1	STATE OF FLORIDA		
2	OFFICE OF THE GO	OVERNOR AND CABINET	
3			
4	IN RE: CABINET	AIDES MEETING	
5			
б			
7	CABINET AIDES:	KRISTIN OLSEN, CHAIR ROB JOHNSON	
8		ERIN SUMPTER ROBERT TORNILLO STEPHANIE LEEDS JESSICA FIELD	
9			
10		BROOKE MCKNIGHT	
11	DATE:	JULY 27, 2016	
12	TIME:	9:00 A.M 11:45 A.M.	
13		CABINET MEETING ROOM LOWER LEVEL, THE CAPITOL	
14	LOCATION:		
15		TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA	
16			
17	REPORTED BY:	YVONNE LAFLAMME, FPR COURT REPORTER and	
18		NOTARY PUBLIC	
19			
20			
21	C & N REPORTERS		
22	CERTIFIED PROFESSIONAL REPORTERS P.O. BOX 3093 TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32315 (850) 697-8314		
23			
24			

1	INDEX PAGE	
2		PAGE NO.
3	Florida Department of Law Enforcement	FAGE NO.
4	By Ron Draa	4
5	Office of Financial Regulation By Jamie Mongiovi	9
6 7	Division of Bond Finance By Ben Watkins	14
8	State Board of Administration By Dennis MacKee	20
9	Board of Trustees of the	
10	Internal Improvement Trust Fund By Renee Lewis	24
11	Administration Commission	25
12	By Katie Cunningham	35
13 14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 2 PROCEEDINGS 3 - - - - -4 5 MS. OLSON: All right. Good morning, everybody. Today is July 27th. This is the б 7 Cabinet Aides meeting for August 2nd Cabinet 8 meeting. Before we begin with the business items or the 9 10 appointment, is there any housekeeping issues? 11 It's on. Okay. All right. The first item we have is 12 13 Appointment of the Executive Director for the 14 Department of Veteran Affairs. The Governor would 15 like to interview next week Glenn Sutfin. 16 (Phonetic.) If there is anybody else that would 17 like to schedule an interview for. Any questions, comments on that? Okay. 18 19 MR. TORNILLO: So are you asking each office 20 to present a name? 21 MS. OLSON: If there's anybody else you would 22 like the Governor to consider, I think now would be 23 the appropriate time. MR. TORNILLO: Okay. If we have a name to 24 25 submit, we'll probably do it by the end of the day.

1 MS. OLSON: Okay. 2 MR. TORNILLO: Because I'm not prepared to give you a name right now. I didn't know we were going 3 4 to do that. Thank you. 5 MS. OLSON: Okay. Sounds good. б First on the agenda is FDLE. 7 Good morning, Ron. MR. DRAA: All right if I move this up? Good 8 9 morning. Can you hear okay? MS. OLSON: Is the light on? 10 MR. DRAA: It is. I know we couldn't hear you 11 12 in the audience very well so I don't know if maybe 13 it's just not working. 14 The Florida Department of Law Enforcement will have three agenda items. 15 16 First is the minutes from the March 2nd, 2016, 17 Cabinet meeting. The next item is final adoption of rules; 10 18 19 sets of rules are ready for adoption 11A, 11B-14, 18, 20, 21, 27, 30, and 35 and then 11C-6 and 20 21 11D-8. 22 You'll see correspondence regarding the Joint Administrative Procedures Committee Review and the 23 Department's response in your package for each 24 25 rule. I believe most of these issues can be worked

out as technical revisions where the revised 1 2 language will be submitted as part of a future rule 3 package rather than halting this one. 4 In addition to last month, we held one public 5 hearing regarding 11D-8, the Implied Consent rule, б which was attended by one individual and his 7 comments are recorded in your package. Overall, there are no changes to the rules that 8 9 we noticed at the March 2nd meeting in this package, so the rules are exactly the same, and 10 while the package looks extensive, a majority of 11 12 the rules are clean up, changes to forms, and changes regarding criminal justice standards and 13 training commission rules which are 11A and 11B. 14 I'm happy to summarize them real quickly. 15 16 11A-7 revises language to match statute 17 regarding public participation at commission 18 meetings. 19 11D-18 simplifies descriptions of the 16 regional training areas. 20 11B-20 involves form changes and simplifies 21 22 driving instructor training requirements and enhances breath testing instructor training 23 2.4 requirements. 25 11B-21 reduces training school inspections by

1 the Department of Biennial and requires the 2 schools to conduct and submit a self-inspection 3 report in the off years. 11B-27 implements language proposed by the 4 5 Penalties Guidelines Task Force to limit б recantation under the moral character rule to 10 7 days. It also revises discipline for committing video voyeurism consistent with statute. It 8 9 deletes requirements for staff to issue a letter of acknowledgement regarding terminations, and it 10 revises sexual harassment penalties to include 11 12 training with suspensions. 11B-30 clarifies the post-exam review time, 13 which is in line with practice and industry 14 standards. 15 16 And 11B-35 updates a list of instructor 17 training courses, requiring the end-of-course exams, retires a number of inactive number of basic 18 19 training courses, extends the eligibility of some crossover training programs and revises a list of 20 advanced and specialized training courses. 21 22 11C-6, which is in regard to our firearm purchase program, revises the appeal program, 23 excuse me, revises the appeal period from 21 to 60 2.4 25 days.

1 And 11D-8 clarifies the approval process for 2 solutions used to calibrate breath test 3 instruments. 4 I would be happy to answer your questions about 5 Item Number 2. 6 The third item is our third quarter performance 7 report and contracts over a hundred thousand dollars. 8 9 Of course, as I'm presenting this report, we've already completed the fiscal year, and the 10 11 Commissioner will present the entire year's 12 performance report at the September 20th Cabinet 13 meeting. 14 Three-quarters of the way through the year, performance was strong. Six of our measures met or 15 16 exceeded standards, and the three measures that 17 were met as non-applicable were included in the Commissioner's annual report. 18 19 We did see a drop in one measure, which was the 20 performance for the criminal history record check responses within defined time frame measure, 21 compared to quarters one and two. This was due to 22 23 increased volume of firearm criminal background checks during an extra busy peak season and recent 2.4 25 terrorist incidents. These events generally tend

to significantly increase the number of people
 purchasing firearms.

3 During the third quarter, the Department 4 received and processed more than 250,000 firearm 5 checks compared to the same period last year. This 6 increase affected our ability to respond to the 7 checks within our four-minute time frame standard.

8 I would be happy to answer any other questions 9 about Item Number 3.

10 MR. TORNILLO: Hey, Ron, since the labs are no 11 longer a part of this process, can you get you us 12 dates on turn-around times and stuff for the labs? 13 MR. DRAA: Well, we do have one measure related

to the labs, but in terms of standards, yeah, we
can get you a breakdown of where we are with the
individual standards for each discipline.

17 MR. TORNILLO: Thanks.

18 MR. DRAA: Okay. Thank you.

- 19 20
- 21
- 23

- 24
- 25

1 2 OFFICE OF FINANCIAL REGULATION 3 4 5 MS. OLSON: All right. Next up is Office of б Financial Regulation. 7 Good morning, Jamie. 8 MS. MONGIOVI: Good morning. Jamie Mongiovi 9 with the Office of Financial Regulation. 10 The Agency has six items on the agenda for the 11 August 2nd meeting of the Financial Services 12 Commission. 13 Agenda Item Number 1, the OFR respectfully 14 requests approval of the minutes of the March 29 and May 10 meetings. 15 16 Are there any questions on Agenda Item Number 17 1? Agenda Item Number 2, the OFR respectfully 18 19 requests approval for final adoption of Rule 20 69U-140.002 Florida Administrative Code. This rule provides application for international banking 21 22 corporations and international trust companies seeking to establish offices in Florida. 23 Are there any questions on Agenda Item 24 25 Number 2?

Agenda Item Number 3, the OFR respectfully 1 2 requests approval to publish notice of proposed Rules 69B-40.0312, and 69V-0313 Florida 3 4 Administrative Code. The amendments will 5 streamline the application process for loan б originator licenses by accepting the 7 Uniform State Test component of the national test 8 and removing the Florida specific test requirement. 9 Florida will dedicate a certain number of the currently required prelicense and continuing 10 11 education hours to Florida-specific material. This 12 will provide a cost savings of \$69 per test. 13 Applicants will still take the national test, which 14 includes the uniform state test section. The applicant's knowledge of state-related content 15 16 based on the Federal Safe Act. 17 Also, part of agenda Item Number 3, the OFR respectfully requests approval to publish notice of 18 19 proposed rule for Rule 69B-180.070, Florida 20 Administrative Code, to delete obsolete rule language. 21 22 Are there any questions on Agenda Item 23 Number 3? Agenda Item Number 4. The OFR respectfully 2.4 25 requests approval to publish notice of proposed

Rule for several rules within the Division of 1 2 Securities. As a result of the Division Of 3 Securities rule reorganization that came before 4 Cabinet and was finalized on December, 2015, the 5 OFR now proposes to amend these rules in order to б update and correct references to various rules. 7 Also as a result of the rule reorganization, the disciplinary guidelines in 69W.1000.001 Florida 8 9 Administrative Code will be amended to -- review quidelines of repealed rules, add quidelines for 10 new rules and revise guidelines for the amended 11 12 rules. Further proposed amendment to rule 69W-600.131 13 Florida Administrative Code will add a provision to 14 the list of prohibited business practices for 15 investment advisors and their associated persons. 16 17 Lastly, further proposed amendments to 69W-600.014 Florida Administrative Code will amend 18 19 recordkeeping requirements for investment advisors and their associated persons. 20 Are there any questions on Agenda Item 21 22 Number 4? Agenda Item Number 5, during Commissioner 23 2.4 Breakspear's leadership assessment on May 10, there 25 were specific requests made by the Financial

1 Services Commission that the agency continue 2 exploring the issues of employee turnover and retention. Their comments included a desire to see 3 4 specific plans regarding employee compensation, 5 training for managers, and revitalizing the б Agency's onboarding process. 7 At the August 2nd Cabinet meeting, the Commissioner intends to provide an update on our 8 9 progress at this year and the Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner intend to come back with 10 specific plans and a presentation that includes 11 12 details on all of those issues. 13 That concludes Agenda Item Number 5. Do you have any questions? Okay. 14 Agenda Item Number 6 is the Agency's 15 16 legislative agenda. The Commissioner will review 17 the two items on our anticipated legislative agenda for 2017. These include the modernization of 18 19 Florida's international banking hapter and a public records exemption to protect personally identifying 20 information of the agency's non-sworn investigative 21 22 personnel and their families. 23 Are there any questions on Agenda Item Number 6?2.4 25 MS. LEEDS: Good morning, Jamie. There's

nothing behind tab six; are you planning to give us the legislative concepts, at least? I know you may not have specific statutory, but at a minimum, are you going to give us the concepts?

5 MS. MONGIOVI: Yes. So the Commissioner is 6 going to review those in detail at the meeting, so 7 there be more information provided; we just don't 8 have specific content that we provided with your 9 agenda.

10 MS. LEEDS: Okay. And during our briefing, I 11 know we talked about the Chapter 494 discussions 12 that are ongoing; will that also be incorporated or 13 is there room --

MS. MONGIOVI: At this time, as you know, we have that in-person round table scheduled for the end of August, so if that does at some point become part of the Agency's legislative agenda, we would come back and amend this and get an additional acknowledgement at that time.

20 MS. LEEDS: Thank you.

21 MS. MONGIOVI: Absolutely.

22 That concludes the Agency's agenda. Are there23 any other questions?

24 Okay, thank you.

1 DIVISION OF BOND FINANCE 2 3 MS. OLSON: All right. Next up we have 4 Division of Bond Finance. 5 Good morning, Ben. б MR. WATKINS: Good morning. 7 Item 1 is the minutes from the May 10th meeting. And then we have four reports of award on bonds 8 9 sales. The first -- well, three of them are refundings; one of them is new money. 10 Item 2A is the report of award on \$239,250,000 11 12 of Lottery Revenue Refunding Bonds. The bonds were sold a true interest cost of approximately 1.59 13 percent; that allows us to reduce the interest rate 14 on outstanding bonds from 4.93 percent to 1.58 15 percent which generates gross debt savings of 39.9 16 17 million, present value savings of 36.6 million, or 13-and-a-half percent of the the principal amount 18 19 of the refunding bonds. Item 2B is a report of award on the competitive 20 sale of 147.6 million in PECO refunding bonds. 21 22 Those bonds were sold at a true interest cost of 2.48 percent, allowing us to reduce interest rate 23 on outstanding bonds from 5.02 percent to 2.48 24 25 percent, generating gross debt savings of 49

million, present value savings of 37.9 million, or 23 percent of the principal amount of the refunded bonds.

1

2

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

Item C is the report of award on the competitive sale of \$92-and-a-half million of write-away bonds. This is a new money bond for write away acquisitions for DOT. The bonds were awarded to the low bidder at a true interest cost of 2.73 percent.

And lastly, the item 2D, is a report of award 11 on the competitive sale of \$218.8 million of 12 PECO refunding dollars. The bonds were sold at a 13 true interest cost of 2.31 percent, allowing us to 14 reduce interest rates on outstanding bonds of 4.78 15 percent to 2.31 percent, which will generate gross 16 debt service savings of 70.2 million, present value 17 savings of 55.2 million or 22.6 percent of the 18 principal amount of tell refunded bonds.

19 20 So just as an aside, we also sold a deal 21 yesterday, another refunding, lottery refunding 22 yesterday; \$211 million and savings were about 46 23 million. So it's just a way to say we continue to 24 lean into executing refundings and moving 25 aggressively to take advantage of historically low

1 interest rates.

2 Of particular note, over the course of the summer is federal reserve meets today. There's no 3 4 expectation that interest rates will move, but 5 Brexit was the surprise for the market, б which caused significant reduction in interest 7 rates, unanticipated. I would -- so the strategists are prognosticating fed interest rates 8 9 moves, and so they're coalescing around one move between now and the end of the year, but I would 10 remind you that they've been wrong for three years 11 12 running now. 13 So, our strategy is to take advantage of the 14 opportunities as they present themselves and take 15 16 17 advantage of the extraordinarily favorable market conditions that exist, and I sound like a broken 18 19 record, but at some point that will change. And "extraordinary" means only every now and then, but 20 "extraordinary" has been the ordinary for the last 21 22 three years, so we just keep rolling. 23 MR. JOHNSON: Is the discussion of negative interest rates kind of isolated to the European 2.4 25 markets, or are we at risk here?

DIRECTOR WATKINS: It's interesting you should bring that up, and there's at least one strategist who has been talking about it who has been right in terms of the extended interest rates for a long time, and his take on it is it's a global financial market now.

7 And so, historically things that were 8 happening globally didn't have an impact so much on 9 US and monetary policy, but his premise is that has 10 changed. And it absolutely that negative interest 11 rates in Japan -- that it's all about central banks 12 now, and the action that central banks are having 13 on the world markets.

So you have negative interest rates in Europe 14 and Japan, and to the extent they have a financial 15 16 system in China, action is being taken to depress 17 interest rates, And that money has got to flow somewhere, right? And the notion is, his premise 18 19 is, that money is going to flow to US markets and that's going to continue to serve to dampen any 20 upside rate movement, notwithstanding what the Fed 21 22 might do with short term rates. A long-winded answer to a simple question. 23

24 MR. TORNILLO: Ben, can you tally up the 25 year-to-date refunding savings?

DIRECTOR WATKINS: Yes, I will do that and 1 2 send it to you. I should do that as part of my quarterly report and I'll get that to you. 3 4 Item 3. Resolutions authorizing the issuance 5 and competitive sale -- authorizing the issuance of б 285 million. So this is the amount of bonding 7 that's included in the '16/'17 Appropriations Act, and so what we're doing is asking for authorization 8 9 for the entire amount and then we'll peel that off in pieces; as Department of Education needs the 10 money to pay bills, we'll execute to put money in 11 12 the bank. So it's like a realtime delivery system of 13 cash; rather than borrowing the whole amount and 14 have it sit there and pay three and invest it, one; 15 we break it into pieces and borrow it as needed. 16 17 So it's the authorization for the full amount, 285 million, and the sale of 52 million of that amount, 18 19 which is the estimated cash needs for the next 12 months to fund those projects. 20 MR. JOHNSON: Ben, what was the previous 21 22 fiscal year allocation from the Legislature, do you remember? 23 2.4 DIRECTOR WATKINS: On PECO?

25 MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

1 DIRECTOR WATKINS: We haven't done PECO bonds 2 probably in five years now. So this is the first piece of financing since I've -- probably 2008, 3 4 2009, something like that. 5 In any case, we had been -- we had been out of б the market in terms of new money bond issuance, so 7 this is the first piece of financing embedded in the Appropriations Act. 8 9 Item 4 are resolutions authorizing the issuance and competitive sale of \$25 million of 10 University of South Florida Parking Facility 11 12 Refunding Bonds for debt service savings. Item 5 is a resolution authorizing the issuance 13 and competitive sale of \$23 million of University 14 of Florida Dormitory Revenue Refunding Bonds for 15 debt service savings. 16 17 Item 6 is a resolution authorizing the feasance redemption of FSU Housing Facility Bonds. 18 19 This is a small piece of debt that they want to pay off. It's like \$950,000, and they just want to pay 20 it off early. 21 22 And then, lastly, is a report back to the Governor and Cabinet, at their request, regarding a 23 report on university direct support organization 24 25 debt.

1	So I've given you guys drafts of the report.
2	We're still mining out numbers and refining that,
3	and we'll finalize that, and I'll distribute that
4	in final form either latter part of this week or
5	first part of next week, but I don't expect the
б	information in it to change substantively.
7	Anything? Okay. Thank you.
8	MS. OLSON: Thanks, Ben.
9	***************************************
10	**
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1 2 3 STATE BOARD OF ADMINISTRATION 4 5 * * б MS. OLSON: Next up is State Board of 7 Administration. 8 MR. MACKEE: Good morning. 9 Item Number 1 on our agenda is request Approval of the minutes from the March 29th and May 10 10th Cabinet meetings. 11 12 Item Number 2 is request approval of a fiscal 13 sufficiency of an amount not exceeding \$52 million 14 State of Florida Full Faith and Credit State Board of Education PECO Bonds. No questions? 15 16 Item Number 3, request approval of the fiscal 17 sufficiency of an amount not exceeding 25 million, State of Florida Board of Governors University of 18 19 South Florida Parking Facility Refunding Bonds. This goes with one of Ben's items. 20 Item Number 4, request approval of a fiscal 21 22 sufficiency of an amount not exceeding 23 million, 23 State of Florida Board of Governors University of Florida Dormitory Revenue Refunding Bonds. 24 25

21

1 Item Number 5 is request approval of a 2 resolution of the State Board of Administration of Florida making the fiscal determination in 3 4 connection with the issuance of an amount not 5 exceeding 10.5 million Florida Housing Finance б Corporation multimortgage revenue notes. This is 7 for the Trinity Towers East project. Item Number 6, request approval of a 8 9 resolution of the State of Florida, State Board of Administration of Florida, making the fiscal 10 determination in connection with the issuance of an 11 12 amount not exceeding 6.4 million Florida Housing Finance Corporation Multi-Family Mortgage Revenue 13 Bonds for the Mary Eaves project. 14 Bring your attention to Item Number 7, which 15 is typically or historically been protecting the 16 17 Florida's Investment Act report. Based on new requirements passed during the last legislative 18 19 session, the report is now going to include in addition to the Iran and Sudan issues, the anti-BDS 20 Israel requirements placed on the State Board of 21 22 Administration, as well as efforts notifying companies, doing business in Northern Ireland of 23 the State Board of Administration of the McBride 2.4 25 principles.

22

1 Going over that report, there have been a few 2 companies added to the Sudan list; one removed, one 3 company add to the continuing examination list, and 4 three companies removed for Sudan. 5 In Iran, three companies were added to the б scrutinized list. None were removed. None were 7 added to the continuing examination list and none were removed from that list as well. 8 For Northern Ireland, we have begun a letter 9 writing campaign, and w e expect that to be 10 completed within the quarter. As far as the 11 12 anti-BDS Israel efforts, we have identified seven 13 private companies to be placed on the prohibited 14 list, and we have several companies on the continuing examination list. 15 16 Any questions? 17 Item Number 8 is request approval of a draft letter to the Joint Legislative Auditing 18 19 Committee, affirming the SBA trustees have reviewed and approved the Florida Prime summary reports and 20 actions taken, if any. 21 22 Item Number 9 is request approval of a draft letter to the Joint Legislative Auditing Committee 23 for annual certification of legal compliance and 2.4 25 best investment practices for the Legal Government

1	Surplus Funds Trust Fund, now known as Florida
2	Prime, as required by Florida law.
3	Item Number 10 is request approval of the
4	investment policy statement for the local
5	government surplus funds trust fund. As required
б	by law, we review this annually.
7	Item Number 11 is request approval to file for
8	notice of amendments to rule 19-11.002 Florida
9	Administrative Code. And I'm going to combine Item
10	Number 12, which is approval to file for noticed
11	rule, Rule 19-11.014. These are to address the new
12	benefit, the in line-of-duty death benefit for
13	special risk members in the investment plan. We
14	needed to make some changes to the rule and
15	incorporate the new form into the rule as well.
16	If there are no questions, Item Number 13 is
17	the quarterly update that Mr. Williams will be
18	providing to the Cabinet, and he is going to be
19	meeting with each of your offices individually this
20	afternoon to provide performance numbers and answer
21	any additional questions you may have.
22	MS. OLSON: Thank you.
23	***************************************
24	
25	

1 2 BOARD OF TRUSTEES 3 4 MS. OLSON: All right. Next up we have the 5 б Board of Trustees agenda. 7 MS. LEWIS: Good morning. I am Renee Lewis with the Department of Environmental Protection. 8 9 There are 11 items on the Board of Trustees' Agenda. Item Number 1 is the minutes from the. 10 March 29, April 26, and May 10 Cabinet meeting. 11 Item Number 2 is consideration of an 12 13 application from Atwater Investment Corporation for a modification of an existing five-year sovereign 14 submerged land lease to combine four existing 15 16 leases into one lease, and to increase the 17 preempted area from 24,400 square feet to approximately 160,400 square feet, for a proposed 18 19 58 slip commercial docking facility located in St. Lucy County. The proposed project was 20 noticed to property owners within 500 feet, and no 21 22 objections were received. 23 We have the applicant Mr. Clive Dom (phonetic) 24 of Atwater Investment Corporation, and his agent 25 Dana Small, if there are any questions on the

project; otherwise, the Department recommends
 approval.

3 Item Number 3 is request for approval of an 4 exchange agreement, in which the Board of Trustees 5 will convey a 4.25 acre parcel of state-owned б conservation land in exchange for a approximately 7 19.23 acre parcel of land from the Florida Community Services Corporation of Walton County. 8 9 This exchanges value for value with the utility paying 395,500 in a cash boot to be deposited in 10 the Florida Forever Trust Fund. The proposed 11 12 exchange request was recommended for approval by 13 the Acquisition and Restoration Council on June 17, 2016. The Department recommends approval. 14

15 Item Number 4 is in accordance with the 16 Cabinet Governance Guidelines and approved on 17 March 10, 2015. The Department of Environmental 18 Protection is submitting its third quarter 19 performance accountability measures. And if I can 20 just highlight those measures that change since the 21 second quarter.

22 Measurement Number 1, the percentage of land 23 management reviews conducted within the statutory 24 timeframe; our goal was one hundred percent and we 25 did complete 12 of 12 reviews, scoring five.

Item Number 10, the percent of submerged land 1 2 leases and compliance. Again, our goal was one hundred percent and a 130 of 136 were inspected and 3 4 found to be in compliance, which is a four, and in 5 the second quarter we had scored a three on that б measurement, so the Department recommends approval. 7 And Items 5 through 7 will be presented by Mr. Kal Knickerbocker with the Department of 8 9 Agriculture and Consumer Services Division of Aquaculture. 10 11 Thank you. 12 MR. KNICKERBOCKER: Good morning. This morning 13 the Department has 3 items. 14 The first one is Skipper Bay Aquaculture Use Zone. The Department is requesting authorization 15 16 from the Board of Trustees to establish an 17 aquaculture use zone in Skipper Bay, covering approximately 28 acres of near shore water in 18 19 Wakulla County. The aquaculture use zone will be 20 comprised of 16 one-and-a-half-acre parcels. Additionally, the Department is requesting 21 22 authorization to execute these leases for the 23 purpose of water culture of native shellfish. If approved, the Department intends to issue lease 2.4 25 sites through random selection process, which was

determined as the preferred method by the Wakulla
 County Board of County Commissioners at a public
 workshop with the commissioners and the proposed
 industry down there in Wakulla County on May 2nd,
 2016.

б The Department will advertise a date range for 7 accepting applications, allowing one application per person, or entity, but not both. Once the 8 9 application window is closed, staff will use a random number generator to assign an order of 10 selection to the applicants with preference given 11 12 to Wakulla County residents, applicants that could not currently hold a lease, applicants who possess 13 a saltwater license or who can provide proof of 14 completion of a shellfish training course. 15

16 The 16 applicants that rate highest, based on 17 the random number assignments and preferences will 18 be notified and informed of an open meeting to be 19 held by the Department in Wakulla County where 20 those 16 applicants will select their preferred 21 lease parcels in the order of rank.

Are there any questions on Skipper Bay?
Okay, I'll move on to Item Number 2 for us.
This is the Woodford Brevard County lease.
Steven Woodford has requested a new five-acre

28

aquaculture bottom lease in the Indian River in
 Brevard County, in order to expand his current clam
 aquaculture business.

4 This site is located within the Indian river 5 Malabar to Vero Beach Aquatic Preserve 6 approximately three and a half miles north of 7 Sebastian inlet.

8 Mr. Woodford is an active leaseholder in the 9 aquaculture lease zone, just west of this proposed 10 site, where he cultivates clams in deeper water 11 situation. The activity does not pose any hazards 12 to navigation and no objections were received as a 13 result of noticing the application to the public.

14 Are there any questions on the Woodford item?15 Very good.

16 The last item that we have is the Dowe 17 Alligator Harbor aquaculture use zone water column lease modification. Guy Dowe, III, has requested a 18 19 water column modification to his current one-and-a-half acre bottom lease in Alligator 20 Harbor aquaculture use zone in Franklin County, as 21 22 Mr. Dowe plans to use the off-bottom culture 23 methods for oyster production. The Alligator Harbor Aquaculture Use Zone is comprised of 46 2.4 25 one-and-a-half acre parcels, of which 31 have

1 already received Board of Trustee approval to 2 modify to use the water column. 3 In addition to the request for this 4 modification, the Department is requesting 5 delegated authority to grant water column б modifications to the remaining 14 bottom leases, 7 upon receiving those applications and determining 8 they meet all of the rule and statutory 9 requirements. Are there any question on this item? Very 10 good. Thank you. 11 12 I will turn it over to John Browne with the 13 Florida Forest Service. 14 MR. BROWNE: Good morning, everyone. We have four Rural and Family Land Conservation Easements 15 16 today for your review. The first is Fussell Farms 17 -- Fussell Farms and Old Town Creek. The request is for consideration of an option agreement to 18 19 require 384-acre perpetual easements over lands 20 lying within the Fussell Farms Old Tune Creek project of the Rural and Family Lands program; 21 22 designation of DACS as the monitoring agency. 23 It's in Hardee County. The consideration for this easement is \$791,808; that is 51.6 percent of 2.4 the fee value. I know that question had been asked 25

30

1	a couple of times, so we're right at almost half.
2	If approved, this will be the 25th perpetual
3	conservation easement proposed for acquisition with
4	a total of approximately 18,762 acres preserved
5	under the Rural and Family Lands Program. This
б	project was ranked in tier one of the 2015 Rural
7	and Family Lands on the 2015 Rural and Family
8	Lands Acquisition List. Fussell Farms property is
9	a cow-calf operation, like I said, on the 493
10	acres. Approximately, 80 head of crossbred
11	commercial cattles.
12	The current owners purchased the company in
13	1995 and have made improvements to the pasture and
14	cattle operation. It's one of the many
15	agricultural operations in the area which is under
16	threat of being acquired by the phosphate industry
17	to mine the minerals. This easement protects this
18	project from being mined. The property's adjacent
19	to Old Town Creek Water Shed Florida Forever
20	Project and is in close proximity to Lake Wells
21	Ridge, Avon Park and other privately and publically
22	managed conservation lands. The easement for the
23	Fussells is typical.
24	Any questions about that one?

25

Going on to Item Number 9, Easement Number 2,

31

Candy Bar Ranch.

1

2 The request for an option agreement to acquire 3 834 acres of perpetual conservation easement over 4 lands lying within the Candy Bar Ranch Project of 5 Florida -- Florida Department of Agricultural and 6 Consumer Services, Florida Forest Service.

7 This property is owned by Jimmy and Susan 8 Lanier, and we're asking that Florida Forest 9 Service be designated as the monitoring agency for 10 the easement. The consideration for this property 11 is \$1,665,000 and that's 52.4 percent of the fee 12 value of this property.

13 If approved, this will be the 26th perpetual 14 conservation easement proposed for acquisition with 15 a total of approximately 19,596 acres preserved 16 under Rural and Family Lands Program. Candy Bar 17 Ranch project is ranked Number 1 on the 2015 18 priority list for Rural and Family Lands.

Approximately 70 percent of this ranch is in varying degrees of natural condition. The property is with the Myakka Ranch in the Florida Forever Project which encompasses and is adjacent to multiple city, county and state privately managed conservation lands. It's also located in close proximity to Pete's River State Forest.

32

1 Due to its extensive connectivity to other 2 conservation lands, as well as the property's mostly natural condition, has ranked it very high 3 4 for natural resource benefits. 5 Again, this easement is typical, nothing б outstanding. Any questions on that one? 7 Item Number 10 consideration of an option agreement to acquire a 1,966 acre perpetual 8 9 conservation easement over lands lying over the Lamb Family Project. Florida Department of 10 Agricultural and Consumer Services Rural and Family 11 12 Lands Protection Program from Raymond and Annette 13 Lamb; a designation of Florida Forest Service as 14 the monitoring agency. If approved, the consideration for this 15 project is \$1,075,000; 47.5 percent of fee value. 16 17 If approved, this will be the 27th perpetual conservation easement proposed for acquisition with 18 19 a total of approximately 21,562 acres preserved under the program. The Lamb family property 20 includes approximately 2,612 acres in Dixie County, 21 22 and with approval of this acquisition the entire property will be protected by easement. 23 Previously, we came to the trustees with a 2.4 25 620-acre easement over the Lamb family. That was

approved, so combine a hundred percent of this project would be acquired.

1

2

The Lambs practice silviculture, as well as 3 4 manage commercial cattle operation, and they also 5 have a Florida Cracker Cattle operation. Property б is located adjacent to Bailey Brothers conservation 7 easement, jointly managed by the Suwannee River Water Management District, and a private entity, 8 9 and it is two miles south of Suwannee River Management District's Mallory Swamp. 10

Suwannee River Water Management District has rated the Lamb family project as very high on hydrological resource benefits scale. And again, this is a typical easement.

Item Number 11 Ox Creek Ranch. Consideration 15 of an option agreement to acquire 752 perpetual 16 17 conservation easement over lands lying within the Ox Creek Ranch Project of the Rural and Family 18 19 Lands Protection Program from Doris M. Lyle as the trustee; and number two, designation of DACS as the 20 monitoring agency. Consideration for this 21 1,082,880; 40 percent of fee value. If approved, 22 this will be the 28th perpetual conservation 23 2.4 easement proposed for acquisition with a total of 25 approximately 22,314 acres preserved under the

1 Rural and Family Lands program.

2 This Ox Creek Project is ranked in tier one of 3 the rural and -- 2015 Rural and Family Lands 4 Acquisition List. The Ox Creek property consists 5 of 759 acres in Indian River County, just south of 6 Fellsmere Road near Fellsmere.

7 The entire project will be protected under this easement with a seven-acre cut-out excluded 8 9 for family home. The Lyle family purchased the property in 1984 with the goal of acheiving a 10 sustainable cattle operation. The family raises 11 12 commercial Angus, Florida Cracker and Longhorn Cattle with approximately 150 cows, bulls and 13 14 calves.

The property is located less than a mile west 15 of large marshes and lakes at the southern extent 16 17 of the upper St. Johns River. It is also surrounded by multiple large tracks of conservation 18 19 land. This easement is typical. And just as a point of information, we recently closed our new 20 project application process. We've got 56 new 21 22 projects that we're evaluating combined with existing projects. We'll wind up with 122 projects 23 on our acquisition list and the selection committee 2.4 25 meets September 8th this year to rank those

1	projects, so we've got a lot going on.
2	Any questions? Thank you.
3	MS. OLSON: And that concludes the agenda for
4	the Board of Trustees. Thank you.
5	***************************************
б	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1 2 ADMINISTRATION COMMISSION 3 4 MS. OLSON: And lastly, we have the 5 Administration Commissioner. б Good morning, Mark. 7 MR. KRUSE: Good morning. We have three items today. 8 9 Item 1 is a request for approval of the 10 Minutes of the April 26 and May 10, 2016 meetings. 11 12 Item 2 is consideration of a petition for 13 appeal of the Alachua County Board of County 14 Commissioners approval of the Alachua County Sheriff budget for fiscal year 2015-16. 15 16 Katie Cunningham, the Public Safety 17 Coordinator from the Governor's Office will address this item. 18 19 MS. CUNNINGHAM: Good morning, everyone. Nice to see you again. My name is Katie Cunningham and 20 I'm the Policy Coordinator in the Governor's Office 21 22 of Policy and Budget. 23 As you know, Section 39.49 Florida Statutes authorizes a sheriff to appeal the budget approved 24 25 by the County, if in any way it differs from the

budget the sheriff requested.

1

2 In review the petition, the Administration 3 Commission must consider whether the Board amended 4 an expenditure at the sub object code level; 5 whether the Board's action was arbitrary and б capricious, or whether the Board's action 7 unreasonably impaired the ability of the Sheriff to 8 fulfill his or her constitutional and statutory 9 obligations.

10 After review, the Administration Commission is 11 authorized to approve the County's budget, to 12 approve the budget proposed by the Sheriff, or to 13 amend or modify the budget approved by the County. 14 I think, as Mark mentioned, we have two appeals 15 today.

16 The first one we'll address is the Alachua 17 County Appeal. In October, 2015, Alachua County 18 Sheriff, Sadie Darnell, filed a petition appealing 19 her law enforcement personnel services budget. The 20 budget approved by the County was \$936,125 less 21 than her requested amount.

The Sheriff alleges that the County's decision to recuse this budget was arbitrary and capricious, and she further asserts that the reduction was made at the sub object level.

1 The County maintains that the reduction was 2 not arbitrary and capricious, but was made after 3 extensive discussion and debate, and the County 4 further contends that they reduce the Sheriff's 5 budget at the object level, not the sub object 6 level.

In accordance with statute, a budget panel
hearing was conducted on July 14th. Each party
provided testimony on the dispute, and they've also
provided follow-up information that was requested
by staff.

Staff has used these materials and the testimony provided to prepare a report of findings and recommendations. This report has been provided to each Cabinet office and to all of the parties.

In sum, staff found that the County did not amend the Sheriff's budget at the sub object level, nor did the County's action unreasonably impair the Sheriff's ability to fulfill her constitutional and statutory obligations. However, staff found that the County's budget action was arbitrary and capricious.

As such, staff recommends the Administration
Commission to direct the Board to allocate \$543,911
to the Sheriff's law enforcement personnel services

1 budget, and this total represents the difference 2 between the \$936,125 reduction already taken by the 3 County, and the \$392,214 loss in revenue incurred due to the reduced school board contract relating 4 5 to school resource officers. We have several speakers. They will be б 7 limiting their remarks to roughly 20 minutes per side, and I believe Sheriff Darnell is on tap to 8 9 speak first. SHERIFF DARNELL: Good morning, members of the 10 panel. I'm Sheriff Sadie Darnell, and I represent 11 12 the dedicated men and women of the Alachua County Sheriff's Office; some of whom are here today and 13 who have helped us prepare our position. 14 First, I want to thank you for your very 15 comprehensive, detailed, reasonable, filled with 16 17 clarity response and recommendation to the Administration Commission. I can tell and we all 18 19 commented on the way up here today of how much time and energy that you put into this process. 20 As I go through the presentation -- let me get 21 22 oriented here. This is a reminder of where we were 23 back on July 14th from the standpoint of the amount of money that has been at issue. Our position was 2.4

that this amount was arrived at, at the line item

25

1 portion, and you-all have made the recommendation 2 that you did not agree, and I respectfully 3 understand your position and I understand the logic 4 that was used in your position; however, had you 5 been sitting in the meeting in which we went б through as part of the budget discussion, you would 7 have seen more clearly what occurred. But I still maintain that the reduction was 8 9 made at the program level and as it was pointed out last time, at every budget discussion except for 10 one, the Board discussed the school resource 11 12 program over and over and identified that as how 13 they reached the amount of money to which they 14 came. Again, the issue is under appeal. I'm going to 15 16 skip down the last two bullets. 17 The Board cannot direct a Sheriff to eliminate programs. In doing so, the Board violates the 18 19 independence of the constitutional office of the sheriff. This was an abuse of power for the Board 20 to decide what programs -- specifically, the 21 22 existing positions -- the school resource deputies existing positions within that program. They 23 decided to eliminate those positions. 2.4 25 Now, the example that was used in your

1 response or in your recommendation gave the example 2 of looking at a proposal, a new unit; a new use of 3 request for funding. Let me point out to you that 4 there's a distinction between putting forward a new 5 proposal, a new idea for a unit and looking at an б existing program, existing positions, and existing 7 deputies that have been in place for over a decade. I believe there is a distinct difference in that 8 9 regard. I'm going to skip through this. 10 Again, the Florida Supreme Court decision, 11 12 Weisenfeld versus Dierks speaks to it may not reduce at the program expenditure level; this 13 discretion belongs to the Sheriff. 14 I definitely agree with your recommendation 15 that it was arbitrary and capricious, which has 16 17 been our belief all along. I do want to stress in this presentation today that the reinstatement of 18 19 these deputies is needed. The deputies are currently working 20 understaffed, and due to the understaffing, many 21 22 are having to work overtime, which leads to already a very stressful job and additional fatigue. I 23 changed a recent procedure that we did. Due to the 2.4 25 current climate in the country and the State of

Florida, I mandate that we have back-ups to be sent to all calls for service.

1

2

That's for the protection of our deputies and has add to the cost and the stressing of resources. I ask you to consider that there has been an impediment to the operation of my office, based upon this reduction in staffing. This reduction in staffing is significant. I want to provide some additional information to stress this point.

10 I did not present this last time, but we took 11 a look at the impact to the staffing levels based 12 upon those positions; those existing positions that 13 were eliminated. This pie chart shows that 14 14 percent of the total patrol staffing was impacted 15 within the law enforcement budget.

16 What this means is there are times during the 17 day -- we use a term called Code 4. What Code 4 means is there are no patrol units to send as back-18 19 ups. There are no patrol units to send to a call, so those calls have to stack up. What that does is 20 impede the operation and responsibility of my 21 22 office because we don't send a deputy, because we 23 don't have a deputy to send, or putting deputies and citizens at risk because we're not able to 2.4 25 respond in an adequate manner.

To further demonstrate this, I asked one of my 1 2 command staff to give me an example, and he said during a recent holiday -- which happened to be 3 over the 4th of July -- our communications center, 4 5 for which I'm responsible, utilized the status б "Code 4" nine times. Patrol units were on 7 emergency traffic six times during that same period, and that Code 4 is almost a daily 8 9 occurrence. Again, this shows that this office's 10 responsibilities has been impeded. In addition to 11 12 that, as you may imagine, the law enforcement is a 13 dynamic profession and having the staffing and 14 having a proper and adequate work force is always a challenge. It is even more so when you look at the 15 16 types of injuries and situations that we have to 17 deal with that other businesses may do, but we additionally have more frequent incidents of 18 19 injuries. We have situations where deputies are involved 20

in what you call a "category one" incident. These are where there's a line-of-duty shooting or line-of-duty significant injury and they were app placed on administrative leave until that investigation is complete. I have five people in

1 that category: One on military employment; 11, as 2 you can see, on light duty; one on administrative 3 suspension; and one on administrative leave; one 4 restricted duty; and one who is seriously ill and 5 is on Family Medical Leave.

6 Getting back to the point of the actions of 7 the Board being unreasonable. In your own 8 response, you show that our budget is healthy. The 9 unrestricted fund balance is healthy; the reserves 10 are healthy and have been for many, many years; 11 that I'm sure factored into your decision regarding 12 it being capricious and arbitrary.

13 One of the most egregious components, and Lieutenant Cutler, I need you to come up to help 14 with the video portion of this. One of the most 15 16 egregious components of this issue has been the 17 action of some members of the board, from a moral and principal-based perspective, have taken actions 18 19 using the budget basically as leverage; holding the budget hostage from the standpoint of properly 20 funding law enforcement and doing it in such a 21 22 vindictive and punitive way.

23 You'll hear comments made where they withhold 24 money, and raises from deputies' budgets, because 25 they're enforcing the law.

(Thereupon, excerpt of meeting was played.)
 SHERIFF DARNELL: Did you hear that?
 "We do have leverage. The leverage is the budget."

5 In this day in age, when the most responsible 6 governments are supporting law enforcement and 7 especially public safety, they are sending 8 messages, they are sending cookies, they're sending 9 resolutions regarding upholding and supporting the 10 people who abide by the law and respect the law.

I ask you to send a clear message that this is 11 12 unacceptable: This mindset; these actions of holding the budget hostage. Withholding raises 13 from law enforcement is unacceptable. It is 14 unethical. Use whatever language you choose, but 15 send a clear message not only to our County 16 17 Commission in Alachua County but so that other county commissioners and leaders within our 18 19 communities recognize that this is an appropriate. May I answer any questions? 20 MR. FAY: Sheriff Darnell, thank you again for 21 22 being here. 23

I just want to provide a little point of
clarification. You reference our recommendations
based on the information you have. Just keep in

1 mind that the EOG is making that recommendation and 2 putting it forward to this body, so we 3 independently provide that information to our 4 principals to make a decision. 5 So it's a fine distinction, but it's an б important one in that the principals do have the 7 ability to approve and modify. They have the 8 ability to change what's in front of them regarding 9 that recommendation. So just so you understand, that's not a 10 collaborative decision that's been made. 11 12 SHERIFF DARNELL: Thank you. I appreciate that 13 clarification. This is a relatively new process. 14 I don't want to be back here next year. I'm hoping not to be back here next year. I hope the message 15 16 to be sent is a strong one and I trust that it's 17 going to be an appropriate one. Just to recap, I ask you to consider that 18 19 when -- to reconsider the sub object code overreach -- the overreach into the sub object 20 code. Because when you talk about programs, you're 21 22 talking about the sub object code and I do -- I disagree with the example, although I do understand 23 24 the example. 25 When you're proposing a new program using

1 estimated costs and associated costs with 2 that new program, it needs to be considered, but 3 there is a distinction when we're talking about an 4 existing program that is being targeted and being 5 cut, and that is where the Board of County б Commission overstepped and overreached their 7 authority, so I can you to reconsider that point. And then, also, that there has been an 8 9 impediment of me being able to do the responsibilities of my office because of the 10 reduced staffing. That was not my choice and that 11 12 was not something that I ever would have considered. In fact, I made it very clear 13 through all of the meetings that I intended to move 14 those existing positions back to the road in 15 various capacities. And we've seen that it was 16 17 needed then and needed even more so now. And again, I ask you to look at the vindictive 18 and punitive measures of how some members of our 19 Commission approach this issue; this very important 20 and responsible issue of utilizing taxpayer monies 21

for items that is needed for public safety, and to consider that we're different than other counties in that right now and for the last couple of years we've been doing well, and so, there's no

There is 1 justifiable reason to reduce the budget. 2 funding for these positions and they are needed for 3 the good of our community. 4 Thank you. 5 MR. TORNILLO: Sheriff, thank you for coming. б You know, because this process has taken so long --7 I know you filed your appeal in October and here we are almost a year later there about -- what time 8 9 crunch are you going to be under to spend this money? 10 Can you help me again understand how fast you 11 12 have to use this and what implications for moving forward for next year? I'm just trying to 13 understand, no matter how much settlement --14 whether it's this or more or less -- how is that 15 spending happening? 16 17 SHERIFF DARNELL: That's a great question, and to your first point, this has been a very 18 19 cumbersome and lengthy process and it is not a level playing field. It is not fair from the 20 standpoint of the sheriffs especially. It benefits 21 22 the County, and you're more likely to see examples of this sort of leveraging, in a negative way and 23 in an inappropriate way if the process is not 24 25 fixed. And I'll be happy to participate that and

Patty Justice, my CFO; we're both happy to make
 recommendations and participate as be a part of
 solving this issue.

To your next point, yes, the fiscal is almost 4 5 at its end. We have two months left. Whatever amount is decided upon, we have plans for that. б 7 Because of our staffing shortages in part created by the elimination of those positions, we're on 8 9 projected payroll deficit. So the money would first be placed towards that payroll deficit, and 10 then we've got some unexpected payouts having to do 11 12 with people leaving, retiring, that we just found out about. 13

The money would go to any sort of liability 14 that we have on the books first. We would like to 15 hire. We could hire up to five people, but if we 16 don't have some commitment, some strong indication 17 that the funding will be provided for next year, 18 19 that's a moot point. It's not fair to those individuals, and it's not fair to the process and 20 the people we involve in hiring people. 21 22 So I ask you, again, to send a clear message that this -- because of the nature of how this was 23 done, that the funds need to be in the budget for 24 25 next year. If short of not being able to hire

1 people, we have looked at buying cars, but because 2 of the short time period and having to get them on 3 the lot by the end of September, that's not do-able 4 and does not appear. 5 But I just recently made some purchases for б ballistic rifle plates and ballistic helmets that 7 will withstand rifle rounds. That has become a need across the nation, and so some of the money 8 9 that comes out of this resolution could be used for those and that could be done very quickly. 10 MR. FAY: Sheriff Darnell, can you explain --11 12 and I apologize for my ignorance -- but explain what a "Code 4" really means to our analysis of the 13 14 Sheriff's Office not being able to fulfill their duties? I'm a little confused. 15 16 If a call comes into the call center and 17 there's no deputy available at that time to respond to it, is that what you're saying? 18 19 SHERIFF DARNELL: That's exactly right, and that has been exacerbated by the reduction of 20 positions; the reduction of deputies. That was not 21 22 my doing and that was the doing of the Board of County Commission. 23 That gets into the deployment decisions. 2.4 That

25 gets into what I consider to be the sub object code

level of where personnel are placed. Those
 personnel that were the funding for which were
 eliminated, they were in the School Resource
 Program.

5 I made it clear during the budget process that 6 I intended and needed them to be put back on the 7 road. What the Code 4 demonstrates is, it 8 demonstrates that we have too many occasions, too 9 many occurrences where there is not a deputy 10 available to send, to send to a call.

Alachua County is 1,100 square miles, so if we have a deputy available in Hawthorne, to try to send them to Newberry, which will take them 40, 45 minutes at any given time is not going to serve our citizens well. If I could put and have those positions for, which the funding was taken away, we would have a more adequate staffing.

Then, you add on top of that, that the normal 18 19 loss of individuals due to injuries or illnesses or administrative matters is a component that I factor 20 in every year, and so this unexpected, 21 22 unanticipated elimination of up to 12 existing positions hurt us. It hurt my ability to serve our 23 community and to be able to provide adequate back 2.4 25 up and staffing response to calls. That's why that

1 example of Code 4 was utilized, to try and bring 2 that home, because I recognized after the last 3 presentation I didn't show as much as I could have 4 or should have, from the standpoint of my authority 5 and responsibilities, being able to be placed and б served in our community. 7 The elimination of that funding eliminated up to 12 bodies, and that has hurt our ability to 8 9 serve our community. MR. FAY: And one more quick follow-up. 10 When you had these resource officers at the 11 12 school, the original 12, are those officers made available to respond to anything outside of the 13 school? So if there was a criminal act down the 14 street, are they able to leave the school facility 15 to respond to those? 16 17 SHERIFF DARNELL: Yes, sir. That's another good point. When they're in the school, their 18 19 primary function according to the contract with the school board is to be on the school campus, but 20 they also included in that contract, is that they 21 22 also patrol the area around the schools. They serve as a force multiplier in that area. 23 2.4 So if there is an emergency they could be 25 pulled away to answer calls. Again, their primary

contractual obligation to be on that campus, but if
 they were there and they could respond when and if
 necessary.

4 And we have the unexpected things come up all 5 the time in Alachua County. We have I-75 that goes б through our county. Just yesterday, we had another 7 major crash on I-75. That took 16 personnel, over five hours, to manage that, and that equates to 8 9 hundreds of thousands of people who are traveling on I-75, being stalled in traffic, diverted from 10 their schedule and a place to go. That happens on 11 12 a regular basis.

So that again goes back to my point that as Sheriff, when I submit my budget, I submit a budget that I believe is reasonable and necessary for the operation of my duties. When they started the day after I started my budget -- I submitted it on June lst -- on June 2nd they started talking about how they were going to eliminate those positions.

20 This is not what I find acceptable, which is 21 why I filed the appeal. That's why we need those 22 deputies. We needed them then and we need them 23 now.

24 MR. FAY: Thank you.

25 SHERIFF DARNELL: Any other questions? All

right. Thank you for your time.

1

2 MS. FIELDS: Can I request a question of Katie 3 quick? Can you just -- what's the Administration 4 Commission's authority to allocate or make 5 directions for allocations outside of the budget 6 year that's being appealed?

7 MS. CUNNINGHAM: I don't know the answer to that. I know last year -- I wasn't in this role 8 9 last year. I know last year, there was some discussion about Liberty County's appeal about 10 perhaps looking at a three-year plan for some other 11 12 vehicle needs, but I don't know the legal authority for the Commission's -- what the legal authority 13 for the Commission to do that or not do that. 14

15 MR. JOHNSON: Yeah, I think you can't encumber 16 funds that will appropriated in the next fiscal 17 year, but you could footnote a recommendation with, 18 you know, a strong advisement, if you will. But I 19 don't believe the Commission has the ability to 20 encumber future funds.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: Alachua County Attorney
Michelle Lieberman will be speaking next.
MS. LIEBERMAN: Good morning. I wanted to
briefly go over our response in the appeal. I
wanted to thank the staff so far. We appreciated

55

1 the regarding the issue on the objects of object 2 code level. I have -- I will focus more on the 3 "arbitrary and capricious" since that was -- seemed to be the primary issue with the staff's report. 4 5 However, I do have information in here regarding б the object, sub object level, and the other prong 7 about adequately funding the Sheriff's Office; if there are any questions or if anybody wants to go 8 9 over those issues again. So, we pointed out, of course, the three things 10 that the Commission is looking at: Was the Board's 11 12 action to not completely fund the Sheriff's Office arbitrary and capricious. 13 An action is arbitrary if it's not supported by 14 fact or logic; that was the definition that's 15

16 provided. And it's capricious if it was taken 17 without thought or reason.

18 The opposite of arbitrary and capricious is 19 logical and reasonable, and that's the way that the 20 Board went about making its decision in the FY-16 21 budget year as it relates to the Sheriff's Office.

First of all, of course, the Sheriff provides budget information at the sub object code level. That's a recent statutory change that occurred in, the reason was so that local governments had the

1 ability make reasonable amendments, because without 2 information it was arbitrary. It was, We're just 3 going to cut 500,000 from your personnel services 4 line in law enforcement. 5 Why? б Well, we can't afford it. 7 But we don't know what we're impacting. So this was put in there in 2011 so that we could 8 9 review issues at the program level, to make sure we're being reasonable when we make decisions in 10 funding at the object level. 11 12 So in 2013, I want to go back to talk about the 13 history of these positions. So in 2013, the sheriff shifted resources from patrol to schools 14 and reaction to the tragedy at Sandy Hook. 15 There 16 were 12 positions. The Sheriff assured the Board 17 when that shift was made that the shift in resources did not negatively impact safety to the 18 19 public; that was 12 less that were in patrol. 20 In 2014, the Sheriff eliminated more than 20 positions -- 11 of them were sworn officers -- to 21 22 implement a step plan that resulted in an average 23 compensation increase to her staff of over the 8 percent that year. 11 positions. That was 11 more 24 25 sworn officers that were not patrolling the

57

streets, bringing the number to 23, that were not patrolling the streets as of 2014. Again, the Sheriff's Office assured the Board that this reduction in officers on the heels of the prior shift of resources did not negatively impact safety to the public.

7 In 2015, during the FY '15 budget cycle, the Board asked the Sheriff again if the shifting of 8 9 resources in 2013 and the reduction of officers in 2014 had negatively impacted public safety; that is 10 23 less officers in patrol, and again, the Sheriff 11 12 said to the Board that there was no negative impact on public; that she had received no complaints and 13 had actually received compliments. 14

This is the information that is before the 15 board in FY '16. The Sheriff's certified budget 16 17 that was submitted in June of 2015 did not identify any need for additional resources in patrol. It 18 19 contained the same number of officers on patrol, patrolling the streets of Alachua County, as it did 20 in '15 and '14. It did not say we need more 21 22 officers on patrol.

It was not until after the school board chose to contract with municipalities for school resource officers that she then informed the Board that

58

additional resources were needed in patrol. That was two months later that this need arose.

1

2

3 The tentative millage had already been set in 4 July and that tentative millage was a raise in 5 taxes that required a super majority vote to support what was being funded; a super majority б 7 vote to raise taxes to support the budget that she had already requested, and that shift in resources 8 9 was an additional .0404 mills on top of the taxes, the raise in taxes that the Board had already voted 10 11 on.

12 Staff recommendation regarding arbitrary and 13 capricious. Discuss total numbers of officers 14 certified. So I want to point out a couple of 15 things with regard to that.

First of all, the number of officers certified, there was a total, but you have to look at what was certified as necessary for patrol, which in FY '13, '14, '15, and as of June of 2015 was one number. Two months later, in August of 2015, there was a need for 12 more.

It was reasonable and logical for the Board to be of the opinion, based on all of those factors, for the Board to be at the opinion that additional patrol officers were not necessary for public

1	safety (or	for	the	reasonable	e and	necessary
2	operatio	on	of t	the :	Sheriff's (Office	e.

The information that was stated to you today, the Board has never heard that information about calls holding and the desperate need for staff on the street. None of that was heard until well after this decision, the school board's decision.

8 The tentative millage had already been set for 9 both the general fund and law enforcement MSTU. It 10 was reasonable and logical for the Board of County 11 Commissioners to decide not to go and re-trim; not 12 to go and send all new trim notices to citizens 13 saying, We have raised our tax to a super majority 14 level but now we want to raise them more.

15 It was reasonable and logical to decide once 16 they have already voted to raise that, not to raise 17 it more. And again, the .0404 increase was the 18 shift of the officers from Juvenile Resource Bureau 19 to patrol. And this may not be the exact part to 20 put this in but I want to mention the external and 21 internal comparisons that were put in the report.

First of all, the internal comparison, they're frankly apples to oranges, and the reason that is, because there are so many factors that have to go in to the Board's consideration of how they fund

all of the constitutional officers and the
 departments. They have to take in the
 extraordinary expenses.

4 Over the course of this time, we have a 5 Property Appraiser and a Tax Collector -- excuse б A Property Appraiser and a Supervisor of me. 7 Elections with space needs issues. The Board heard that. The Board bought a building to place them 8 9 in. There were extraordinary expenses for both of those constitutional officers having to move to 10 those locations and expand -- no furniture, other 11 12 needs. And we also had in 2016, we had a 13 Supervisor of Elections who had to comply with state law and hundreds of thousands of dollars in 14 new voting equipment. So looking at those 15 percentages is frankly apples to oranges. 16

17 What should be remembered is from 2009 to 2015, the Board increased its own budget by .09 percent a 18 19 year -- .09 percent. We increased .52 percent in all of that time, so keep that in mind when you're 20 looking at those internal comparisons. And it's 21 22 reasonable and logical to balance the extraordinary needs and general needs of all funds and all 23 constitutional officers in balancing the budget and 2.4 25 in prioritizing what those needs are between all of

61

those competing interests. That's reasonable and
 logical to do.

The external comparisons, frankly, we've told 3 you that the Board looked at crime statistics in 4 5 making this decision. They looked at officer б ratios in making this decision. And when you look 7 at the external comparisons, we are funding the Alachua County Sheriff's Office 20 million dollars 8 9 above the average of the comparison counties, and when you look at the statistics that go into that, 10 we are at average or below average on all of those 11 12 statistics.

The only reason we're below average on the 13 officer-to-citizen -- citizen-to-officer-square-14 mile ratio is we had one county in that mix who had 15 10 officers per square mile; everybody else was 16 17 three. So it became 4.4. We're at four. We're actually higher than four of the five comparison 18 19 counties, so we're funding at \$20 million more, average, for a department that has less crime 20 issues and a higher ratio to citizens. 21

22 So those were all, you know, within the 23 discussion of the Board, and it's reasonable and 24 logical to look at those statistics to ensure that 25 we're adequately funding, and whether there are

other priority needs to balance the budget for all constitutionalists.

1

2

Little discussion of the 392,214 reduction. 3 4 That was another basis for staff's recommendation. 5 First of all, it was discussed and it was rejected. б In fact, the Board made a motion. There was a 7 motion by one of our Commissioners, Commissioner Chestnut. That was discussed that they would 8 9 discuss the reduction. We took a 10-minute break. Came back, motion made. There was some discussion 10 on the Board by that motion and the Sheriff then 11 12 stood up, and we said, "That's correct, right?"

13 There was a question -- we don't want to 14 paraphrase for the Sheriff -- that's correct --15 accept that, and the answer was, "No, I will accept 16 no reduction in my certified budget." The 17 discussion went on from there. It was 18 rejected.

For any of you who have watched any number of Alachua County Commission meetings, every day is like Ground Hog Day in Alachua County. We discuss things to death. We discuss things multiple times for hours at a time. We start board meetings at 9 a.m. and go till 9 p.m. We deliberate and we discuss.

1 You saw snippets of conversations in our 2 appeal documents, but I will tell you, those conversations took hours. The deliberations on 3 4 these issues took hours. More than one option was 5 provided, and the issue was discussed and debated б extensively. We continue to subsidize the school 7 board's duty to provide security and safety to its students at an 80 percent level instead of a 70 8 9 percent level. Yes, they reduced it by 392,214, but remember, we were flipping over 70 percent of 10 the bill to begin with. 11

We went ahead and gave the sheriff over \$200,000 in enhancements because of the savings that were realized in the Board's budget from the change in service. And remember there was \$182,926 added that's accounted for some of that 936,000 that was never accounted for to begin with.

The unrelated comment of a County 18 19 Commissioner. And the staff report did find it was unrelated, but the opinion of one is not the 20 opinion of three or more, and it takes three or 21 22 more to make a decision. The options presented were presented by staff, not by the Board. Staff 23 came to the Board and said there's a reduction in 2.4 25 services; provided a methodology and discussed it

extensively with the Board. There was no comment at any time during this discussion of anything other than the school board circumstances. There was no evidence that this was the basis for this year or any prior year for any decision the board was making.

7 The prior years' discussions, we had two 8 years' worth of discussions on school resource 9 deputy program and the fact that we were funding 10 over \$2 million of 2.8 million dollar expense, and 11 that we just couldn't afford to keep doing that 12 anymore; to the point we had joint meeting with the 13 school board.

The issue on reducing funding for the resource program, I couldn't tell you what would have occurred if they had to make that change, but it's very possible the board would have reduced funding for that regardless in law enforcement for that, because the Board simply couldn't keep footing that much of the bill for the school board.

21 So the board reached its decision on the level 22 appropriation, the Sheriff's Office law enforcement 23 personnel services object code, based on the 24 Sheriff, did forgot identify a need for resources 25 and patrol for 13, 14, and 15. The Sheriff did not

1 address a need for additional resources in patrol 2 for June '15 at the time of submitting the FY 3 certified budget. The schools decision in August 4 of 2015 insured the same officer presence in the 5 schools but this was simply through the use of б municipalities instead of the Sheriff's Office. 7 Remember, these schools were in the municipalities that the Sheriff's Office was no 8 9 longer in. To the extent that the Sheriff's Office may have provided some kind of call for service out 10 of those schools, these are municipality 11 12 jurisdictions. Maybe back up, maybe they still provide back up, but these were schools in 13

14 municipalities.

The Board already had set the tentative 15 millage rate for the law enforcement municipal 16 17 services taxing unit, which tentative millage rate required a super majority vote to raise taxes, and 18 19 the shift in resources required an additional .0404 mills to increase the MSTU budget. And this was 20 the second time in three years that the Board had 21 22 to raise taxes by a super majority level to support the increased demands of the Sheriff's Office. And 23 frankly, that is with the increase that comes from 2.4 25 the increase in value. We still had to raise taxes

1 by a super majority, two out of three years, to 2 support the increased spending. And the sheriff 3 provided assurances on multiple occasions that the 4 shifting of resources in 2013 and elimination of 5 resources in 2014 had not negatively impacted 6 public safety.

7 FDLE crime data supported crime continues 8 downward in Alachua County, and that Alachua County 9 has the third highest ratio of sworn officers per 10 capita. So based on all of that, there is no other 11 than the reason and the basis behind the Board's 12 decision was both reasonable and logical.

I'm not going to go through all of the 13 information the sub object level, other than to say 14 that, this is a basis for us to be reasonable in 15 our decision-making process. We appropriate at the 16 17 object level. We submit the money to the Sheriff's Office at the object code level. When it goes, it 18 19 says "law enforcement personal services" or "law enforcement operating" and it is remitted to the 20 Sheriff in that way. 21

22 And so, this just pointed that out. We 23 operated within our statutory authority to consider 24 information found in the sub object code level as a 25 means of reasonably determining funding at the

67

1 object code level.

2 And of course, adequate funding, you know, the staff report found there was adequate funding. I 3 4 would say look at the comparisons and the 5 comparisons to the statistic and how much money б we're providing. Clearly there is adequate funding for the Sheriff's Office. And based on all of the 7 things I said prior, all of those things were 8 9 considered.

There was a discussion about offers. 10 We did meet again. We called a special meeting because it 11 12 was clear that there was a hope that we would do 13 that. And the Commissioners were on vacation. We got them together and we did discuss. We did make 14 an offer. I provided both our offer letter and the 15 response letter from the Sheriff's Office to Katie. 16

17 Katie, I hope that was forwarded on.

The 156,021 that was offered, frankly, 18 19 represents everything the Sheriff asked for. The 936,125 is was requested. The 156,021 represents 20 two months of that, because there are two months 21 22 left in the fiscal year. The fact that there was unexpected overtime or unexpected retirements, 23 those are the types of issues, that if the money is 2.4 25 not in the personal services line, that the Sheriff

68

comes to the board for a budget amendment and says, "I have money over here and I need to put it in personal services because I have these unexpected expenses."

5 The things that were noted were all issues б related to recent things, not at the beginning of 7 this budget appropriation. We did condition that on two specific issues which we believe are 8 9 important to avoid being here in the future. Mainly, the transfer of budgetary funds between 10 object codes, because frankly, part of the reason 11 12 we are here today is because in FY-'15 the personal 13 services budget was over spent by more than 14 \$171,000. Some of that came from forfeiture to cover the bill, but \$154,000 of that came from 15 16 capital funds.

17 The Board appropriated money for capital needs and the Sheriff's Office, without Board approval, 18 19 took capital money, and put it in recurring personnel expenses, and that was exacerbated when 20 we got to 2016. And frankly, that's where the 21 22 186,000 increase comes from that was unaccounted for; the 186, where did that additional come from. 23 It's the transfer of one-time capital money without 2.4 25 board approval to recurring funds, and the statute

is very clear that cannot occur.

1

2 The Sheriff responded saying \$300,000 was 3 necessary to cure budgetary shortfall from recent 4 events, payouts from retirements and overtime. It 5 also required that we fund an additional 636,210 in б law enforcement personnel services for FY '17 on 7 top of the certified budget and refusal to separately account for the MSTU funds, and a 8 9 refusal to follow board policy on Florida Statute; sections to the repeated practice of transferring 10 money between capital debt service, personal 11 12 services and operating, by spending money on things not certified, as necessary for in her budget when 13 she provides it to the Board. 14

So in summary, we adequately funded. There's
no evidence to support the providing of the money.
She can't transfer it and that's the point.

You provide this money to her, to the 18 19 Sheriff's Office, and they've got to spend it. They can't transfer it. The statutes are clear. 20 There's only two months left. They are adequately 21 22 funded. You've got no violation of law in that they were adequately funded. Providing them over a 23 half-million dollars for two months, they can't 2.4 25 spend it and it's not needed. There are six vacant

1 positions right now.

2 And I'm happy to answer any questions. 3 MR. TORNILLO: Can I get a copy of your 4 presentation, please? 5 MS. LIEBERMAN: I'm sorry? б MR. TORNILLO: Can I get a copy of your 7 presentation? 8 MS. LIEBERMAN: Ms. Cunningham said she would 9 send it to you. MR. FAY: Thanks for being here, Michelle. 10 11 Can you elaborate a little bit on this idea 12 that if the decision was made as a logical and 13 reasonable decision, that from your commentary -and I know you can't speak for the entire 14 Commission -- you were unaware of the fact that the 15 16 Sheriff is dealing with some of these issues, where 17 they are in a position to not respond to calls because their resources are allocated on other 18 19 things. Does that change your analysis at all as far as them fulfilling their legal objection? Or 20 do you feel because of the comparison -- I know 21 22 they're apples and oranges like you said -- but in 23 comparison they have sufficient resources. MS. LIEBERMAN: You kind of lost me in that 2.4 25 whole...

MR. FAY: The question is, you made a comment 1 2 that you were unaware of any of that. So you've 3 obviously had discussions or the Commission has had 4 discussions regarding their resources, and today 5 the information that's in front of us states that б at times they are extremely limited in their 7 ability to respond to those calls. And so, if the is that the decision was not arbitrary and 8 9 capricious, and it was a logical and reasonable decision, do you believe there's still an analysis 10 to be made that they can sufficiently fulfill their 11 12 legal duties?

13 MS. LIEBERMAN: First of all, I think that any question, if there is an issue and that issue needs 14 to be raised, it's an FY-'17 issue. To come and 15 say, "I now am asking for these patrol officers 16 17 because here's what we are facing here's what we've shown in the last couple of months. We're now 18 19 adding back-up for officer safety; here's the increased needs for all of these things that have 20 recently happened." That's an FY-'17 issue. 21

The fact is that there are two competing things here. In June of 2015, we had enough patrol officers on the street. We're fine, we're not impacting public safety with these 23 less

72

1 positions; we're good.

2 In August 2015, it was, "Whoa. Things are bad. We need to move these back." 3 4 It can't be both. It can't be both. So 5 either we were misinformed for all of those years б that eliminating 23 positions really did impact 7 public safety, but they didn't want to let us know 8 that, or the fact is that they were not necessary 9 for public safety, as we've been being told, and circumstances changed at some point, but that's an 10 11 FY-'17 issue. 12 And again, those resources, they're in 13 municipalities. Those officers -- there's no net 14 loss there of that function. Those functions are being performed by other municipal officer in those 15 16 schools. 17 MR. FAY: Yeah, I appreciate you can only make the decision on the information you have at the 18 19 time. 20 Okay, thank you. MS. FIELDS: I have a question for Shelly. 21 22 You expressed in your presentation that the 23 Board had some concerns on the Sheriff's force, the size of the force; especially compared to the other 2.4 25 counties that you brought up.

1 Did the County ever express that concern to 2 the Sheriff and ask her to make an analysis of her force and propose any reductions in her force? 3 MS. LIEBERMAN: No. Reductions had been made: 4 5 The 23 officers on the street, but 11 sworn б positions had been eliminated in 2014. And by the 7 way, the Board continued to fund those, so we continued to fund positions that are no longer 8 9 there. What that money was used for is at the sub object level so that was for her determination. 10 We've not asked for any kind of review of 11 12 reductions. Frankly, I don't think we would come back with anything that said that those should be 13 14 reduced. We look at statistics just as you look at 15 16 statistics. We look at the FDLE data; the per 17 capita information was before the Board. Now, we have the per-square-mile information that's on 18 19 here, and I think that it's clear that we are not arbitrarily funding the Sheriff's Office. We are 20 funding the Sheriff's Office to the tune of over 21 22 \$70 million, which is 20 million over average for comparative counties. We are truly funding the 23 Sheriff's Office, and, you know, beyond what our 2.4 25 peers do.

1 MS. FIELDS: So a follow-up to that. So, for 2 the other constitutional officers, I'm trying to 3 understand how you set your budget for those 4 offices.

5 Do you ask them, "Supervisor of Elections, you 6 tell me what personnel you need or do not need."

7 If you see that a reduction or you see that 8 her budget is large compared so some other capable 9 budgets, do you ask her, since it's her statutory 10 authority to make those determinations, do you ask 11 her for proposals for those reductions?

12 THE WITNESS: Yes. For example, because we 13 simply can't fund everybody's desires. We can't. 14 We have to prioritize those and where we can find 15 the resources to do that. So, for the Supervisor 16 of Elections, the Sheriff's Office, and I'm missing 17 one. The Tax Collector and the Property Appraiser 18 go through DOR and their budgets go to them.

We have the ability to make objections, and we have, and changes have resulted. One of which was you didn't start from your, in FY-'16, you didn't start from your FY-'15 -- like we asked everybody to do -- and so you didn't find raises within your own budget -- like we ask everybody to do. And we talked to DOR about some of the numbers in the

budget and that was resolved between DOR and the
 Property Appraiser. They found other cuts to make
 to make it work.

4 The Clerk, the Tax Collector -- the Clerk, the 5 Supervisor of Elections and Sheriff, they come to б us first. So yes, we asked all constitutionals in FY-'16 to start from FY-'15. We will pay for your 7 We will pay for your insurance increase, but 8 FRS. 9 find raises, find the ability to increase your personal services line by decreasing expenses, and 10 that's what other all of the other constitutionals 11 12 did and the Sheriff's Office did not.

13 So we do ask them to do that. The Sheriff's Office did reallocate over 400,000 in FY-'16 that 14 was reduced from operating and other areas in law 15 enforcement and added into personal services, and 16 we were okay with that because we thought that was 17 finding the money; what we can asked them to do was 18 19 find the money so we could increase personnel services, but there was still the additional 186 20 that was in there that I pointed out last time. 21 22 So we do ask for them to find the money. MS. McKNIGHT: I have a question for Katie, 23 and it's regarding the offer; the counter offer 24 25 that was put forward by the Commission on July

21st.

1

2 What are we to do? I mean, they've already 3 submitted their budgets for fiscal '16-'17. This 4 process is not a fast one, and so the counter-offer 5 that's been made by the County, basically in 6 concept, I think, agrees with the number that the 7 Sheriff has suggested she would need to fulfill her 8 constitutional duties.

9 What do we do, though, when there are only two 10 months left? I mean, how are we to look at that 11 picture? Are we not to supposed -- I mean, the 12 whole appeal is for the fiscal and we're left for 13 two months, so how does that work?

MS. CUNNINGHAM: I think the question was asked of the Sheriff earlier, as to how she would spend if it was this sum that was decided by the Commission or a different sum, and how would they use those monies, and she answered that.

Now, the Commission has -- there's pretty free reign for the Commission to amend or modify the budget that the County approved. So whether it's this recommendation, whether it's a different figure, whether you direct it into a certain personnel budget, whether it's directed generally to the Sheriff's budget, those are sort of caveats

that I think the Commission can make when they make
 a decision in awarding nor not awarding any sums to
 the Sheriff.

4 MS. McKNIGHT: It's inappropriate for the 5 Commission to only look forward based on today's 6 date when the petition was filed for an entire 7 fiscal year?

8 MS. CUNNINGHAM: I think when you're looking 9 at the appeal -- you want to use the legal standard 10 in determining, okay, was it made at the sub object 11 level; was it arbitrary and capricious; you have to 12 look at that within the confines of the fiscal 13 year, absolutely, I would say so.

But then, when it comes, when the Commission 14 needs to decide on an amount to be funded. I think 15 it is fair for the Commission to consider the 16 17 totality of the circumstances, where we are in the fiscal year, possibly what are the Sheriff's 18 19 current needs that have occurred during this fiscal year and how that might have changed. I think 20 using that totality, that's fair for the Commission 21 22 to look at.

23 MS. McKNIGHT: Thank you.

24 MR. FAY: So quick follow-up, Katie.

25 Maybe this is a question for the Commission.

1 Can they enter into an agreement that would bind a 2 future budget? I guess that would be probably not; that the Commission would still have to vote to 3 4 approve a final budget. 5 MS. LIEBERMAN: Legally, and we can't bind б future boards either. So making multi-year 7 agreement is aspirational, but we can't bind a future board because it could be two or three 8 9 different commissioners sitting there two years from now. 10 So each one has to be taken individually and 11 12 voted on individually and utilized in the public 13 process. 14 MR. FAY: So even if you said, "We acknowledge the hundred-twenty-something this year to fulfill 15 the 112" and went on to the next year, you would 16 17 note -- there would be no way to bind the Commission. They would still review what's in 18 19 front of them and vote on the budget for the Sheriff's Office, and if there's a disagreement, it 20 would be back in this appeal process? 21 22 MS. LIEBERMAN: Correct. And actually, at this point in time, we have just set the tentative 23 millage for FY-'17 that has to occur in July. So 2.4 25 we have already set the tenative millage for both

1 the general fund and the MSTU fund, and so, any 2 monies that come out for FY-'16 will be taken out 3 of reserves and then have to be recouped from reserves, as well as adding an additional expense 4 5 on the FY-'17. So we have already set the millage. б We have to out how to basically -- so now 7 you're talking about two year's worth that would have to essentially have to come out of reserves, 8 9 because the millage has already been set for '17. MR. FAY: And can you think of what would be 10 deemed as fair, because to Brooke's question, we're 11 12 sort of acknowledging what's in front of us -- a very small timeline of funding. The process itself 13 then would only allow for the sheriffs to try and 14 recover whatever they could at the time this appeal 15 made it to our desk. 16 Is there a fair way for the commissions and 17 the sheriffs to not just meet in the middle but to 18 19 come up with some sort of process and agreement that allows, you know, to avoid this happening 20 every year? 21 22 MS. LIEBERMAN: To avoid happening every year, I'm not sure. That's probably a much bigger 23 picture than I can address. 24 25 MR. FAY: I guess the heart of my question is

1 acknowledgement that -- you have to balance the 2 safety of Alachua County and your budget 3 constraints, but the offer that's on the table --4 there's some acknowledgement that additional funds 5 would be helpful, and it's in a small timeline. So б if that analysis is being made, it seems to me 7 going into next fiscal year -- I don't know what that number would be -- but there has to be some 8 9 discussions between the parties so get to some ground where they feel they could sufficiently 10 satisfy their constitutional and statutory role, 11 12 but the Commission is not overstraining their 13 budget to get there.

14 MS. LIEBERMAN: And there are 10 positions proposed at the FY '17 budget at base level by the 15 16 Sheriff's Office for patrol. The Board is 17 reviewing that. You know, frankly, I don't know whether the funds are there for all 10 positions, 18 19 but they are put in there and they are being considered in this process. We have to go through 20 the rest of the budgeting process and public 21 22 hearing process.

23 MR. FAY: And I acknowledge that the
24 Commission has to finalize that and you can't speak
25 to that. It just seems like to me from what we've

heard from both sides, that both sides agree the 1 2 safety and the best interest of the people in 3 Alachua County are the top priority, and you're 4 limited by your budget constraints. And the 5 sheriff is limited by the current resources. She б has to try and fulfill that role, and neither of them seem to be satisfied. You know, that's how we 7 ended up here. 8

9 So, if there's a way to understand that going 10 into next budget cycle, there's a dialogue that 11 won't lead us to the same scenario that we have 12 here, because it's almost impossible for us to make 13 an analysis on what would be appropriate for a 14 two-month period, since all of this time has 15 passed.

16 MS. LIEBERMAN: I will tell you that we have 17 already, in advance of the August 2nd date, have gone ahead and scheduled a special meeting for 18 19 August 1st. The first day everybody is back from vacation, so we managed to get everybody in 20 for a special meeting, which we are doing that 21 22 afternoon at 1:00. So there will be some more 23 discussion on that front then. We may not see you 2.4 on the 2nd, and we may see you on the 2nd. I guess 25 that depends on how that meeting goes on August

lst.

1

2 So we are still discussing, and to the extent 3 that you've got all five of them there to talk 4 about next fiscal year, certainly they can do that. 5 MR. FAY: And we always like to encourage the б residents of Alachua County to come on up to Leon 7 County and see us anytime, so thank you. SHERIFF DARNELL: If I could clarify some of 8 9 the statements, please. There's been a lot of ancillary information 10 that has been brought forward, and I just want to 11 12 bring us back to why we're here. And why we're 13 here is the Alachua County Sheriff's Office has been harmed. We have been harmed because of the 14 process of a budget appeal is so lengthy and 15 16 cumbersome. 17 The money that should have been in the budget, my opinion, of almost a million dollars, has gone 18 19 unfunded toward positions and we're now at the last two months of the year. 20 How do we make that whole? There's no way to 21 22 recoup, but where did that money go. The County has that money. They spent it on other things. 23 The clarification from the standpoint of. 2.4 25 Ms. Lierberman your man makes the point that

1 according to a survey that they've done that we're 2 over \$20 million, based upon an average of whatever survey they've done. The law enforcement budget is 3 4 only 26 million, and the use of FDLE per capita 5 information was never intended for deployment б purposes. You can ask Commissioner Swearingen from 7 that standpoint. That's just a point in time, piece of information, but it's never been intended 8 9 to use for deployment purposes and the County does bring that up way too often. 10

I would also refute that they haven't had to 11 12 raise taxes in order to increase my budget every single year. My budget for law enforcement in 2008 13 compared to 2016 is only \$40,000 more. Now, that's 14 got to scream that there has not been a huge amount 15 16 of increase in the law enforcement budget; 17 especially when you factor in health care costs and retirements, FRS increases. 18

19 The point, is that the County cut funding for 20 almost 12 positions. Those positions were intended 21 to be deployed elsewhere. That is my decision. 22 That is my decision based upon my 38 years of law 23 enforcement experience.

24 They have reduced my force in that amount and 25 it has harmed us. Part of the negotiation or the

1 amount that's been offered is the two months worth 2 of funding. Well, that speaks to, yeah, you divided the 900 by 12 and that's what you come up 3 4 with. It doesn't address the need that has been 5 created by their actions to have overtime staffing б to full the need so our deputies can respond to 7 calls at an adequate level, barely adequate level. But the money has to be more than the 156,000 8 9 because they have created a situation and we have had to have overtime in order to be able to 10 properly staff the deputies in the field. 11 12 So I just want to make sure we stay focused on what the intent is here, and the process does work 13 against me. And I again ask you to making a strong 14 impression, by whatever words you want to or by 15

whatever means you want to, that these positions 16 17 are in the certified budget currently and the certified budget request. It is something that the 18 19 Board has been considering at the same time while they've already funded over 30 positions in their 20 own budget while they're waiting to see what the 21 outcome of this appeal is for my 10 positions that 22 I have requested in the certified budget. 23

24 MR. JOHNSON: Sheriff, if I could? What's the 25 unfunded deficit created by the overtime currently

1 or projected? Obviously, this whole process has 2 created now a deficit. What is that number 3 currently?

4 SHERIFF DARNELL: It's over 300,000; under 5 500,000. But it is something that whatever the 6 outcome is, those funds would be applied first to 7 that deficit before we could even think about 8 hiring anybody, and we can't think about hiring 9 anybody until we know about next year.

10 And I have to point out that the current 11 commission, current sitting Commission will be 12 deciding on the certified fiscal budget year ending 13 '17, so the people who are part of this ongoing 14 process will be making that decision.

So I think we all have recognized this is an onerous process and it's something we don't want to repeat, and I hope that there is recognition that our community is being harmed by this indecision and this lack of funding when there's plenty of money.

21 Going into fiscal year '16, I figured this 22 first budget time was going to be a cake-walk, 23 because it was the first time, in years, new 24 revenue was coming into the county. New revenue 25 did come in to the County, 2 percent into the

general revenue fund.

1

2 Our Board of County Commissioners created a 3 MSTU method of taxation to gain additional revenue. 4 Less than 10 percent of the general fund is used 5 for law enforcement. Less than 10 percent of the б general fund is used for law enforcement. So there 7 is money there; it's where they choose to fund and what projects they choose to fund out of the 8 9 general fund. We're looking at an increase of this next year of probably 4 to 5 percent of increase 10 in revenue, so there is money. 11

12 MR. JOHNSON: Sheriff, let me ask you this. If there's a deficit of about \$300,000 for the 13 overtime that is accruing right now as we speak, 14 the County offered 156, which is the two months; 15 16 that kind of shows me that if that offer is on the 17 table, that offer would be good going forward. And that, to me, would signal that even though they 18 19 haven't spoken yet, officially, that they were going to fund that personnel services to the tune 20 of 936 for the next fiscal year. That's the road 21 map that we look at. That's logic to me. 22 Now, obviously, we have a \$300,000 deficit, 23

24 which is money that's owed, which is money that's 25 got to be paid from somewhere.

1 So this is to the County and the Sheriff. You 2 have a deficit on the table that's got to get paid from somewhere, but there's a willingness from the 3 4 County for the two months to fund those positions, 5 right? Correct? The 156, right. б MS. LIEBERMAN: Right, was two months of worth 7 of the 960 or whatever it was. MR. JOHNSON: And that's to fund those 8 9 deputies? SHERIFF DARNELL: Yes. 10 MR. JOHNSON: Okay. So, to me, we are really 11 12 -- there's some other devil in the details here: Shifting money from here to there, there's some 13 14 questions from the County Commission on what you're doing with that. Okay, I think all of that can get 15 16 hopefully worked out. I don't think we're too far 17 off, because we have to address the \$300,000. And this is for Michelle. Michelle, has the 18 19 County spoken to -- obviously, the Sheriff has to deploy deputies in an overtime manner to get to 20 that deficit. Has there been any discussion from 21 the County relating in how to address that overtime 22 deficit that's accruing right now? 23 MS. LIEBERMAN: Frankly, we were not aware of 2.4

the impending deficit until after July 14th, and if

25

1 the Board were to offer the 156, which is two 2 months worth of the salaries, clearly there's still 3 hundreds of thousands of shortfall, and that's a 4 concern. 5 MR. JOHNSON: It's a concern for everybody. б MS. LIEBERMAN: That's a concern that those 7 are not being planned for a full year. MR. JOHNSON: And look, from where we sit 8 9 you've got to understand the way we look at. Obviously, with a budget appeal going on, it's 10 contentious. There's not a lot of positive, fluid 11 12 conversation going on, so it doesn't surprise me that you may not know that's accruing right now, 13 but that's not going to stop it from going forward 14 going. 15 16 So it's our job to eliminate that equation for 17 that thing from the equation. So yeah, that's out there. Now you know. And by having this public 18 19 meeting now, we're getting that conversation out 20 there, so now you know, I guess. MS. LIEBERMAN: Staff suggested at the last 21 22 board meeting knowing that was the case after finding that out on the 14th. Staff made a staff 23 recommendation for, I believe, 338,000 to be put 24

25 into law enforcement, but the reduction in the jail

services of the enhancements of the 108. So it was
 an offset total of 252,000, but it boosted - because they weren't necessary in the jail line,
 because the year before there was a million dollars
 in lapsed salaries.

б So we knew there was room in the jail line. 7 That was a -- 108 in the general fund would offset some of the 46 percent addition from the general 8 9 fund -- because of how we fund -- into the law enforcement personnel services and would have 10 gotten out of that deficit. So we did make that 11 12 recommendation for a net impact of 252,000, and the 368,000 would have gone directly into law 13 enforcement personnel services. The board voted 14 not to accept staff's recommendation on that amount 15 16 and went with the two months; felt that the two 17 months of personnel services was a logical, you know, a logical number, as far as what the appeal 18 19 was about.

20 MR. JOHNSON: Sure. And it's helpful that 21 they came to the conclusion that the two months in 22 funding that, because that's one part of the issue, 23 you know. Then you've got the unfunded portion of 24 the overtime that's owed to those people. They 25 earned it, they worked for it, so you guys have to

1 figure out a way to pay that -- you and the 2 Sheriff. And, you know, it seems to me that just on the 3 4 surface, the Sheriff would be satisfied with, you 5 know, the annual funding of the 936, as long as we б can clear up the overtime issue. I mean, I don't 7 think we're that far off. Am I missing something? 8 9 SHERIFF DARNELL: I don't disagree with you. Are there any other questions? 10 11 Thank you. 12 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you both. 13 MS. CUNNINGHAM: Okay, the next item relates to the Liberty County Sheriff Budget Appeal. 14 In October, 2015, Sheriff Finch filed a 15 16 petition, appealing his approved budget, which is 17 \$282,060 under his requested amount of county funds. Sheriff Finch alleges that because the 18 19 budget approved by the Liberty County Board of 20 County Commissioners does not give them sufficient county funds for necessary vehicles, positions and 21 22 leave pay-outs. He cannot safely operate and 23 provide law enforcement services. He further alleges that the budget poses a 2.4

25 threat to the health, safety and well-being of his

staff.

1

2 The County argues that the Sheriff does not have standing, essentially, to file an appeal 3 4 because when outside funding sources are taken into 5 account, the Board appropriated the amount б requested by the Sheriff. The County also argues 7 that the appeal should be denied because the Board's adopted budget was not arbitrary and 8 9 capricious. In accordance with Statute, a budget panel 10

hearing was conducted on July 14th. Each party provided testimony on the dispute and also provided follow-up information that was requested by staff. We've used this material and the testimony provided to prepare a report of findings and recommendations, and this has been provided to both the Cabinet Aides and to each party.

In sum, staff found that the Sheriff does have standing to file an appeal. Additionally, staff found that while the County's action was not arbitrary and capricious, it did unreasonably impair the ability of the Sheriff to fulfill his constitutional and statutory obligations.

24As such, staff recommends the Administration25Commission direct the Board to allocate an

additional \$140,363 to the Sheriff. Now, this total represents \$100,000 for the purchase of at least four patrol vehicles, \$30,000 to hire one full-time OPS bailiff for their courthouse, and \$10,363 to pay a former employee's accrued compensatory and annual leave.

We have several speakers. They will try and
limit their remarks to 20 minutes per side. I
believe Sheriff Nick Finch, Major Brian Langston,
Captain Lee Keith, and finally, Finance Director
Hugh Black, are here to speak on behalf of the
Sheriff and they will speak first.

SHERIFF FINCH: Good morning. Thank you once 13 again. In an effort to save time, I'm going to do 14 most of the talking. There's not going to be a 15 whole lot of talking, except for, thank you for the 16 17 hard work you've done so far. I'm thrilled you found it -- you agreed that it's hard for me to 18 19 provide the services that I need with the money that I've got. 20

21 One thing I did find out this week is the 22 county did -- every year the county gets over 23 \$600,000 in county funds in the ad valorem and for 24 the Forestry Service and stuff. Every year, the 25 Sheriff's Office has gotten about \$42,000 of that

1 money. This year we got zero, so if you subtract 2 42,000 that we should've got from what the proposal 3 was, that cuts me down to a hundred thousand 4 dollars. We currently have \$60,000 in unpaid liabilities in back -- in bills that haven't been 5 б paid and payroll. So if you add that together, you 7 know, that leaves me about \$42,000 to buy vehicles and... 8 MR. JOHNSON: Sheriff, so where does that 9 \$42,000 that you say you didn't get, what was the 10 explanation for that? Was there a public 11 12 explanation for that? 13 SHERIFF FINCH: No explanation whatsoever. 14 MR. JOHNSON: And how do you usually deploy those funds? 15 16 SHERIFF FINCH: Typically, in years past, they 17 get a portion of that money. I guess there's some restrictions, and I don't know what the 18 19 restrictions are, honestly, but there's some restrictions that it can only go for law 20 enforcement. So the School Board typically gave us 21 22 20, 24,000; the County usually matched that, which was about 40 or \$42,000. This year, we got none of 23 it, and there was no explanation as to why we 24 25 didn't get any of it -- and that's not budgeted

1 money. That's in addition to what we would have 2 budgeted for last year; that's \$42,000 less. 3 And I'm just trying to explain, that the 4 140,000 is not, in my opinion, I appreciate it but 5 I don't think it's going to be sufficient for me to б make a settlement at this point. We still have the 7 comp time that wasn't addressed at all. Once again, I appreciate the board's 8 9 consideration, but at some point, this comp time is going to have to be addressed, and that's sitting 10 at \$57,000 right now. So if I were to just zero 11 12 out the bills and the payroll that we're deficient, which is 60,000, and comp time, which is 60,000, 13 that's 120, and then add the \$42,000 we were 14 shorted, we're well past the 140,000 that was 15 proposed. 16

17 So, I think at this point, moving forward, I like that the board has realized that my base 18 19 budget is 1,622,876, and as long as the County approves that as the base budget next year, I think 20 we can work with that. I've asked for a five 21 22 percent reserve for contingency next year, because of what happened this year when I asked for it and 23 they said, "Well, you haven't asked for a reserve," 24 25 so I've asked for that.

1 So really, if you add the 42 that I didn't 2 get, the five percent reserve for contingency, and 1,622,876, we're sitting at about 1.77; we're 3 4 sitting at what my budget should be. 5 Now, I understand the reserve for contingency б is reserve for contingency, and if I didn't have to 7 spend that money, I wouldn't spend that money. So again, as you said, I don't think we're far off but 8 9 we've got to resolve the issues of this year as well. 10 So that's kind of where we're at. I 11 12 appreciate your hard work. It looks good. But the 140, I don't think is going to get us to where we 13 14 need to be this year. So, if y' all have any questions, I'm happy to 15 answer them. 16 17 Thank you very much. MS. CUNNINGHAM: Alachua County Attorney, 18 19 Robin Meyers, I think is going to speak next on behalf -- I'm sorry, Liberty. 20 MR. MEYERS: Good morning. I want to tell 21 22 y'all a little personal story here. When I got this report, y'all took me back somewhere, where I 23 hadn't been in 25 years, and that's to the 9th 24 25 grade.

1 In the 9th grade, at Liberty County High 2 School, I got introduced to a guy by the name of 3 Mark Twain. I knew him as Huckleberry Finn and Tom 4 Sawyer, but Sonia Camps, who wound up being a 5 Teacher of the Year for the State of Florida, 6 showed us he was more than that. He was a 7 political commentator.

And he told me, and I've used this saying to 8 9 guide myself through my legal profession, because in my profession, believe it or not, the truth is 10 hard to find. There's three types of misstatement. 11 12 There's a lie, there's a dang lie and there's a statistics. And I'm not here to address any lies 13 or dang lies, but I do want to talk about the 14 statistics that are found in your report. 15

First, before I go to that report, I would be 16 17 remiss if I didn't correct a misstatement by Sheriff Finch. The PILT money, the payment in lieu 18 19 of taxes, I think we discussed what that money is. It comes from the federal government, because 20 52 percent of our county is owned by the Federal 21 22 Government and the Federal Government doesn't like 23 it when you tax them. So they pay us a penance on the value of their property, and it does come up to 2.4 25 324,000; comes for secure rural schools.

1 Now, what does that mean? That means two 2 things: Some of that money goes to the school 3 system. They in turn give some of that money to 4 the Sheriff for school resource officers and the 5 like.

б Some of that money come to the county with the 7 caveat that the Feds are famous for: The money must be spent in the National Forest to improve 8 9 roads and bridges. We can't give that money to the Sheriff. We can't give that money to anybody. 10 It's got to be spent on road and bridge projects 11 12 within the National Forest. We just spent \$80,000 13 last week fixing a bridge that basically goes nowhere, because we have to spend this money for 14 road and bridge projects. So we do not get 15 16 \$600,000 that we can spend. We get 324,000 that is 17 already spent for us by the Feds.

Now, the money that he says he did not get 18 19 from this year, the money was allocated to Search The money come from the Federal 20 and Rescue. Government. They ask we provide it to a very 21 specific group of people. Sometimes it's the 22 sheriff; it could be firefighting that occurs 23 within the National Forest. We have 526,000 acres 2.4 25 of National Forest.

1 Apalachicola National Forest is the second 2 largest national forest in the country. Any time 3 there is a drowning on Apalachicola River that runs 4 for 108 miles from Lake Seminole to the Gulf of 5 Mexico, we will send out our Search and Rescue team б to assist in recovery. Any time there's a lost 7 hunter, hiker, camper, et cetera, we send out Search and Rescue. And we work very well with the 8 9 surrounding Search and Rescue teams in Gulf and Franklin Counties, and that money was sent to 10 Search and Rescue. That's where the money went. 11 12 It's not in the coffers of the Board of County 13 Commission.

Now, with that being said, let me start with 14 discussing your report here. First off, let me say 15 that -- address some concerns that members of the 16 17 commission here have brought up. How can we make sure that the monies y'all ask the board, whether 18 19 it's Liberty or Alachua County, is spent in a fashion that y'all think it should be spent; 20 whether it be to buy patrol cars, fund positions, 21 22 fund security at the courthouse. And the short answer is we can't. 23

24 Chapter 30.53 Florida Statutes, and I'm going 25 to read it to you, says, "The independence of the

1 sheriff shall be preserved, concerning the purchase 2 of supplies, selection of personnel, the hiring and firing and setting of salaries of such personnel." 3 We cannot tell the Sheriff. The word "shall" 4 5 in the legal profession is pretty telling. We б cannot tell the Sheriff what supplies to purchase. 7 We can tell him all day long; we have zero teeth to enforce it. We cannot tell him who to hire. Y'all 8 9 can tell us to give him \$30,000 to hire courtroom personnel; there is zero enforcement of that if one 10 is not hired. Y'all can tell him to buy four cars; 11 12 zero enforcement mechanism. And so, as an attorney I'm being asked to tell 13 my client, Board of County Commission, to enter 14 into an agreement whereby there is zero enforcement 15 mechanism that their consideration is thought to. 16

17 That's a very difficult position to be in, for an 18 attorney to be in.

Number 2. In your report, you compare Liberty
County to various counties surrounding us. At some
point, there's no way to do it other than to
compare us to other counties. And there's a chart,
page 6 of your recommendation lays out Liberty,
Calhoun, Franklin, Gilchrist, Lafayette, Union
Counties.

1 Now, you will look. On the population of 2 Liberty County, y'all have as 7,524. That's not 3 exactly correct, but we'll go with it. You look 4 next at Calhoun County. Calhoun County, actually, 5 when you include the latest numbers, Calhoun County б has almost double the population we have. 7 The budget that was actually provided to the Sheriff this year including the outside funding 8 9 sources, was closer to 1.6 million. They get a hundred thousand dollars a year with double the 10 population and 350 miles of dirt roads to patrol. 11 12 You look at another telling feature is we can only give what we have to give, and I think we went over 13

this before and so I won't beat a dead horse. 14 Liberty County has our millage rates maxed out. We 15 have our special assessments maxed out. We cannot 16 17 afford to fund the fire departments, so before being put before the voters in November is a 18 19 special half-cent sales tax assessment to go towards firefighting services because the County 20 Commission does not have money to fund firefighters 21 or volunteer firefighting services. Right now we 22 fund volunteer fire departments at about \$1500 a 23 2.4 year. It's slightly inadequate.

25 Our people are being taxed at the highest

1 millage rate allowable by law, 10 mills. The total 2 value of our property is \$870 million. Of that 3 \$870 million, \$400 million of it is Government, 273 4 million of it is agricultural; 18 million of it is 5 institutional. That leaves us taxing \$110 million б worth of property to gather our funding source. 7 They don't make any more land. And I want to show you something here. We're 8 9 not from Alachua County and we've got to go a little low tech here. This is Liberty County. 10 All right? Where I was born and raised. See the green 11 12 on the bottom? That's Apalachicola National Forest. This is the city of Bristol; it's got the 13 highest population density in the County. This is, 14 for lack of a better term, I call it the City of 15 Hosford, and has the second largest population. 16 17 This white area is private agricultural timberland. Not only can the Sheriff not patrol 18 19 that area, he's prohibited by law from going on it, unless he has probable cause to believe a crime 20 occurred. 21 22 So in your report, you say we have 850 square miles. None of this is under the jurisdiction of 23 the Sheriff. Can't go on it unless a crime occurs 24

and I call him to my place. Every bit of that land

is leased to private leaseholders.

1

2

3

4

5

This green area is residential. That's where the population is of Liberty County, so while we have 850 square miles, we have significantly less than that, that requires services of the Sheriff.

б Also, in your report, you say that the Sheriff 7 is solely responsible for the patrolling of the 850 square miles. I told you that Apalachicola 8 9 National Forest is the second largest national forest in the country, behind the grasslands of 10 North Dakota. We also have the second largest law 11 12 enforcement agency dedicated to wildlife and wild lands conservation, behind California. The Florida 13 Fish and Wildlife Commission is the second largest 14 law enforcement agency in the country when it comes 15 to enforcement of game violations. 16

17 Now, we talked about logic and reason. I can tell you every road in green, where it goes and 18 19 where the roads that come off of it, and I can tell you because I've been in it my whole life. But you 20 can't hit a golf club without hitting a game 21 22 warden. I wish there was less of them, but folks, you don't have the largest forest in the nation and 23 not have it swarming with law enforcement officers 2.4 25 from the fish and game department. They patrol

that. Not only do you have that, you have Federal
 US Forest Service law enforcement that live in
 Liberty County and work in that forest. I know
 them by name.

5 So the idea that the Sheriff has this huge б area to patrol with no help is just not supported 7 by the facts. Also, we must compare ourselves to the other counties. We would love to fund him at 8 9 the level of Franklin County. After all, Franklin County has only 1,000 more people than we do. 10 They also have 51 miles of Gulf of Mexico frontage that 11 12 we don't. Franklin County's tax rate is 13 \$2.7 billion. Their millage rate is 6 mills. They collect \$10,676,000 in ad valorem taxes: Five 14 times what we collect. They have the ability to 15 16 pay their share of that. They have the ability to 17 increase the taxation on their citizens to increase as budget. We do not. We cannot increase the 18 19 taxation.

20 Now, the other side is to cut revenues or cut 21 spending. That's what we had tried to do. We have 22 tried to cut spending as much as possible in all 23 other areas. If you look next at Lafayette County 24 -- and if I'm saying that wrong, I apologize --25 they only have \$88 million worth of government

property. We have 400 million worth of exempt.
 They collect 2.4 million; we collect 2.1. We're
 close to them. We're nowhere close to Calhoun.
 They also have an additional \$3 million worth of
 single family properties that they're able to tax.

б Gilchrist County has a total taxable base of 7 1.4 million. They collect \$365 million worth of taxable single family properties. We cannot be 8 9 compared to the other counties because of our unique position of having over half of our county 10 owned by the Federal Government, and as you can 11 12 tell by the white, the other half-owned by private 13 timber companies. Those private timber companies get the Ag exemption, the Green Bud Ag exemption; 14 their taxes are pennies on the dollar. 15

16 Our ability to raise the taxation on our 17 citizens are limited, because most of our citizens are born in Liberty County, built a house when 18 19 they're 20, and die in the same house. So the Save Our Homes Act precludes above three percent 20 assessment per year in the value of the property. 21 22 So I literally, in example, my family home is on 40 acres of land. My father pays \$43 a year in 23 taxes, because he built it in 1955. I bought a 2.4 house in 2006, smaller than a house on a half-acre 25

piece of property in the county and I pay \$1,800 a year. They're getting all they can from me, but we can't get any more than we are getting from our citizens. That's the law of unintended consequences: The Legislature passed the bills and we have to live with them.

Now, let's talk about the courthouse bailiff.
Y'all mentioned that in your report. You have the
courthouse security comparison. You have us listed
as two circuit judges, one county judge, and have
us as .5 security per judge with one courtroom.

12 That, ladies and gentlemen, is inaccurate. We do not have two circuit judges. We have zero 13 circuit judges. Our circuit judges come from 14 Gadsden County. Gadsden County has two circuit 15 judges: Barbara Hobbs, who does the criminal; 16 17 Frank Allman does the civil. We borrow them to take care of ours. They come one day a month for 18 19 criminal felony court; two days a month for civil. If there's any emergency hearings that need to come 20 up for civil injunctions, et cetera, our county 21 judge tries to handle that as best as he can. 22

23 So we do not have -- if you add up the number 24 of days, 20 working days, we have court about 25 25 percent of that time. So we have .25 available

circuit judge, not two circuit judges.

1

I'm not sure what the second bailiff would do.
We don't have enough court days to make one
bailiff. We don't have enough work for the one
bailiff we have; where are we going to put the
other bailiff?

7 The other -- perhaps more importantly than 8 that -- I think it's her keys. Perhaps more 9 importantly than that is, how do we make him hire that bailiff? And if law enforcement is the issue, 10 why are we going to spend \$30,000 on a bailiff that 11 12 can only protect a handful of people in the 13 courthouse when we can take \$30,000 and hire a deputy that could protect everybody in the county? 14 That doesn't seem to me to be the best use of 15 16 limited resources we have. If he cannot adequately 17 provide for the county, let's give him a deputy, not give him a bailiff. 18

Now, the leave. We cannot agree to a proposition that tells us to pay a particular person's leave time when the Sheriff has failed to pay left his employ. We have pending two cases, two lawsuits in circuit court involving the Sheriff's failure to pay employees when he left, despite having the money to do so. Y'all saw the

last time we turned in a check of \$10,500 that the Sheriff didn't spend. That man sitting right there is owed \$7500 in leave time from the Sheriff even though the Sheriff had the money to do it.

1

2

3

4

5 We cannot force him to take the money we give б him and pay leave out. Can't do it. The statute 7 won't let us. And to be perfectly honest with you, I don't trust that he will, because that man 8 9 sitting right there, left the Sheriff's Office to go to work for the County, is owed \$7,500 in leave 10 and has not been paid a penny. Instead of paying 11 12 him leave, he gave the money back to the county and told us to pay him. I don't trust that Sheppard 13 will get paid his leave. No other way to put it. 14 We're in circuit court right now on that case where 15 the County and the Sheriff are being sued to get 16 him his money being owed. 17

Now, also, in your report -- I'm going to find that dog when I get out of here -- there's an application that shows the fiscal year general revenue has maintained a positive balance of \$3,128,000, 2.9 million and 2.5 million. That is the epitome of statistics.

24 What we have in Liberty County is not the best 25 system, and believe me, I'm trying to talk them out

1 of changing it. However, Chapter 29.011 allows the 2 county to consolidate all funds into one fund for 3 the purposes of the county, because it's easier to 4 see.

5 Now, this figure is all the revenues that we б have listed. It doesn't break down what is 7 restricted funds and what is actually available to spend. Restricted funds can only be spent on very 8 9 specific things. Road bridge can only be spent on roads and bridges. Secure Rural Schools Funding 10 can only be spend on forest, roads and bridges. 11 12 That's included in this number. When you take out the things that we cannot spend, except on those 13 very specific things, you have a totally different 14 picture. What you're left with there we have \$1.1 15 16 million in the bank right now.

17 We still have to make one requisition to every constitutional officer. One-twelfth of their 18 19 annual budget. After we make that one-twelfth requisition, we'll be left with about \$800,000. 20 With that \$800,000, we've got to pay the light 21 22 bill, the water bill, and the salaries for the people that work for the county for the rest of the 23 year. We are required by statute to maintain in 2.4 25 reserve two months, which is \$1.86 million. Y'all

1 accurately reflected that.

We currently have \$800,000. I don't know where the money is coming from. I really don't understand where -- \$140,000 is peanuts compared to the Alachua County situation, but it's all relative. Einstein had it right: It's all relative. \$140,000 will pay seven county positions at the rate that we pay our employees.

9 That money, if you've noticed, going down 10 every year by about \$500,000, \$400,000 is because 11 FRS increases every year. Tomorrow, we're meeting 12 with Capital Health Plan because they're raising 13 their rates, and the County tries to absorb those 14 rates because their employees haven't had a raise 15 in years.

16 I don't know where we're going to get the 17 money. The Sheriff said 140 is not enough; that's the conundrum we're in. 140 is too much for us, 18 19 but I don't know if 240 is good enough. 340. The proposed budget we have from the Sheriff for the 20 next year is \$1.9. So I would hate to say it, but 21 22 if that's what he's looking for we're all going to become good friends, because it is illegal for the 23 Board of County Commission to pass a deficit 2.4 25 budget. Y'all know this, working for the state.

You can't pass a deficit budget.

1

If you do approve expenditures that are above and beyond what's contained in your budget, guess who has to pay for it? The Board of County Commissioners are personally liable for any expenditure that is made above and beyond and the budget approved.

8 Clerk of the Court or the Comptroller is 9 personally liable for any warrant they sign that is 10 above and beyond those that are supported by the 11 budget. 129.007 and 129.08 are the Statutes that 12 reference the statement I just made.

What we have here is a choice that the County has had to make. Asking the Sheriff to provide his services, we have more than one man in our county. We have to look out for all of the citizens. We have to provide water. We have to provide solid waste. We have to provide all of the things to our citizens, including law enforcement.

20 We have the lowest crime rate in the state. 21 We have the highest employment rate in the state. 22 We have very small centers of population. All 23 we're asking him to do is to spend the money 24 wisely. And so, we will meet with him. We will 25 discuss with him. We've got a meeting tomorrow

1 night with the Board Of County Commission. I'm 2 going to bring forth to them your recommendation. 3 We got it in the middle of the afternoon yesterday, so I didn't have a chance to go over it. And after 4 5 I have a chance to round them all up, I'll go over б it. If we can reach some kind of resolution, 7 obviously, we will. The predicament we're in is, I'm asking them 8 9 to give money without any assurance that it is going to be spent the way we all think it should. 10 I'll take any questions you may have. 11 12 MR. FEY: Can you speak a little bit to you 13 said there's zero accountability for, I guess, if there was \$30,000 that was slated to go to the 14 Sheriff's Office, I guess my concern would be that 15 16 any sort of allocation that's made, the knowledge 17 of what that was spent on would be open to the public and the Cabinet would know that information, 18 19 and therefore, if a budget appeal came forward in the future or if it was an object category. Do you 20 think there's any oversight whatsoever? 21 22 MR. MEYERS: In theory, there is. In theory, you as the Commission would tell any sheriff, 23 "We're going to give you this money to spend on 2.4 25 this purpose. If you don't spend it the way we're

1 telling you to, we're not giving you any more 2 money." I suppose you could say that. 3 What is the actual teeth to it? You have now 4 prejudged any future appeal, saying, "We told you 5 to spend it this way last year and you didn't do б it." And so now I believe the Sheriff would have 7 the argument that y'all have overstepped your bounds in his constitutional of how to run his 8 9 Sheriff's Department, which 30.53 says no one can do. 10 11 So that's my fear, is you would think that in 12 every other aspect, you could say, "If you misspend 13 it," which we do as a board, "We're going to give 14 you this money. If you misspend it, we're not going to give you any more." With the Sheriff, we 15

16 can't dictate how he spends it. I don't think you 17 can dictate how he spends it. I don't think the Governor can dictate how he spends it, and I think 18 19 it was made that way by statute so that county commissioners and other branches of government do 20 not encroach on the executive powers of the 21 22 sheriff. So the short answer is faith is the only thing we have. 23

24 MR. FEY: Do you think the requirement to be 25 an object category would be a limitation?

1 MR. MEYERS: I will tell you this and I think 2 I said it the last time, we have had multiple 3 meetings about the -- this is my first year of 4 going through with them how it's adopted. I've met 5 with every constitutional officer, Mr. Hugh Black, б the finance officer with the Sheriff, I speak with 7 him several times a week. We're going to try our best to eliminate the 8 9 vagaries that are in our budget. Just like, on paper it looks like we have 2.2 million, and when 10 you break it out, we don't. That's not right. 11 12 We should have it laid out to where if anybody wants to look at it can see. We are working to 13 resolve that issue. I think that's part of the 14 problem is a miscommunication. When the sheriff 15 16 sees 2.2 million on the bank balance, he thinks we 17 have 2.2. And that's a fair assumption; factually, not accurate, and we're going to try to resolve 18 19 those issues. We contacted the Department of Financial 20 Services to get some help, so we're doing it on the 21 22 sub object code level and try to clean that up. We're aware of our deficiencies in that department. 23 MR. FEY: And I'm sure in your years of 2.4

25 practicing law, you've never done a statement with

1 a dog barking over you, and you did a very good 2 job, so thank you. MR. MEYERS: I'm not sure what that is. 3 4 MR. JOHNSON: It's a test. 5 MS. McKNIGHT: I have one follow-up and I б think Katie maybe even can speak to. 7 Of the settlement of the 300,000, from what the sheriff said he was going to spend the funding 8 9 on, did that align with what he did spend his funding on? 10 MS. CUNNINGHAM: To the best we can tell, it 11 12 did. We asked him to provide a listing of what he purchased. The settlement funds totalled \$300,000; 13 109 of that was slated to essentially bring his 14 budget from that year up to the same point as the 15 16 prior fiscal year, so the remaining 191 was spent. 17 It was directed to be spent on cars and on equipment, and that is, in fact, what he spent 18 19 those -- I think it was four patrol vehicles, one truck for the sheriff, and then a whole host of 20 items: Bulletproof vests, tasers, firearms, those 21 22 kinds of things, and we can provide that. I think we have provided it, but it's buried. 23 MS. McKNIGHT: So it did align. So we can't 2.4

25 hold him to that, he committed to that and that's

what he spent it on, is your understanding? 1 2 MS. CUNNINGHAM: Correct. And I would point 3 out, too, if I think outside of the Cabinet making 4 a recommendation, if the parties entered 5 voluntarily into a settlement agreement, I think б last year that didn't occur. There was no written 7 document that articulated what the settlement was, but I think now with Mr. Meyers involved, I think 8 9 that would probably be a more advisable situation, to enter into a settlement agreement that is a 10 binding document; then there's a legal process 11 12 there that if it's not adhered to, it can be used, 13 perhaps. MR. MEYERS: One of the things that the 14 Commission seems to favor maybe -- and I'm going to 15 make a personal opinion here -- we have two months 16 17 left in the budget, so even if you say give him a

18 million dollars, spending a million dollars in two 19 months in difficult.

I'm not sure how to speed this up, but looking forward, if we could have these hearings within the first six months of the fiscal year; that way if he does get more money, it could go to the citizens of the county. I'm not sure how to do that. Y'all have a lot more pull than me, but we're here

1 arguing about money at the end of the budget year 2 and it does nobody any good. If we could enforce 3 once he files the appeal and we know what the 4 budget is going to be October 1st; if we can have 5 some rule changes where he has to file his appeal б and we can get heard by Christmas, then any monies 7 he gets can actually go to the people, which is where it needs to be. That's my oratory there. 8 9 As far as the making an agreement. The last 2, 3, 4 years, one of the things that the sheriff 10 brought up was it was his understanding that he 11 12 would agree to the money last year, and we would agree to provide him so many cars per year. 13 Τn private business, that's an awesome deal, but when 14 it comes to budgetary concerns, you can only spend 15 this year's money this year, and if you spend this 16 17 year's money next year, we get in a little bit of trouble. So we can't allocate future resources 18 19 until we have an approved budget. Even though it makes perfect sense and it's 20 logical and it's rational, it's not legal, so 21 22 sometimes the law is not rational.

Any more questions? Thank you for your time.
SHERIFF FINCH: We're making progress. We can
agree that this process needs to be changed and it

needs to be moved forward a little bit, and thank you for suggesting that.

1

2

Facts are a tricky thing. And last year, you 3 4 had the county auditor stand up here and tell you 5 that not only did Liberty County have the б 25 percent they were required to have, they had 7 50 percent. They were proud of the fact they had 25 percent more than they were supposed to. So if 8 9 you take the \$1.8 million and 25 percent and add that to itself, that's \$3.6 million. How did we go 10 from \$3.6 million to \$800,000 in a year? And those 11 12 are the questions that I have that never get 13 answered. Never.

Let's talk about some more facts that are tricky. True enough, this is the biggest population base. We have a little town down here called Sumatra, Florida. The rest (inaudible) from Bristol to Sumatra. Running at 120 miles an hour, it takes me 20 minutes to get there. That's a long time, folks, when you need to get there.

21 See this highway right here, 65? Crashes, 22 people hitting deer; I've got to take care of 23 those. The National Forest has two law enforcement 24 officers, that's true, but they can't enforce state 25 law.

1 FWC helps out the national forest, absolutely, 2 that's a true statement. There's two assigned to 3 Liberty County. Two. So to make it sound like FWC 4 is the largest agency in the world and they have 5 this place covered is disingenuous. The fact is, I б have 850 square miles that I have to cover and 7 maintain. There's Kennedy Creek Fish Camp down 8 here somewhere . A little town Orange. There's 9 houses -- I can't pick them out here, but there's little pockets throughout these national forests 10 where, he's right, they're private land. But what 11 12 happens when someone gets broken into on this 13 private land? So we cover 850 square miles, and 14 we're the only law enforcement agency in the county. So those are some of the facts. 15 16 Let's talk about Brett Speed (phonetic) Brett

10 Let b talk about brett bytet (phonetic) brett
17 left and I owe him \$7,500. I wrote a letter to the
18 County using the State's Statute for contingency
19 funds and they denied the funds. It's in
20 litigation.

Did we give back \$10,000? We did. I got a new finance director. When the audit was done, he had spent money he wasn't supposed to spend, so understandably, we had to give that back to the County. We contacted the attorney and said, "What

1 do we do? Do we pay the man, or do we give the 2 money back to the County?" He said, "Give the 3 money back to the County. It's still in 4 litigation." 5 So, I just get tired of the disingenuous б telling half-truths, it frustrates me. I know you 7 have heard it all and I'm not going to bore you any 8 more. I appreciate your time and attention and 9 I'll take any questions if you have any. Thank you very much. 10 11 MR. KRUSE: That concludes the budget appeals. 12 Before we wrap up the agenda, Peter Penrod, the 13 Commission's counsel, would like to speak briefly 14 on the issue --MS. McKNIGHT: I'm sorry, but can I segway 15 16 back on the Sheriff Finch? On what I think was 17 provided for the liability for accrued time, does it also -- I don't see Brett on here -- it doesn't 18 19 include the two that you said are up in litigation? 20 SHERIFF FINCH: I don't know the two he referred to. I know Brett is one we're litigating. 21 22 MR. MEYERS: There's two separate lawsuits involving Mr. Phillips. Mr. Phillips was forced to 23 file a lawsuit against the Sheriff for failure to 24 25 pay the money, which is due the next pay period

1 after he leaves, and then the Sheriff joined the 2 County in on the lawsuit. So we have a writ of mandamus, which is 3 4 pending, where the Sheriff is asking The Court to 5 require to fund a contingency, which he did not б have in his budget, which was used to pay Mr. 7 Phillips and then we have the lawsuit. So it's all Mr. Phillips, but it's two cases, so if I wasn't 8 9 clear on that, I'm sorry. MS. McKNIGHT: But he's not on this list, I don't think? 12 MR. BLACK: He is not included on that list 13 because our auditor is the one that instructed us to return the entire 10,000 to the county, because

10 11

14 that was what was the monies left over as of the 15 end of the year. And so he told us that the county 16 17 was waiting to get that check back to make Mr. Phillips whole, so that's the reason once we 18 19 returned that, it was our understanding that liability went away based on the instructions from 20 our auditor. 21 22 Again, I don't know what criteria he used to

make that, and so, he did make that and that's what 23 we did. 2.4

25

MS. McKNIGHT: So he's officially wiped from

1 your list as far as -- based on the guidance of the auditor?

2

SHERIFF FINCH: No. I think we're still 3 4 pending litigation. We still have active 5 litigation. The question hasn't been answered yet б should the County do this; me and my attorney 7 believe, yeah, the statute is very clear that the 8 County should give me the money to pay 9 Mr. Phillips.

10 MR. BLACK: And at this point, based on the 11 last County Commissioner's meeting we were at, they 12 were still holding it at the recommendation of 13 Mr. Meyers and other attorneys waiting to get a 14 resolution on who needs to pay that money. If it's given back to us, we get the check and pay it. So 15 16 there's no one arguing the liability. It's how it 17 works out.

I came on board on September 28th with a sack 18 19 of bills, because Mr. Phillips left on 20 September 7th so we had the full month of September. I paid the bill that was dated 21 22 September 30th for the next fiscal year in error. 23 So after we went through the audit, we realized there was funds available for us to pay that, and 2.4 25 that's what made up that \$10,000.

1 MS. McKNIGHT: And it's \$7,500. 2 MR. BLACK: \$7500 is the gross amount. It 3 does not include fringe and retirement on top of 4 that as well. 5 MR. MEYERS: That's where the rub comes with б the County, Ms. McKnight, is we have no problem, 7 and we've reached out to the attorney. We will 8 give the money back, but the payment needs to come 9 through the Sheriff, because they have to pay taxes on the money that is paid to him, and retirement, 10 and all of those good things that has to go through 11 12 the payroll department. 13 The County just cutting him a check for \$7,500 is not how the process needs to work. The reason 14 we have not cashed the check is because I've 15 16 advised him not to. I've contacted the Sheriff's 17 attorney, Mr. Jason Vail, and will gladly give you the \$10,000 back is you process the money that you 18 19 owe Mr. Phillips and make him whole. We have not had any movement on that. 20 SHERIFF FINCH: It's the first I've heard of 21 22 it. MR. MEYERS: That's because I have to talk to 23 24 your lawyer. I can't talk with you.

25 SHERIFF FINCH: And I would just like to say,

1 last year we reached an agreement. They gave us 2 the 109 to put back the roughly 200,000. I met 3 with the board and the board said, "Listen, if we give you this money, what are you going to spend it 4 5 on?" I told them exactly what I was going to spend б it on, and that's exactly what I was going to spend 7 it on. So for them to say they have no trust that I will spend it the way I've said I'm going to 8 9 spend it, is disingenuous.

Listen, I don't lie to the Board of County Commissioners. I don't make stuff up. I tell them what is reasonable and necessary, just exactly like the statute says, and that's what I spend the money on. It's not a shell game for me. It's all about the people to me.

MR. TORNILLO: Katie, I know we have talked 16 about this. We know the system is broke. I know 17 that this shouldn't take more than 60 days once 18 19 someone files an appeal to get the process and get a decision. Are there plans for looking at this, 20 and is the Commission going to approve some type of 21 22 revamped process to kind of speed this up? MS. CUNNINGHAM: I think I've mentioned this, 23

24 but I came in at the end of last July, so we had 25 two appeals on my plate right from the get-go. And

1 there are internal procedures and instructions that 2 were in place at the time; that gets sent out to the Sheriff Association, to the Florida Association 3 4 of Counties; certainly to any party who files an 5 appeal, sort of outlining the process for these б appeals. It is inherently a lengthy process; just 7 gather the documentation required to analyze it, the follow-up information. In this particular 8 9 instance, I think Liberty County, we essentially said, "Let's start from scratch, and we need you to 10 sort of redo your documents." 11 12 After that document, we do that five-county analysis. That takes time as well. There's a lot 13 of factors that go into that, so what I've looked 14

at those instructions I believe could be

the counties but help the Cabinet, too.

previous agenda before the Cabinet.

Penrod to address an issue that came up at a

MR. FEY:

drastically improved. What we're hoping to do this

your offices and work internally -- especially now,

summer is work with the associations, work with

I've got two under my belt -- to see how we can

make improvements that are not only going to help

MR. KRUSE: I would like to introduce Peter

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

MR. PENROD: Thank you, Mark.

1

25

At the last agenda meeting, there was a question as to why one of the CDD rule admins were coming before the cabinet. Specifically, it was a Scribner's error, and that sort of led into a larger question about delegation of authorities and what can and can't be delegated from Administration Commission down to staff.

9 I'll address the rule in one moment, but generally speaking, when you're handling 10 delegations of authority, if you have a collegial 11 12 body -- in this case, the Administration Commission -- and the statute specifics that the collegial 13 body will take some final action unless the statute 14 allows that to be -- specifies in the statute that 15 it can be delegated down to another individual, the 16 17 Cabinet -- the body would have to actually make the final action. 18

What that means for us is, typically
rule-making or final orders, those will always have
to come before the Administration Commission,
unless we have some type of statutory change that
allows it to be handled by the Secretary of the
Commission or perhaps some agency.

Going back to the CDD rule change, I think

1 there might have been a little confusion when we 2 used the term Scribner's error, and I think it was confused with technical change. Obviously, 3 technical change would not have to come before the 4 5 Cabinet, but in the case of that CDD we have before us, the Scribner's error actually affected the б 7 material language of the rule and since we had to 8 go into actual formal rule-making, that's the reason that issue that came before the Cabinet. 9 10 If I didn't answer any questions, I'm happy to 11 answer any questions and try to address it more 12 specifically. 13 MS. OLSON: Thanks, Peter. 14 MR. JOHNSON: Thanks. 15 MS. OLSON: All right. That concludes today's 16 meeting. 17 (Hearing concluded at 11:46 a.m.) 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

- б

- ___

1 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE 2 3 STATE OF FLORIDA) COUNTY OF LEON 4) 5 б I, YVONNE LAFLAMME, FPR, Court Reporter, certify that I was authorized to and did 7 8 stenographically report the foregoing proceedings; that a review of the transcript was not requested; and that 9 10 the transcript is a true and complete record of my 11 stenographic notes. 12 13 I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative, 14 employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor 15 am I a relative or employee of any of the parties' 16 attorney or counsel connected with the action, nor am I 17 financially interested in the action. 18 19 DATED this 23rd day of AUGUST, 2016. 20 21 YVONNE LaFLAMME, FPR 22 Court Reporter 23 24 25