation later this year. Dr. Freiburger stated he did not feel comfortable discussing the retention until after the new evaluation tool is in place. He explained that the Committee would be authorizing IG Lascell another four-year contract without an evaluation review.

CAO Bowling indicated they would be researching and reviewing for a new proposal for the IG evaluation in October, therefore, more time would be required before another meeting could be scheduled. Dr. Freiburger responded the Committee members can form a sub-committee to create the review. PD Cofer brought to attention that a sub-committee would not be a possibility because it would be considered as deliberating behind the scenes. He added he feels comfortable with Employee Services putting together an appropriate review plan as it is their profession and responsibility. Dr. Freiburger stated putting together the IG evaluation is a separate topic all together.

CAO Bowling asked IG Lascell if a one-year contract extension would make him feel comfortable as the Committee works through the IG evaluation process. IG Lascell responded that the City Code requires an evaluation but does not indicate how he should be evaluated. He added he does not see this situation the same as Dr. Freiburger. The Committee can discuss to retain him, and they can still work on the process of how to evaluate the IG going forward.

IG Lascell explained he works closely with CAO Bowling and unfortunately does not have the same luxury with working as close to the other Committee members. He was not sure what process could be put in place where the rest of the Committee could get the same kind of interaction with him. IG Lascell recognized the hesitation of extending his role as IG without having an evaluation

and indicated he still could do the current evaluation template, the Committee would retain him, but they still would be left in the same situation as they are in now.

Dr. Freiburger explained that the Committee is trying go beyond what was done in the past and this is not a slight to IG Lascell's performance. Dr. Freiburger said that in order to play his role on the Committee legitimately, he needs more information or at a minimum a copy of the latest report should be provided.

CA Bowling inquired if there is a compensation portion tied to the evaluation review or contract renewal. IG Lascell responded there would be a compensation piece attached to the new employee contract. CAO Bowling asked the Committee if the compensation portion is something they should look into. PD Cofer stated compensation was discussed fairly recently and if IG Lascell's contract is renewed in March, the Committee can deal with the discussion then due to City budget preparation.

OGC Ashley Smith advised that the Ordinance Code provides for a four-year contract term, and the Committee is required to convene at least six months prior to the end of the four-year term to determine whether to renew the contract of the IG or to solicit new candidates.

Mr. Smith also referenced the Code's options for removal, if necessary, and advised the committee of the need to determine whether to renew or solicit new applications at this meeting or another noticed meeting in roughly the next 10 days to comply with the Ordinance Code.

CAO Bowling clarified the decision for retention needs to be made today or in 10 days. Mr. Smith explained that IG Lascell's current four-year contract expires on March 21, 2026, therefore the Code required the committee to convene to make a determination by approximately September 20, 2025, which would be 10 days from this meeting.

PD Cofer stated 10 days would not be adequate timing to come up with a useful evaluation tool. He added if they just used the current evaluation template, he had no doubt it would show IG Lascell is doing a good job and would be retained. PD Cofer said he feels comfortable voting on the retention portion now, with the idea that there needs to be a better evaluation tool going forward.

PD Cofer moved to retain IG Lascell. CAO Bowling seconded the motion. Chair Chambliss, Ms. Birk, and Mr. Siegel voted in agreement of the motion. Dr. Freiburger did not vote. **Motion passed by majority vote.**

Chair Chambliss requested any further discussion from the Committee. CAO Bowling stated the Committee always has the option to fire IG Lascell and giving him retention does not necessarily prevent the Committee from making changes once the new evaluation tool is in place. IG Lascell understood and accepted the stipulation. He added the OIG will consider enhancing IG SRC new Committee member orientation as well.

III. Any Other Business

There was no other business.

IV. Comments from the Public

There was no public comment.

V. Adjournment

Chair Chambliss adjourned the meeting at 9:30 AM.