

Leon County Commission Meeting

An Analysis of the Public in Public Administration

Julissa Rosas

College of Social Sciences and Public Policy, Florida State University

PAD3003: Public Administration in American Society

Professor Collin Cox

July 20, 2025

Introduction

I've seen hundreds of government meetings on the news, but I'd never truly watched a full one from start to finish. So, when I tuned into the Leon County Commission meeting on YouTube, I was mostly just curious about how everything operated. It started with some nice community awards, but the tone and mood in the meeting changed when people began sharing really personal stories about not being able to find affordable housing. What really caught my attention, though, was a long debate about setting up a citizen review committee. As I listened to the commissioners argue, it was like a lightbulb turned on in my head. I realized I was witnessing a concept from our class playing out right in front of me. That concept was the different ways government thinks about "the public." This paper will cover everything I observed in the debate and how it connects to H. George Frederickson's ideas about citizens and their representatives

Meeting Proceedings and Observations

The meeting opened bursting with positive community energy as the commissioners recognized several local leaders for their work in education. At one point, Commissioner Proctor declared, "Ain't going to let nobody turn me around", as he passionately spoke about supporting schools and children. The mood in the meeting changed, however, when a teacher named Jordan Rios shared a powerful story about her family's housing struggles. Her statement, "Families like mine don't want pity. We want policy," really seemed to focus everyone's attention on the serious issues facing the community.

While the public comments highlighted these immediate needs, the next item on the agenda focused on the county's long-term future: forming the Citizens Charter Review

Committee (CCRC). This committee serves great importance as it only convenes every eight years to review the county's charter, which is essentially the local constitution. The debate that followed was not about a specific policy, but about the very process of governance. The heart of the conflict was a simple but profound disagreement. One side, led by Commissioner Maddox, argued that the review should be a purely citizen-led effort. His view was that the commission's only job was to appoint a diverse group of members and then step back completely, trusting them to find the right issues to examine. The other side, argued by Commissioner Proctor, felt the commission had a duty to provide the committee with a starting list of complex topics. He mentioned things like the ongoing debate about consolidating city and county services, which he felt were issues regular citizens might not know the full history of. It was a tense back-and-forth about the role of government itself, but in the end, the motion to give the committee a list of topics passed with a close 4-3 vote.

Theoretical Analysis of the CCRC Debate

As I listened to the commissioners' debate, I found myself thinking about the H. George Frederickson (1991) reading from our class. He explains that in public administration, there isn't one single definition of "the public." Instead, officials tend to see the public from different viewpoints. The two that were clearly clashing in the Leon County Commission meeting were the "public as represented" and the "public as citizen."

Commissioner Proctor's argument was a perfect example of what Frederickson (1991) calls the public as represented. This is the viewpoint where elected officials, like the commissioners, are trusted to make decisions for the people they serve, using their experience to handle complex issues. Proctor was essentially saying that because he and the other

commissioners understood the complicated history of city-county relations, it was their duty to guide and assist the citizen committee. He wasn't trying to forcefully take over, but to act as a representative protecting the public's interest in things the average person might not be aware of.

On the other side of the debate was the public as citizen perspective. This view, as Frederickson (1991) explains, favors a more direct form of self-government where an "engaged citizenry" is empowered to make its own decisions. Commissioner Maddox's argument was a clear reflection of this idea. He advocated for a completely autonomous committee because he believed a truly authentic, citizen-led review could only occur if the commission intentionally stepped back and trusted the citizens to identify the most important issues themselves. The narrow 4-3 vote was, in essence, the commission deciding which of these two valid, competing theories of public engagement to prioritize.

Conclusion

Watching the Leon County Commission meeting was a truly insightful experience. It's one thing to read about theories in a textbook, but it's completely different to see them play out in a real, unscripted debate. Seeing the commissioners struggle with the question of how to best involve the public gave me a new appreciation for just how complex democratic government can be. The debate over the Charter Review Committee was a powerful reminder that even basic questions, like "Who is the public?," aren't settled. They are negotiated every day in meetings just like this one, and the answers have a real impact on the community.

References

Frederickson, H. G. (1991). Toward a theory of the public for public administration.

Administration & Society, 22(4), 395–417. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009539979102200401>