## SCHOOL BOARD OF BROWARD COUNTY

AUDIT COMMITTEE MEETING

Monday, September 14th, 2020 2:00 p.m. - 4:25 p.m.

HELD VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS all attendees present via virtual platform

Court Reporter:

Emily Scott, stenographic reporter

Bass Reporting Service, Inc.

633 SE 3rd Avenue, Ste. 200

Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33316

United Reporting, Inc. (954) 525-2221

Page 2 1 SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS: 2 MS. SARAH LEONARDI, School Board Member-Elect 3 COMMITTEE MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: 4 MR. ROBERT MAYERSOHN, CHAIR 5 MR. ANDREW MEDVIN, VICE CHAIR MR. ANTHONY DE MEO, CPA 6 MR. MOSES BARNES MS. REBECCA DAHL 7 MS. MARY FERTIG DR. NATHALIE LYNCH-WALSH 8 MS. CONNIE POU MS. PHYLLIS SHAW 9 OFFICE OF THE CHIEF AUDIT STAFF: 10 11 MR. JORIS JABOUIN, Chief Auditor MS. ALI ARCESE, Manager, Property and Inventory Audits 12 MR. REYNALDO TUNNERMANN, Manager, Charter School Audits MR. ERIC SEIFER, Auditor III 13 MS. KASHAMA PATEL, Auditor III MS. MICHELE MARQUARDT, Executive Secretary MR. BRYAN ERHARD, System Support Specialist II 14 MR. JONATHAN TOLENTINO, Confidential Clerk Specialist C 15 16 DISTRICT STAFF: 17 MR. JEFF MOQUIN, Chief of Staff MR. DANIEL GOHL, Chief Academic Officer MR. JOHN SULLIVAN, Chief Portfolio Services Office 18 MR. THOMAS COONEY, Assistant General Counsel, Office of 19 the General Counsel MR. ROBERT F. HAMBERGER, Chief Building Official 2.0 MR. RONALD MORGAN, Asst. Chief, Building Official -Inspections MR. FRANK GIRARDI, Executive Director, Office of Chief Facilities & Construction Management 22 MS. SHELLEY MELONI, Director, Pre-Construction MR. PHILLIP D. KAUFOLD, Director, Construction 23 MR. DAVE ARCHER, Director, Program Controls DR. DONTE COLLINS, Director, Charter Schools Support 24 MS. RHONDA STEPHANIK, Coordinator, Charter Schools Support 25 MS. BRENDA RIVERA, Charter Schools Support MS. DIVINE AMOAH, Manager, Architectural Engineering MS. DIVINE AMOAH, Manager, Architectural Engineering

United Reporting, Inc. (954) 525-2221

Page 3 1 2 INVITED GUESTS: 3 MR. DAVID LUKER, Director, RSM MR. MATTHEW BLONDELL, COA, Business Risk Consulting, RSM 4 MR. LUCKIE KAUFMAN, Risk Consulting Sr. Associate, RSM MR. CHRIS GUMS, RSM 5 MS. YVONNE GARTH, President, Garth Solutions, Inc. MS. DENIECE WILLIAMS, Garth Solutions, Inc. 6 MR. DANIEL JARDINE, Program Director, CBRE/HEERY MR. MICHAEL BOBBY, CBRE/HEERY 7 MS. ASHLEY CARPENTER, Atkins MS. KATHLEEN LANGAN, AECOM 8 MS. EMILY SCOTT, Court Reporter, Bass Reporting 9 10 ADDITIONAL GUESTS: 11 MR. SCOTT TRAVIS, Reporter, Sun-Sentinel MR. ANDREW GRUB, Student 12 MS. CHARLOTTE GREENBARG MS. STACY GROSSMAN 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 2.2 23 24 25

United Reporting, Inc. (954) 525-2221

	1 9.50
1	Thereupon, the following proceedings were had:
2	MR. MAYERSOHN: All right. We have a quorum,
3	I believe, so can we call can we call this
4	meeting to order and then take attendance?
5	MR. JABOUIN: Yes, we can, Mr. Chair.
6	MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay. Are we recording?
7	MR. JABOUIN: Mr. Chair, I count seven
8	members.
9	MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay. So are we recording the
10	meeting?
11	MR. JABOUIN: Yes, the meeting is being
12	recorded.
13	MR. MEDVIN: Okay. All right.
14	MR. JABOUIN: Bryan, can you make sure that
15	that's done?
16	Thank you.
17	MR. MAYERSOHN: All right. So let's call the
18	Monday, September 14th, special audit committee
19	meeting to order. Let's just rise for the pledge.
20	(Whereupon the pledge of allegiance was
21	recited.)
22	MR. MAYERSOHN: All right. You can take the
23	flag down. There you go.
24	Moving on to the first item is the approval

of the agenda. Do we have a motion to approve the

25

1 agenda?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. JABOUIN: Mr. Chair, did you wish to take attendance first or after that?

MR. MAYERSOHN: We can take attendance after the approval of the agenda.

MR. JABOUIN: Okay.

MR. MAYERSOHN: So do I have a motion to approve the agenda?

MR. JABOUIN: Mr. Chair, before, if I may, there were some changes to the original published agenda. I'm not sure --

MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay.

MR. JABOUIN: -- if you would like me to go through that with this meeting?

MR. MAYERSOHN: Yeah, you can start with that. Go ahead.

MR. JABOUIN: Thank you.

Mr. Chair, there -- there were some changes that were done in the agenda since I originally published it on Friday, September 4th. Agenda item number one, which is the current agenda item that's being reviewed right now, the approval of the September 14th audit committee meeting, was added.

In addition to that, agenda item number two, the chief auditor's administrative matters were

1 also added.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And with respect to agenda item number three, the addendum to the original response, capital programs department, an email was sent to the committee on Friday morning, September 11th, with an updated document that had some new information for observation eight; and then the audit committee questions were also revised to indicate the proper departments that should be answering some the questions and some minor changes, and those were also -- had a purple font for the changes, and those were revised.

Mr. Chair, there were no changes to the agenda besides those.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay. Thank you.

So do I have a motion to approve the agenda with those changes?

MR. MEDVIN: So moved.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Mr. Medvin.

Do I need a second?

MR. BARNES: Second.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Second by --

MR. BARNES: Barnes.

MR. MAYERSOHN: -- Mr. Barnes.

All those in favor, signify by saying "aye."

	Page 7
1	ALL PRESENT: Aye.
2	MR. MAYERSOHN: Any opposed?
3	The ayes have it.
4	Moving on to item number two, the chief
5	auditor chief auditor administrative matters.
6	MR. JABOUIN: Mr. Chair, did you wish to take
7	attendance before this one?
8	MR. MAYERSOHN: You keep on wanting to take
9	attendance. Yeah, we can take attendance.
10	MR. JABOUIN: Thank you.
11	Should I call their names, or would you like
12	to do that?
13	MR. MAYERSOHN: Yeah, call the roll, and then
14	we can determine who's here and who is not.
15	MR. JABOUIN: Thank you.
16	Mr. Moses Barnes.
17	MR. BARNES: Here.
18	MR. JABOUIN: Ms. Rebecca Dahl.
19	MS. DAHL: Here.
20	MR. JABOUIN: Mr. Anthony De Meo.
21	MR. DE MEO: Here.
22	MR. JABOUIN: Ms. Hagen Disch called to say

United Reporting, Inc. (954) 525-2221

Mr. Michael Gauci indicated that he would not

that she would not be attending the meeting.

Mrs. Mary Fertig?

23

24

25

1 be attending the meeting.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Dr. Natalie Lynch-Walsh?

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Here, but I am going to hang up and come back in, because I don't have chat or the ability -- I guess I can raise my hand. Sorry. This looks different today, I think because it's the first time we are doing it as a team, but I am definitely here.

MR. JABOUIN: Mr. Mayersohn, you are here?

MR. MAYERSOHN: I'm here.

MR. JABOUIN: Mr. Andrew Medvin?

MR. MEDVIN: Here.

MR. JABOUIN: Ms. Connie Pou?

MS. POU: Here.

MR. JABOUIN: Ms. Phyllis Shaw?

And Ms. Stephanie Shimm?

17 Thank you.

I'm Joris Jabouin, the chief auditor. I do have a few administrative matters for the committee. First, I like to acknowledge members from the Superintendent's cabinet, if you are in the meeting, if you can kindly identify yourself?

MR. MOOUIN: Good afternoon. Jeff Moquin on

MR. MOQUIN: Good afternoon. Jeff Moquin on behalf of the Superintendent.

MR. JABOUIN: Thank you.

We also have with us the court reporter,

Ms. Scott is with us. She is a court reporter that
took the minutes at the August 13th meeting.

During some of my conversations with her, she indicated that there were some issues with some of the members talking over when they were speaking. We would like to ask everybody to please state their name throughout the course of the meeting.

I did ask Ms. Scott to jump in if there is any confusion, so she may need to interrupt; and given that she has to take her hands off the court reporting device and unmute herself, there may be a little bit of a lag.

In addition to that, the agenda does have some time guides. These are not required time guides. They are being provided because we've had some instances where some of the meetings have gone a little bit longer. We hope to be able to make up some of that time, if we do surpass them in some of the different sections.

Some of the committee members have communicated to me that they have some time constraints, so we do appreciate the time that you have spent. We are also very grateful and thankful that you are able to be here at this meeting in

addition to the previous meeting that you were in in August and the next meeting that you will be in in October.

We have also provided these times to district staff, so that, that way, they can attend the meeting at certain times and be able to know when the matters that affect them are being discussed.

I did email to the committee members

CE Form 8B, memorandum of voting conflict for

community municipal and local public officers. If

applicable, in cases of voting conflict, I will

need those back, signed.

And, also, the acknowledgment of school board advisory committee member's responsibility needs to be completed. Those were emailed to the committee members on Friday, August 14th. Please let us know in the chat if you did not receive them, and we can go ahead and send those back to you.

And then, with respect to the annual training for School Board established advisory committee members, the link was also sent out on Friday, August 14th. Please let us know in the chat if you did not receive it. We would like to get those back by Friday, September 25th, so that at the committee's next meeting, on October 8th, I can go

over the statistics with the members.

members that are having some concerns. Ms. Dahl, I have your concern on because you are supposed to complete the short training and it's leading you to do the longer training, so we'll work with you on that. And I also received some emails from two different members of some challenges that they

I do understand that there are a couple of

have, as well.

There were some documents that the audit committee members emailed to me that I have forwarded to the entire committee. There were some documents from Dr. Nathalie Lynch-Walsh that had some attachments. I emailed those to the committee on Thursday, September 10th; and then there were also some documents from Committee Member Mary Fertig that were received, and I forwarded those to the committee this morning. I will check the chat to see if people did not receive them so I can go ahead and forward them again.

I do want to take a moment to, again, thank the committee for this special meeting. I realize that this takes time from matters that you need to attend to.

I want to thank the committee for your ongoing

They are important to me. They are very comments. serious. Changes and comments that you have under the program, I do evaluate them and put them into The committee itself is a group of our program. distinguished persons, attorneys, CPAs, members of the municipalities, former principals, managing partners, members of other school districts and community leaders. All of your comments are very important to me. I know that there has been some discussion that I had at the Board level about the advisory nature of the comments, but they are very serious, and they are all part of what I evaluate as I establish the program, so thank you very much.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

With respect to the committee's next meeting, the Governor's executive order allowing remote meetings is set to expire at the end of the month; thus, for the next scheduled meeting on October 8th, I may need to have a commitment from the members to have a quorum in the KCW Board room; and then, once quorum is reached, members can participate virtually, but a quorum would be needed to conduct business, unless the executive order is extended.

We would also need to design the room for public access and ensure that the public can view

the meeting, and we will go ahead and set that up; but I just wanted to let the members know that the ability to have these virtual meetings we are doing today may not be possible and more information will be forthcoming.

Mr. Mayersohn, this concludes my administrative comments to the committee.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Thank you, Mr. Jabouin.

Dr. Lynch-Walsh, did you have any questions? Because your hand was raised.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Well, sort of.

The District is supposed to be looking into the fact that the original executive order suspending in-person quorum requirements was Executive Order Number 69. That is actually tied to Executive Order 52, which is the state of emergency; and last week, the District was going to look into that. I believe someone was trying to get with Mr. Moquin. Because there doesn't appear to be anything rescinding 69, and somehow they seem to keep extending it without acknowledging that it was tied to the state of emergency, as an FYI -- and there have been problems trying to get in-person quorums. So if we don't have to -- if we don't have to forego virtual meetings, it would be

good to know that ASAP.

Secondly, I don't see how we are ever getting to the charter school investigation report today, but we'll see, because we are already at 2:12. And the whole point of this meeting, unless my memory is failing me again, was to discuss this audit report.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Are those all the questions or comments?

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Yes. I believe we have

Mr. Moquin, so if they are looking into the

executive-order issue and the virtual-versus-quorum

issue, it would be nice to know that.

MR. MOQUIN: Yeah, I'll be working with Mr. Sullivan to get some conclusion on that; but as of right now, I don't have any additional information to add.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Mr. Moquin, there was some discussion about possibly the Board instituting, under Policy 1001, Item Number 4, which is emergency rule policy, which relates back to quorum, not necessarily to having an open and public meeting, but controlling the quorum to allow, I guess, virtual meetings, or to have one person present and, you know, twelve others

virtually, so I don't know where -- whether or not the Superintendent or the Board is willing to take up that discussion.

MR. MOQUIN: I'll have conversation with Mr. Runcie and Ms. Myrick on that issue. If it's something we can do to accommodate the advisories for a few months, I don't see why they wouldn't ---wouldn't consider that.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay.

And I also -- and I also see that Ms. Marte and Mr. Woods are also on this call, as well, so I just want to recognize them.

MR. MOQUIN: Yeah, and I also would like,
Mr. Chair, if I can acknowledge the fact that Board
Member Elect Leonardi appears to be joining us, as
well, in the meeting.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay. All right.

Dr. Lynch-Walsh, do you have another followup question?

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: No, can you just -- sort of.

Can you restate what policy and section that

was, 1001?

MR. MAYERSOHN: 1001, Section 4, under emergency policies, I think A more pertains to the Board determines the public health, safety and

welfare is endangered and that immediate action is required to protect the public interest, so --

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. Thank you, I'll incorporate that tomorrow when I give the task force committee report.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Thank you.

MR. MAYERSOHN: All right. With that being said, do we have any public comments?

MR. JABOUIN: Mr. Chair, we do not have any public comments.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay. All right. Moving on now to the RSM Roofing process analysis.

Do we have RSM here?

MR. JABOUIN: Yes, they are here. Mr. Luker is here.

Mr. Chair, if I can please mention a few things before Mr. Luker speaks?

MR. MAYERSOHN: Sure.

MR. JABOUIN: Thank you.

So the roofing process analysis, which was prepared by RSM, the scope of the work involved was the roof sub permitting application process, the usage of the ISS software for tracking and submission and the resolution of comments,

benchmarking, comparison of District standards to the building code, and the pay application process. RSM spent time meeting with individuals and facilities, buildings, the roofers and the design firms. Their work concluded with nine observations.

Mr. Luker and his team that are part of this meeting, they have already discussed and summarized the findings of the analysis at the August 13th meeting. Since that time, I went through the notes from the Board member comments at the August 11th workshop. I identified some questions from those, and I prepared a document for both the building department and the capital programs department, and they've returned those, and they serve as addendums to their original responses, and those were part of the meeting documents.

Also included in the section are the audit committee member questions that were received from Ms. Pou and Dr. Lynch-Walsh, and they are included in the documents.

Would you prefer, Mr. Chair, that you go through the different observations, as well as the responses that began on page 11?

MR. MAYERSOHN: Yes, I would prefer to go
through the observations one by one, taking, you
know, one through nine, and discussing those
observations and asking if, you know, the committee
has any questions or anything that we need to
discuss before we submit the report.

MR. JABOUIN: With respect to observation one, Mr. Luker, would you be able to describe that in about 60 seconds for the committee?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: He needs to be unmuted.

MR. JABOUIN: One moment, please.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: He's called in by phone. I think he needs to -- I don't know if it is star six or pound six?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, yeah, he is going to have to unmute.

MR. LUKER: Hi, this is David. I just unmuted myself. Can everybody hear me?

MR. MAYERSOHN: Yes, we can.

MR. LUKER: Thanks, and apologies for that.

Joris, to answer your question, 60 seconds or less, observation number one relates to that roofing design and plan review process, and there were several key components of the process that were cited as either missing or perhaps commonly

overstepped or overlooked, and we've included a series of recommendations that kind of correlated to each of those areas.

So lack of roofing knowledge; lack of, you know, detailed site visits, you know; response or resolution of review comments for plans; but there is a list included in the observation that I've been through with this group before and am happy to go through it again, if needed, or if there are specific questions about each one; but that was the nature of the finding.

MR. JABOUIN: I wanted to bring the committee's attention to, in addition to what Mr. Luker summarized on Page 12, you probably read the management response that follows this observation, and then there are also the -- the Board -- the audit committee member questions that also follow that, as well.

Mr. Chair, there are two hands that are up.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay. So I believe number -- the first one is Dr. Lynch-Walsh and then Ms. Mary Fertig.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. So it would probably have been better for Staff to have provided written responses, considering the sheer number of

questions I asked, especially since my questions have text surrounding them.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So observation number one, and this question was directed to the Office of Capital Programs and/or CBRE/HEERY, because all these things are occurring under HEERY, not under AECOM: from 2015 is part -- is part of the contractual obligations to which HEERY agreed in August 2015. It was light in defining the importance of the building department and related processes, a weakness that was addressed in this year's PMOR It did, however, contain some language that RFO. suggests HEERY should have addressed design issues at the front end of their involvement, rather than at the back end, specifically, Section 6.3 --6.4.3.5 design management, that they are supposed to provide day-to-day management of the design process and then also 6.4.3.6, regarding master project specifications and guidelines.

We already know from an earlier RSM review that the plan reviews were being done, I believe, in Atlanta, and that they were largely not beneficial to the process. I forget which RSM report that was, but that probably should have been factored in here, because it was an earlier

finding.

But, anyway, my questions are the following: Given that the contractual obligation above has existed since 2015, why weren't the issues identified in observation number one on page 11 proactively addressed prior to 2018?

See management response on page 12, because it seems like they didn't respond until 2018.

So that's the first question; and although -- and second question: Although roofing is the only area requiring a sub permit, it is not the only discipline requiring additional drawings. Are there similar challenges, obstacles, delays, et cetera, due to HVAC and fire safety projects and explain.

So I'd like -- I hope that there is an answer forthcoming from either HEERY or the Office of Capital Programs to these two questions.

MR. MAYERSOHN: So who -- who was going to address those questions?

MR. GIRARDI: It's Frank Girardi, executive director of Capital Programs. I don't know if HEERY is on this call, either Mike Bobby or Danny Jardine; I know Danny was at the airport and just getting in town, because they are the better ones

to answer these, on why they did that prior to 2018, that they didn't do it. I would hope that they would be on here to explain their actions on that.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Wait a minute. Why aren't they here, then, or why didn't someone have them prepare a written response? Is the answer to all of my questions going to be "HEERY is not here and we don't have an answer"?

MR. GIRARDI: No. HEERY should be here. We are trying to find out why Mike Bobby is not on here at the time -- at this time, but they were supposed to be --

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: I don't think he signed the contract so --

MR. GIRARDI: Excuse me?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hang on a second.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: I don't believe Mike Bobby signed the contract -- he is not the program director. I believe currently Danny is, but Danny wasn't the program director prior to 2018, so --

MR. GIRARDI: I guess we have to talk to Rob Chomiak or --

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: And why wouldn't that have been done -- how long ago did I send this email

with all these questions? August 25th. Did no one take these questions seriously and think that I expected an answer of some sort today?

MR. GIRARDI: Yes, I looked at them, and then Danny has been looking at them.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Well, looking and answering are not the same two things.

MR. GIRARDI: Well, he was going to answer them here. We were not requested to answer these and return them back in writing. We were given them to be prepared for today, and that is --

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: However, we have neither happening right now. So we don't have --

MR. MAYERSOHN: Dr. Walsh, because I -- if we go back and forth, we are not going to get an answer anyway.

So at this point in time, Frank, can you contact or somebody contact Danny, or whoever it is, so that we know -- I mean, we've got until 4 o'clock; hopefully we can get some answers. Because if this is going to be situation where we are going to have questions and HEERY is not here to answer them, then that's problematic.

MR. GIRARDI: Hold on. The phone is finally ringing. He must have landed because he was flying

1 in from Georgia.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: I don't need him trying to answer this as he is getting off of a plane.

That's just insanity.

MR. GIRARDI: Hey, can you get on this meeting?

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Frank, can answer the question, because in addition to being the executive director for two years --

MR. GIRARDI: Okay.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: -- he was the director of construction for three before that, so he should know the answer to Question 1B.

MR. GIRARDI: Well, the question to 1B is also part of the building department, because they are the ones that set what permits --

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: No, no, no, but you should know the answer. That's why I directed --

MR. GAUCI: Will you let me talk, please?

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Uh, no, because --

MR. GAUCI: If you want to talk, go ahead; I'll listen.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Well, you are telling me the building department has to answer the question. I am --

1 MR. GIRARDI: No, I am not.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: -- asking you the question.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Dr. Walsh, let Frank answer the question, please.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: He is not answering it.

MR. MAYERSOHN: He is going to.

MR. GIRARDI: I am going to, but you --

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay.

MR. GAUCI: -- keep talking over me, so I am going to sit here until I have some silence to be able to talk.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Go ahead, Frank. You are recognized.

MR. GIRARDI: The roofing is the only thing the building department requires a sub permit on.

Are there other areas that require additional drawings? Absolutely.

Fire sprinklers need additional drawings.

They need to be engineered by the fire sprinkler company.

Fire alarm drawings need additional drawings.

They need to submit shop drawings where they
engineer the fire alarm. The --

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: That's not the question. The question is: Are there similar challenges,

obstacles and delays due to HVAC and fire safety projects?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. GIRARDI: Okay. Quick answer: No.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: There are no -- there is no delays due to HVAC?

MR. GIRARDI: Nothing that I know of.

We do -- I don't know of any delays specifically due to HVAC on any problems. Are there some issues with possibly --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello?

MR. GAUCI: -- getting equipment? Yes, there --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello?

MR. GIRARDI: -- could be; but the delays are not anything that I know of that are holding up projects.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. We'll look into that. So you are positive, no delays, nothing -- it's HVAC --

MR. GIRARDI: Is there a delay out there? We have 75 projects going; there could possibly be a delay. Has it reached to me on any delays? No.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: But you should be able to tell from the reports that you look at, the ones that have HVAC in it.

So I guess we are going to need written 1 2 responses that put -- where some more thought is 3 put into the answer. So I am willing to move --MR. GIRARDI: Danny will be on in a few 4 5 minutes. As soon as he gets off the plane, he is 6 going to join us. 7 DR. LYNCH-WALSH: We can double back to the 8 first question, because I don't want to hold 9 everyone else up, and I believe Mary has her hand 10 up, and Robert is muted. 11 Yes, are you done, Dr. Walsh, MR. MAYERSOHN: 12 with questions for observation number one at this 13 point? 14 DR. LYNCH-WALSH: For now. 15 MR. MAYERSOHN: We can still --16 DR. LYNCH-WALSH: So as --17 MR. MAYERSOHN: -- go back. 18 DR. LYNCH-WALSH: -- not to hold it up for 19 now --20 MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay. 21 DR. LYNCH-WALSH: -- but I really would like

MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay.

are not going to work for me.

written responses, because these

22

23

24

25

shoot-from-the-hip, off-the-top-my-head responses

1 Ms. Fertig?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. FERTIG: Thanks, Bob.

Listen, can I ask a question that is in the analysis section, before we get to observation one, and it's going to come back on another observation?

So if I could, I wanted to ask Mr. Luker:
They've chosen ten schools here that they've
analyzed. They have the total data for 80. Am I
understanding that correctly?

MR. LUKER: Yes, ma'am, that's correct. We --

MS. FERTIG: Okay.

MR. LUKER: -- selected the ten schools, and we had the data from ISS for 80 projects.

MS. FERTIG: Okay. And you are showing the number of days of delay?

MR. LUKER: I wouldn't say the term "delay" is --

MS. FERTIG: Let me take that out.

MR. LUKER: -- appropriate.

MS. FERTIG: I'm sorry, I'm sorry, let me change that. Let me take the word "delay" away.

You are showing the number of days that they are in the two categories?

MR. LUKER: Yes, ma'am, the length of time to review and to revise and resubmit the responses to

those review comments. That's what this is showing.

You're on page seven, I think?

MS. FERTIG: I am on page seven, and I'm -looking at this chart, something struck me. Some
of these are schools that I'm very familiar with
and have followed for years on issues that were -on repairs that were needed.

Is there -- did you look to see if there is any disparity by race in the total number of days that they are spending in the building department review and in the queue afterwards?

MR. LUKER: I'm sorry, can you repeat that question? I didn't quite get it.

MS. FERTIG: Yes. Is there any disparity by race? I'm looking at these schools that you chose. Seven of the schools are predominantly black schools; three are not. Is there -- did you notice any disparity -- and I don't know about the other 70, so maybe I should just get the data and look at it myself.

I am wondering if there is any disparity on how long it's taking to get the roofs on certain schools and if that -- if that correlates to predominantly black schools or predominantly white

1 or majority minority.

MR. LUKER: Our -- our procedures and analysis of this data did not contemplate or factor in any considerations with respect to the demographics of the school, so, unfortunately, I couldn't comment on that.

MS. FERTIG: Okay. Well, let me just follow up by saying, One of the ten is Stoneman Douglas, which does not appear to be following the same process as some of the others; is that correct or not correct?

MR. LUKER: That is -- that is correct. It actually -- I believe that project has not completed this process. I'll have to open up the work papers, and I also would welcome if any of my colleagues who are listening have the answer to that question. I am -- help me out, but I'll have to open the work papers to see.

But, yes, it's my understanding that that project has not gone all the way through the process but had started the process, and I believe there was some -- some testing we did around the first round of review for that to obtain an understanding of what was communicated back and forth, but I apologize for kind of batting that

1 answer back at you.

MS. FERTIG: No, no, that's fine. My point is -- is that, if it's not -- you know, if it's not following in the same process, that it's not in the same loop, then it's skewing the data because you've got, you know, one day and building department review and you don't have any days here for the other.

So I was wondering -- and I know it's probably late, but I think -- I think another school might have been a better -- a better choice.

MR. LUKER: Yes, ma'am. I can comment. I am in the work paper now, and it is -- it did follow the same process, but those -- those review comments were resolved in -- in -- in a single day based on the data provided from ISS.

MS. FERTIG: Okay. Whereas Dillard took 396 days? If I'm reading this correctly; I just want to make sure I'm reading it correctly.

MR. LUKER: Yes, ma'am, you are reading it correctly. That is correct.

MS. FERTIG: Okay. And Lake Forest took 300 -- 400-some days?

MR. LUKER: Yes, ma'am, that's correct.

MS. FERTIG: Okay. All right. So now I thank

1 you for that.

I'll comment on that at the end, Bob.

So I -- I find that your observation that many designers lack the knowledge is somewhat alarming, but I want to go to management response, which is --

MR. GIRARDI: Can I get some clarification real quick?

On Stoneman Douglas, is that the renovation or is that the new addition, because I don't think the renovation has gone through --

COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, who is speaking right now? This is the court reporter. I'm sorry, who was saying that?

MR. GIRARDI: Frank Girardi. Frank Girardi.
COURT REPORTER: Thank you.

MR. LUKER: Frank, this is the new -- this is the new classroom addition, Building 12.

MR. GIRARDI: Okay. That's why your numbers are skewed, because that's a new roof; that's not a renovation.

MS. FERTIG: So my point -- my point, Frank, I think, is that I understand that, in looking at the chart, I thought that might be the explanation, is that it seems like that might have been put in the

wrong category here. I don't think -- and I think it skews the data, so it's just going to mean that they are even -- in a summary, to me, that just means that it's taking even longer than what we are seeing, if you have 10 schools and one takes a day and another one takes 400 days.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Ms. Fertig, is your recommendation to remove that from the report? I mean, if it's not a reroofing project --

MS. FERTIG: Yeah, that's a good point.
Thanks, Bob. That's good. I like it.

Yes, I feel like it skews the data, and I don't think that -- I don't think that is helpful. It's pretty -- it's pretty alarming data anyways, but I think it would be more realistic to have the real number of days there.

MR. MAYERSOHN: So are you -- are you recommending that they, A, remove that and choose another school for analysis purposes?

MS. FERTIG: I am recommending that they either do it on nine schools or they pick a tenth school that follows the same processes as the other nine.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Is that a motion?

MS. FERTIG: Oh, yes, that's a motion.

1	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Second.
2	MS. FERTIG: Thank you.
3	MR. MAYERSOHN: All those is there any
4	discussion on the motion?
5	I guess, seeing none, all those in favor,
6	signify by saying "aye."
7	ALL PRESENT: Aye.
8	MR. MAYERSOHN: Anybody opposed?
9	So you guys have some direction.
10	All right. Go ahead, Ms. Fertig.
11	MS. FERTIG: Again, on management's action
12	plan, as we all now have a better understanding of
13	the requirements necessary for successful
14	implementation, I have to tell you, I feel like
15	that could be written a little differently. It's
16	been six years, and how, after six years, do you
17	say we now have a better understanding of the
18	requirements necessary for successful
19	implementation?
20	So, with that, let me look here, I am on to
21	number two when you are.
22	MR. MAYERSOHN: Dr. Walsh, you wanted a
23	followup on this?
24	DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Yes, thank you.
25	Just getting back to that table for a second,

since I started looking at it, the last column is the total days in the architect's queue after building department review, and this -- so this means -- just so I am clear, Mr. Luker, those numbers represent what?

MR. LUKER: The -- you are talking about the far column on page seven?

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: The far right, last column on the right on page seven, total days in architect/engineer queue after building department review.

MR. LUKER: So, as you know, the architect submits plans and waits, and then the building department submits comments back to them and waits.

So the far right column represents the cumulative amount of time that the architect or engineer was not advancing the ball forward; they -- they had review comments from the building department, and they were revising and addressing those comments before they could return. So the far right is the total aggregate amount of time in the AE's queue, versus the center column is the total aggregate time that the building department was holding the plans.

Hopefully, that's helpful.

\_\_\_

\_\_

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. And these -- all of these sample -- these sample projects were pulled and represent what time period in terms of the program years, I mean, as opposed -- 2015 or 16, as opposed to more recent?

MR. LUKER: So, in all of our plan review sample projects, the samples that we have are from 2018 and 2019 plan review completion. We also looked at those same projects for permitting, which is, obviously, a different timeline subsequent to that; but those projects were in plan review in 2018, primarily.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. All right. So, then, I don't know if this came up in another RSM and I'm going to have to go back, although, I mentioned earlier the plan review process and the problem with the HEERY plan review process; but given that this has been going on for at least the past two years, I guess my followup question is: Who would be making sure that the architects weren't spending so much time?

I mean, in some cases, the highest number on here is 304 days in total, divided by four. That starts to get to be a big number. I mean, we are looking at they could have something sitting around

for 75 days without giving it back to the building department. Is that normal? And whose job would it have been to follow up on that?

And I don't know if you know that, Mr. Luker; but I do believe Mr. Girardi should know that answer.

MR. GIRARDI: Yes, Frank Girardi again.

Danny is on the call now, but I will start with the answer to that.

A lot of that is part of project management, getting on the architects to make sure they get them submitted back to the building department.

There should be no reason that an architect should hold it as long as they have, and I don't know if Danny wants to add to that.

MR. JARDINE: Yeah, this is Danny Jardine, CBRE/HEERY.

Reiterating what Frank said, the architects are responsible for turning the comments around with their consultants. RPMs were the ones who were trying to keep them on task and keeping them moving and -- and assisting, if there were issues or problems with the comments.

MR. MAYERSOHN: So I don't think that answers -- Dr. Walsh's question is: Who is

1 ultimately responsible?

MR. JARDINE: The PM -- I mean, the architect has a contractual obligation to turn this stuff around, and their contract says they have 21 days to respond after revision one and two and then 14 days; and when they don't comply, we enforce the terms of the contract in regards to the delays.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: The PM reports to whom?

MR. JARDINE: The PM reports to their team leader, who is -- ultimately reports to me.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. And what report would you guys have been reviewing that showed you that these took so long.

MR. JARDINE: We gave -- we gave the team leaders -- basically, every week we got a report from the building department that we were able to extrapolate that shows where we were with each one of the revise and resubmit on plans going through permitting.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. So the building department gave you guys reports --

MR. JARDINE: No, no, no, no, no, no, that's not what I said.

We have access to ISS, their system, and we extrapolate a report that we use to share with the

1 PM.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: As you should as the program manager, I would imagine, but okay.

So -- so you guys pulled it out of ISS, and what -- was there any action? Well, I guess not, because then we wouldn't have had this sample, I guess is the point, that these just happen to be delays that occurred.

But since we have you here and we have eight other observations to get through, Question 1A Frank has decided to punt to you, even though you weren't in charge back then; but, again, these questions were submitted on August 25th, and I did copy Frank, so he's had them since the 25th of August.

So I'm looking for a really good answer, or else we are going to have to revert to written responses where people put some thought into these things.

So 1-A: Given that the contractual obligation above -- and I'm hoping that Frank forwarded you these questions -- oh, no, wait. I -- it looks like I did, because I knew better.

So given that the contractual obligation above, which is coming out of the RFP, which is

part of the contract HEERY has with the District, the contractual obligation existed since 2015, why weren't the issues identified in observation number one proactively addressed prior to 2018?

MR. JARDINE: Okay. Nathalie, pardon me, but I don't have the information in front of me. Ask me the question. Okay?

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: That was the question. I guess it's the contractual obligation, which --

MR. JARDINE: Uh-huh.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: -- that you wouldn't have in front of you, and those have to do with design management and master --

MR. JARDINE: Right.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: -- project specifications and guidelines, and I definitely included this --

MR. JARDINE: Yes.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: -- in my questions.

MR. JARDINE: Okay. And we -- we did a review of the District's guidelines and design standards and gave a report to the District in -- I believe it was September of 2016.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: I've never actually seen that, so I guess I'll have to request that from Frank.

However, let me -- let me read it to you, because the one -- and you've mentioned doing it the one time --

MR. JARDINE: Uh-huh.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: -- but the idea is that the OR is expected to actively contribute to the District's initiative to continuously improve the master program standards to avail itself of current industry standards and evolving best practices.

The process of developing these standards is expected to be iterative and collaborative between the OR, FCM, PPO, Design Professionals, and other applicable District departments for the duration of the program.

So that's where I asked the question. If that's yes, you gave it in 2016, but then --

MR. JARDINE: Yep.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: -- it was supposed to be a continuous thing, and the question is: Given that the contractual obligation existed since 2015, why weren't the issues proactively addressed prior to 2018?

And it may not be fair to be --

MR. JARDINE: Well --

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: -- asking you this question.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. JARDINE: -- yeah, and, Nathalie, there has only been several minor changes to the District's design standards over the last several years, you know. We updated the fire alarm specifications in 2018. There has been some other minor tweaks and revisions; I know we are going through the process of updating the roofing system specification now to allow for another vendor as soon as they can get tested. And then the roofing specification got changed, what, middle -- end of 2017, so that was done, you know, after our initial review; and the District says, these are our standards, these are our specifications and this is what we want.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. So is -- so you're saying there was no need to address them prior to 2018?

MR. JARDINE: No, no, no, no, that's not what I said. I said we did it. We did our reviews, and since that time, there's only been a couple of changes to the systems design standards.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. So, then, everybody should have been clear on what the design standards are, then, is what I seem to be hearing. Because if there haven't been changes and you did a review,

then that would suggest that everyone should have known what the design standards are. I guess that's my answer, is, there was no need to do it prior and --

MR. JARDINE: I can't answer for how architects or engineers or other people interpret the documents; but we -- we did a review of the documents, and we continually look at them and review them, but we've not made any significant changes to them because we've only had -- we've only made those several minor -- I don't want to call them minor. We've only made those several changes over the past couple years.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: So just to -- so let me read you the other section from the RFP, then, because it pertains to design management.

MR. JARDINE: Uh-huh.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: As discussed in Sections 3.2 and 3.05, the OR shall provide day-to-day management of the design process from project definition through the completion of preconstruction. Of critical import is that the OR team be fully capable of developing design criteria packages -- which I know we threw out the whole design-build concept at --

1 MR. JARDINE: Yep, yep.

(Multiple voices.)

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: -- (unintelligible). So we can skip that for the most part.

As part of the budgeting the process, the OR shall -- let's see -- shall ensure that the design professional or other design entity produces a design that is within the established budget for construction of the project in question.

The OR shall implement the District's robust process to control changes during the design that necessitate a change in the project budget.

Furthermore, the OR shall establish a clear understanding of the cost drivers of the project prior to development of completed construction drawings. This should include understanding the risk related to the scope of work in question and taking the appropriate steps to assess such risk, such as destructive testing and environmental sampling.

Furthermore, the OR shall incorporate collaborative constructability reviews into their design review process to further mitigate the occurrence of the foreseeable changes during construction.

So that is the entire section that I pulled out of the RFP, which is, of course, part of the CBRE contract, which is why I'm asking these questions, because based on the contract, they shouldn't have really had observation one as an observation; but I think I have a better sense of what the answer is here based on your explanation.

So I'm good, Mr. Mayersohn.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay. Ms. Fertig, did you have a followup on this observation?

I guess that's "no," because you put your hand down.

Are there any --

MS. FERTIG: Yes, I'm sorry. I didn't catch this right away, but I meant to ask this: It says evidence of a site visit should be retained to verify that the designer -- this is on page 11 -- performed an inspection.

Is it not -- is it not expected that your designers would look at this beforehand? Has that not been the District practice?

MR. JARDINE: Ms. Fertig, I don't know how they can do a design without going out and visiting the jobsite. Now, whether we have gotten formal documents, like we are doing now, if we move

forward, or as we've been doing over the last couple months ...

But in discussions with them, they've all said, Yeah, we've been going out to job sites. We are doing our observations. We are getting out and looking at things.

It just may not be in the presence of other individuals.

MS. FERTIG: There would be pictures or some photographs?

MR. JARDINE: You would think so. There would be a report. There would be some kind of documentation somewhere that we could go back to.

MS. FERTIG: Yeah, I would think there would be, yes.

MR. JARDINE: Yes.

MS. FERTIG: Okay. Thank you.

Thanks, Mr. Mayersohn.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Are there any other questions regarding observation one?

All right. Just for the record, Ms. Shaw has joined us, and she has requested if we are going to talk about points, just refer to the page number to kind of help us all out.

Moving forward to observation number two,

Ms. Fertig, you have a question?

MS. FERTIG: I have a comment. Is this the right time?

MR. MAYERSOHN: Go ahead. Comment.

MS. FERTIG: Okay. I -- I have a problem with this. There is no strategic roofing plan, and I've sent you all an exhibit which I'll be referring to a couple times today from the 2013 DEFP, which as you know, the District publishes, the Board adopts, and it's the five-year plan. And you can see that -- and they had an absolute plan for 2013, which they did not follow, if you are looking at this thing.

And I also -- I also, as we are going through this, wanted to introduce, because it's going to be coming up other times, the document showing that in 2013, the District designated Northeast High School as an emergency on that main building.

And Frank -- or whoever best can answer -- that roof didn't get done, did it?

MR. GIRARDI: The Northeast -- again, this is Frank Girardi.

The Northeast buildings did not get done.

They are in the process of getting done now. We are in for permitting for the roofs.

We did do temporary roofs after -- I believe it was Hurricane Irma, where we put another ply down; but the actual roofs, they are -- they are planned on over the next year or so.

MS. FERTIG: So as you can see from the document I sent you, in 2013, this is well after Irma, there was a -- there was -- that roof was designated an emergency; and, in fact, it was in the plan.

So I -- I guess my comment is: You can have long-range plans, as we did have before the SMART program, but if you don't follow that plan, it does not help. It really won't solve nothing, and that Northeast roof has been a problem for a lot of years. It's just unfortunate that it's taken so long to get where we are.

Sorry for editorializing, but there we go.

MR. GIRARDI: And I think you said the hurricane was years prior; that was Wilma.

MS. FERTIG: You are right. You are right.

MR. GIRARDI: The temporary roofs were Irma.

MS. FERTIG: I apologize. You did get those -- you did get those federal dollars from Irma, right? Did you get the FEMA dollars?

MR. GIRARDI: Capital would have to say that.

1 I don't know if they got it.

MS. FERTIG: I just was questioning whether they were spent on the Northeast roof.

Okay. Thank you.

MR. MAYERSOHN: All right. Dr. Walsh and then Ms. Pou.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. So my question is on the memo that Mary Fertig shared dated July 30th, 2013, because I understand it didn't get done, but what I can't tell from just this one memo, and it begs some forensic -- some forensic actions here, is what happened next, because this is saying due to the extremely poor condition of the roof -- and are we talking about the building that's currently being reroofed or the building that's being replaced?

MR. GIRARDI: I don't think it's any of the ones that were replaced. I believe the two buildings -- again, Frank Girardi, sorry about that.

The two buildings that we put the temporary roofs on, I believe, was the auditorium and either the gymnasium or the cafeteria, and those are not -- well, the cafeteria is fairly new. That's one of the newer buildings, so it had to be the

gymnasium.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Because I would like to find DR. LYNCH-WALSH: out why this didn't happen, and if not here, then I'm sure the facilities task force would like to trace the history of why this never actually happened, because I can't imagine this roof got -and it was -- and we'll have to look at how this played into -- Mary, you may remember -- the high FCI building report that Messier did back in the summer of 2014. I went and looked at it, and I want to say that it was either Northeast or Deerfield, we have to see if they were actually on there, because how do you go from having a roof that's in critical condition, that's in an emergency status, and then it doesn't get addressed and, in fact, they have to fight to get it reroofed at all? So I'm kind of curious what happened after that memo.

So observation number two, when I went through this analysis, most of the questions -- most of the observations are tied to lack of program management. Observation number two is tied to lack of a plan at all, and in management's initial response, because this entire observation cited the lack of a strategic roofing plan in place for

prioritizing, selecting or scheduling roofing projects to develop a long-term plan for each of the 241 school facilities managed by BCPS and that while the DEFP is critical to capital outlay planning, it does not contemplate the long-term plans for each BCPS school.

The thing is that this wasn't -- they didn't just cite a lack of a roofing plan. They cited the lack of a long-term plan altogether and, in fact, said that without proper tracking after long-term plans related to each building's life cycle, resources may be utilized ineffectively, leading to financial, operational and reputational damage. Because they are looking at there is no plan whatsoever, and any of us who were here back in 2014 know that.

So a question 2A: Is the lack of the aforementioned strategic roofing plan and long-term plan overall a primary reason why we are discussing all of these roofing issues now, instead of back in 2015 or '16 or even '17? Meaning, if we had a plan, would we have been discussing these issues back then? That's the first question.

My second question, why did -- and maybe I should just do these one at a time. So question

1 2A --

MR. GIRARDI: Yes, want to do the first one? Frank Girardi.

With your comment about would a long-term plan have benefited --

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Is the lack -- the question is: Is the lack of the aforementioned strategic roofing plan and long-term plan overall a primary reason we are discussing all of these roofing issues now, as opposed to discussing them in 2015, '16 or even '17?

MR. GIRARDI: I would say yes.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. 2B: Why did the management response on page 14 -- so that's at the bottom of page 14 -- fail to address the RSM recommendation that BCPS develop and maintain a long-range plan for all facilities managed?

You addressed the roofing part of the recommendation but not the first part of the recommendation; it's just -- just ignored. Because they said, We recommend BCPS develop and maintain a long-range plan for all facilities managed. And your response, Frank, is --

MR. GIRARDI: For the roof.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Right. So why didn't you

respond to the first part of their recommendation, which is actually a longer recommendation than the one about roofing?

MR. GIRARDI: Because I think it was answered by a board member in one of the board meetings, that we have no money to look at long-term plans --

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: That -- that --

MR. GIRARDI: -- so we were looking at the roofing, since this was a roofing analysis, and that we are doing something regarding the roofing. The older roofs that are not done were not -- will not be done as part of this program, but I can't answer anything on the long-term facility --

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Are you not -- okay. So let me back up.

This report was done prior to the hasty flinging of this thing in front of the Board prior to it going to the audit committee. So the fact that a board member, namely, the chair, said we don't have money, and a couple others, which is -- not having money is not why you don't do long-term planning, and I can't even get into the -- the nonsensical nature of that comment.

But the question is: Why didn't you address it? You are currently the executive director of

capital programs. Why is long-term planning not part of what you would be thinking? Why didn't you address the recommendation with some sort of answer? You just omitted an answer altogether.

MR. JABOUIN: Excuse me, Mr. Chair.

It might be important to bring some information that the chair of the board indicated that the Board, themselves, would need to give that direction to district staff with respect to creating a strategic plan.

Mr. Girardi, do --

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: And that's --

MR. JABOUIN: -- you want to expand on that?

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: I'm sorry, I don't want to get off of my question.

So the thing is, he could have provided -someone should have told Frank to put that in as
his answer. I'm asking why he didn't answer it.
I'm not asking why people suddenly came up with a
bunch of excuses to try to explain away the fact
that they failed to have a long-term plan.

MR. GIRARDI: Because I read it as this was part of roofing, because this was the roofing audit; I did not take it as the whole district and program regarding --

1 DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay.

MR. GIRARDI: -- all the facilities. It was strictly --

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Even though --

MR. GIRARDI: -- looked at --

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: -- that's exactly --

MR. GIRARDI: -- as roofing.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: So you made a mistake, and just -- you just missed that whole first paragraph.

Okay. So --

MR. GIRARDI: Absolutely.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: -- moving on. All right. So you'll say that you just missed it.

MR. GIRARDI: Absolutely. Put it in writing.

I'll sign it. I missed it.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Question 2C, given that the council -- and this question was directed at the Superintendent: Given that the Council of Great City Schools PPO report made the same recommendation, a recommendation similarly ignored, please explain why the District attempted a general obligation bond program without an underlying long-term plan to guide it -- and, no, people, a five-year DEFP is not a long-term plan -- and why, now, given lack of planning has led to so many

unnecessary delays and costs, why the District seems so unwilling to engage in what amounts to be best business practices? Is the problem a failure to understand the difference between a five-year DEFP and long-term facilities planning?

And I don't believe the Superintendent is here, so I don't know if Mr. Moquin wants to take that one?

MR. MAYERSOHN: Mr. Moquin?

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: I'm just -- is he there?

MR. GIRARDI: On the Office of Capital Program side -- Frank Girardi again -- we were not asked to look at a long-term for the program before the --

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Well, you weren't in charge at the time. You weren't in charge in 2014.

That's why I was asking the Superintendent, because you weren't the one that decided to go out for a bond and skip the whole year of analysis and planning, for instance, lack of planning to make sure that the cost for roofing met building -- the current building standards and building code, as opposed to just repairs. So there is a whole host of things that would have occurred, had there been planning and analysis.

Okay. So I'm glad most of my questions are

actually rhetorical ones, because it doesn't look like I am going to get too many answers.

All right. 2D, this one I think we should have an answer for: What steps have been taken to ensure the asset management company will be mobilized by early 2021?

This is in response to the assertion at the bottom of page 14, that the recommendation moving forward and for the longer term is to procure and contract with a third asset management company to develop a comprehensive plan for the ongoing management.

So that's why I am asking this question, is, what steps have actually been taken to ensure that they will be mobilized by early 2021; and as the people in this committee may not know, there are roofs that are due for inspection so that they would -- to be under warranty and not fall out of warranty, as have been all the other roofs in the District.

So, one, what steps have been taken? Where is it -- where are you guys in the process? And have you actually gotten the roofs inspected that need to be inspected ASAP?

MR. GIRARDI: Frank Girardi.

The second part was the roofs are planned to be inspected within -- I don't know the timeline, but the next few weeks we are doing the inspections of the new roofs through a continuing contract with PPO, hiring -- we have three of our top roofers that are on continuing contracts. So we are taking a contract from them to inspect the two roofs that are due now. I believe we have three more roofs that are due by the end of the year.

So on the new roofs, we have those covered with the inspections. What we need to do is get the asset management company, of which we've received, or we've researched a few of the RFPs, one of them through Washington, D.C., for hiring a asset management company. We are putting an RFP together to get that out so we can bring someone in, more so to look at the existing roofs that are not part of the program, or even some of the existing roofs that are part of the program that are down the road a little bit to see if there is anything to extend their lifetime until we actually get to reroofing them.

So we are moving forward with an RFP to hire a asset management company that will be working through us and PPO.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: So you are piggybacking on an RFP or you are writing one?

MR. GIRARDI: No, we are writing one.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: And that will be -- and we are into September.

So followup question, then: Back in April of 2015, there was a roofing symposium, and I believe one of the companies, because I keep hearing the name "Blue Fin" thrown about. Were they one of the attendees back in 2015? I mean, this was something people talked about in 2015.

MR. GIRARDI: I was not part of that symposium, so I don't know if they were there. I don't know if Shelley Meloni was there for that, if she could answer that; but I cannot. I cannot answer that. I was not there.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Because I am trying to understand, if there was a roofing symposium back in 2015 that looked at roofing specifications, new warranty format, and M/WBE certifications and prequalification, and it was open to architects, engineers, contractors, and manufacturers, why we never put an asset management, as far as roofing goes, in place so that the roofs didn't fall out of the warranty? And why was -- and I guess this

might be a question for Mr. Moquin, because Derek Messier is no longer here. Leo Bobadilla is no longer here, but it seems as though that the warranty was a topic that was covered, and I'm trying to understand when -- what happened when HEERY came on board, because this was something that predated HEERY and predated Bobadilla, but seems to have fallen into some sort of black hole in terms of being followed up on.

I see Shelley.

MS. MELONI: Yes, Dr. Lynch-Walsh.

Yes, I was -- at the time, in 2015,

April 2015, I had, along with the -- the standards committee, had coordinated this symposium; and Blue Fin was present, because in addition to the topics that you had indicated, there -- there was a presentation segment of the symposium, and Blue Fin had introduced the concept of asset management to us, the standards committee, as well as to speak about the benefits of having such a program in place.

Subsequent to that, we had asked Blue Fin, along with a couple other companies that had offered to provide us with some asset management data, we asked the three companies if they could

give us sort of like a pro bono analysis of three schools each. Each one of the companies had -- we selected three schools that they would go out and analyze, and we have since -- we had received the data.

Based on the committee's evaluation of the data, including bringing in other departments to review the data with us, we had come to the conclusion that Blue Fin offered us the best product overall. It was the most comprehensive, most forward-thinking, and the -- the data itself, the data collected, seemed to -- to speak to many aspects in terms of -- of the current conditions, as well as -- as opportunities to extend the lifespan of those roofs and to -- to look forward into a long-range master plan.

So we did really, you know, favor that -- that product overall, and we continued to try to -- to bring attention to it. It -- we were never quite successful in gaining -- in it gaining -- gaining traction to be able to implement such a program.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. Thank you.

So I guess this takes me back to HEERY and what they would have turned in in September of 2016, as far as their review, because I'm trying to

understand. We have, you know, tangible -- I'm holding -- I'm holding a document. We have tangible evidence that this -- that the District was, in fact, thinking about roofing in 2015, and I'm trying to understand how it -- we stopped thinking about roofing and until largely 2018, '19, '20, to the point where we are having these discussions today.

So I guess the question -- the next question is: What did HEERY do -- HEERY, the program manager, who has been paid close to \$70 million since 2015 --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Unintelligible.)

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: What did they do -- what's that? Did somebody die over the amount?

But, yeah, what did they do with all of the -this initiative? Because it sounds like they did
nothing.

MR. JARDINE: That's not --

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: So I guess --

MR. JARDINE: Dr. Lynch-Walsh, can you please give me about two seconds to take care of something while I get in the car and then I can answer these questions, please?

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Sure. I'm -- again, you

weren't the one in charge, Danny, if that's who -I believe that's who I am talking to, and I'm not
trying to put you on the spot, but -- because I'm
not sure you had the answer to this.

If nobody took these questions seriously and put some thought into answering them, then I'm never going to get any real answers here, because the question is -- and we -- we are never going to get through all of these observations if there is no answer to the question: What happened in between 2015 -- granted, this was not a written -- an original one, but I think we have discussed this roofing symposium, and this goes back to what happened in between 2015 and 2018.

So I'm not sure I'm clear on the steps that have been taken, other than you're writing an RFP -- and is there a timeline, Frank, for mobilizing by early 2021? Because we know it takes several weeks to put out an RFP, and it takes, in average, about a month to write one; I know that, and that's just to write -- this one should be a lot less, but let's say a month.

So there have been meetings to discuss putting that out there and there is a timeline?

MR. GIRARDI: We don't have -- Frank Girardi.

We don't have an exact timeline right now. We are just putting all the information together, and once we look at it, we'll put a timeline -- or, again, we are hoping for the first quarter of 2021 to be able to have someone onboard.

Again, it's not so much for the new roofs. It's for the roofs that are not being completed during the bond. So we have a long-term plan.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Well, if it's not for the new roofs, then who is doing the new roofs as they get completed? Why would --

MR. GIRARDI: They are -- it will be part for the new roofs, but we have so many few new roofs that are 18 months old, because, again, the first year is under the general contractor's review, and then, after that 12-month warranty, it's six months after that. So we've got three, maybe, by the end of the year and, again, maybe a handful through the next half of next year. Because if we finish a product now -- a roof now, it's 18 months before we have to inspect it, so --

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. So I got it. It's not that it won't be for the roofs that are being completed; it's just that there is so few that have actually been completed?

1 MR. GIRARDI: Correct.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. I'm good, Mr. Mayersohn. Thank you.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay. Ms. Fertig, did you have a followup? And then, after you, I just need to just keep us on track, so go ahead.

You are muted. Ms. Fertig, you are muted.

MS. FERTIG: Well, I did turn the camera on, though. I'm making progress.

So I -- I wanted to comment on developing the long-range plan and looking at the conditions of existing facilities' roofs and include a life cycle analysis to assist in the planning.

Just one thing that I think that we should note in some of these plans is that Stranahan, Northeast, Hollywood Hills and other schools have these; they have had them for years, and so at one point they weren't doing anything to those schools, because they were going to be replaced, and I -- I just -- I just think that the one thing that I've probably learned in the last ten years is that it can -- we can be told it's going to be replaced, but it isn't necessarily, so it's important to keep the kids under the roof dry.

And I just wanted to comment back on something

Dr. Lynch-Walsh mentioned. I believe -- and I didn't say this very eloquently, but with the changes in the facilities department in 2013, I think some of the shift on planning for the roofs occurred. We had a lot of project managers who knew their schools, knew when things were going to be needed, and suddenly we adopted another method of management.

And so, I -- I think this -- I think you should have a long-range plan. I'm not sure where you put that funding, if you are not putting it in the DEFP, but I think you should have a long-range plan. I think that needs to consider the fact that we sometimes want to replace schools but can't replace schools and we still have an obligation to make sure that we have a sound roof over the heads of our kids.

Thank you.

MR. MAYERSOHN: All right. Ms. Pou, you had a comment, as well?

MS. POU: Yes, Mr. Mayersohn.

My comment was -- my comment is directed to RSM. I just wanted to know that, in addition to the required five-year District -- facility plan, did RSM look at other districts to see if they have

long-term plans or -- and if they do, do they have an asset management company or do they do it in-house?

MR. LUKER: David Luker, RSM.

As a part of this engagement, we did not conduct specific benchmarking with respect to long-term strategic planning. That said, having worked with many jurisdictions in the State of Florida, as well as around the country, we do know that many of our clients do execute upon these types of plans; and for what it's worth, I know Cannon Design is a firm that recently performed a similar function for one of our Central Florida jurisdictions. So I know these are being performed and being followed in the State of Florida.

Hopefully, that's a little bit helpful.

MS. POU: Okay. Thank you.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Does that answer your question, Ms. Pou?

MS. POU: Yes. Thank you.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay.

MR. JABOUIN: Mr. Mayersohn?

MR. MAYERSOHN: Yes.

MR. JABOUIN: I'm doing a quick quorum check, and I just wanted to double-check on the members

1 still in attendance for the meeting.

We have Ms. Pou, Ms. Fertig, Mr. Medvin, Mr. De Meo, Mr. Mayersohn, Ms. Dahl and Ms. Shaw. So we are just at the quorum level. So if any -- if I missed a member, if you could please let us know; but if a member departs, if you could please let us know before you depart. Thank you.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Jabouin.

Just a couple of things that I just want to

express. First of all, it's about 3:15. So we

have approximately 45 minutes or so to finish this

analysis, and we have seven more observations to

continue.

The part that I want to kind of voice my opinion on, and this is something that I brought up when I brought my report to the -- the annual audit report to the Board, is that a lot of these answers are just surface answers in response by management action plans. They are not actually plans. They are not actually something that is -- is concise and detailed.

Mr. Girardi, you had mentioned a couple of things as far as short- and long-term plans, and even, you know, the idea of mobilizing a timeframe to have an asset management company, you know, in

early '20/'21. I believe -- and Dr. Lynch-Walsh had expressed this -- is that it shouldn't prohibit us or prevent us from having a plan because of budgetary constraints. That's up to the Board to figure out where they are going to get the funding or how they are going to spend it.

I think the important part is that we need to have a plan. We need to have some actions. We need to have some timeframes so that when we get this report and submit it, the Board knows the expectations that are there from staff, which is very helpful; and we've -- consistently, over the years, have seen reports of, you know, admitting that, yes, what we did, we need to make a change, but as well as: We won't do it again. And some of these things seem to consistently happen.

So I'm -- I would like to see more detail in responses. If it asks for a timeline and asks for, you know, a, kind of, some action, is to create what that action is and the timeline for that action. I think that would be very helpful. You know, we can go back and look at what challenges were there, some of the observations, and how to improve; but I think, moving forward, we really need to look at what the action plan is based on

the observations and based upon what we learned.

So those are just my comments.

MR. JABOUIN: Okay.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Moving on to item number -- or observation number three, do we have any questions, concerns, comments?

Dr. Lynch-Walsh?

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Thank you.

I don't think I missed any of the observations. I did combine some of them, so I have one here.

Why is it, when I ask a question, we have the report but not my question and we had Ms. Pou's questions up? Just asking.

Okay. So observation number three, which had to do with utilizing alternative/separate contracting for roofing scopes; and, basically, it boiled down to trying to pull roofing, which is the exact opposite of what the Board was sold back in 2014 when Derek Messier bundled, packaged, combined -- whatever you want to call it, which Frank did reiterate in his response, so --

But my question is: Given that, the sheer volume of roofing that's being done, if you extract roofing, HVAC, and mechanical scopes, what's left

in terms of a project? Because in the response, it's talking about looking at -- or perhaps in the recommendations. Let's see, roofing only so -- but the extraction of roofing scopes -- I am on page 18, Phyllis, to keep in your good graces.

Page 18, the recommendation says, In addition, the extraction of roofing scopes may require the carving out of HVAC and mechanical scopes, since roofing is often done in conjunction with both disciplines. So hence the question, if you extract roofing, HVAC, and mechanical scopes, what in the world is left of those projects that have been awarded designers, awarded -- they have been designed. They have potentially been awarded to CM at-risk firms. They have been put out.

What is the point based on what would be left? Is there anything to be gained in terms of saving time and money, or was the goal to create more CSMP opportunities, given the threshold recently increased to 4 million?

That's the first question, and these are for Frank and/or Danny.

MR. GIRARDI: Do you want to go question by question, or do you want to read them all?

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: No, no, I think I am safer

going one at a time.

MR. GIRARDI: Okay. With regards to your first one, I'll start off. If Danny wants to add anything, that's fine.

Just looking through the DEFP at all the different other areas that are part of the SMART program, we do have fire alarms. We do have interior renovations. We have medias. We have fire sprinklers. There are other aspects of the SMART, other than just the mechanical, roofing, and the other things you've mentioned.

With regards to the separation, there is so much mechanical work that is part of this, and the ones we've been able to carve out have very, very little mechanical on the roofs. If there is a lot of mechanical on the roofs, a roofing contractor cannot hire a HVAC contractor as a subcontractor.

So what would have to happen is if we use the CSMP, we would have to go out to a roofing CSMP, get a roofing project. We would have to then go to a mechanical and have the mechanical do the same thing. We'd have to then oversee and coordinate both of them, because there is a lot of heavy coordination between when you pull the units off, when you replace curbs, when you reroof, you put

1 the units on.

That's a big part of why we haven't been able to, and maybe this is why Derek Messier bumbled them in the beginning, is that you needed someone, a general contractor, whomever; or we do it ourselves, where we play general contractor and we hire them out separately.

That -- that really doesn't help us, but you mentioned the \$4 million. Now, prior to that, most of our roofing was over \$2 million so we couldn't use the CSMP. We have -- as of July 1st, the state statute changed to \$4 million. Now, we can't just go out and hire the ones we've got now for over the \$2 million -- between the 2 and 4 million.

We've got procurement working on -- and I believe they are out already, and I don't think procurement is on this, and I don't have the answer on when the bids are coming in for that 2 to 4 million.

So until we get Board approval with contracts for the 2 to 4 million, we can't use that -- that part of the statute. We have to stick with what we've got right now, which is up to 2 million.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. So followup question, let's say you had \$100, this -- a project was \$100.

How much of that \$100 would be wrapped up in roofing, HVAC, and mechanical, versus fire alarms and media centers and all the other fluffy things that are not all the roofing, mechanical, and HVAC?

MR. GIRARDI: Well, without giving you any exact numbers, right from the start, we've been saying it's been about a third roofing, a third HVAC, and a third is all the other items. So roofing is about a third, and HVAC is about a third.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: So -- okay. So we are now two-thirds, and how much would mechanical be? So we are -- of the \$100, we are at 66 bucks out of the 100; and mechanical would be how much of that remaining third?

MR. JARDINE: I don't believe --

MR. GIRARDI: I don't know.

MR. JARDINE: -- there is two-thirds on roofing, Frank.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: But my point is that a significant portion would be getting carved out, which then begs the question: Seeing the challenges that the District and the PMOR have faced with program -- with project managers, when you carve all of this out, it seems like it would

present challenges, the question is, is there anything to be gained, in terms of saving time and money by doing this?

MR. GIRARDI: I don't know if you would save time, because those same roofers have to go for their permits. We've seen what's happened with some of those permits. So that -- that, I don't think is going to save time.

Money-wise, you -- you probably would save -if you didn't -- if you didn't have the need for a
general contractor, you would save their
percentages; but a lot of the areas require that
management to oversee both the mechanical and
roofing.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay.

MR. GIRARDI: We've got roofers that are general contractors --

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Yes.

MR. GIRARDI: -- and they are only going for the ones that are 80 percent roofing and 20 percent HVAC, so ...

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: So there is a potential GC overhead savings.

So on the flip side, what's the potential impact on procurement of extracting roofing?

Because procurement did their job and procured all of these services based on a different set of assumptions. If you carve all of this out, do they have the personnel to do this additional workload?

MR. GIRARDI: Well, I think if you carve it out, and we are using CSMP, they are really not involved in it. Because once we have the CSMP contract, capital programs are the ones that get the estimates, put everything together. So I don't -- I don't think there would be a hard hit on procurement once we got the contracts in place.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: So you wouldn't have to put any of these projects back out to bid or cancel things that were already put out?

MR. GIRARDI: Well, it depends. If we are using CSMP, no. If we are doing hard bids, then absolutely; we would end up by taking one project with one bid and possibly having -- turning it into two projects with two bids. So it would double what they need to do, which would definitely affect their capability of doing it if we had to hard-bid.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. And I guess what I'm asking is: Have things already been put out to bid but potentially haven't been awarded, or have been awarded, that would then be getting canceled; or is

this just on projects that haven't been put out to bid in any way, shape, or form post-design?

MR. GIRARDI: It would be that last part. It would be projects that have not gone out to bid.

MR. JARDINE: Right.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. And do we know how many projects those are? Because I think, at one point, they were talking about -- because time doesn't stand still. When this was originally done, there were -- it sounded like a ton of projects, but I think that number would have changed by now.

MR. JARDINE: There is not -- there is probably less than 30, 35 projects that would serve as potential carve-outs under the conditions of which we have to work right now. Depending on how quick we can get the CSMP contractors up to the 4-million level, that should -- that should open up a couple more opportunities.

MR. GIRARDI: And the one thing with using the CSMP, that is not really a bid. That is a negotiation, compared to a hard bid. So you are going to get better pricing if you hard-bid it than using the CSMP.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. Well, yes. All

right. So I guess that answers the question would they then be hard-bid.

So, yes, it would double procurement's work, because you want to put it out to hard bid to get a better -- better price.

MR. GIRARDI: Yes, correct.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Did you guys think this all through before I asked the question? Because it's kind of sounding like we are thinking it through and now --

MR. GIRARDI: No. No, we've thought this through for a while, and we've been saying for a while the answer we've -- we've given.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. That it won't be CSMP, most likely?

MR. GIRARDI: Correct.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. All right. So that sort of answers 3C: Are there contracts and contractors who would be impacted by extracting roofing scopes? Because you would only be doing it for projects that haven't gone out to bid, so it's not like you would be -- there would be no canceling of contracts at all.

MR. JARDINE: Correct.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay.

MR. GIRARDI: If I may, Kathleen from AECOM has her hand up, if she has something to add?

MS. LANGAN: Thank you, Frank.

I just want to let folks know that in moving to pulling out the scope like that, the management associated with that is going to increase. So right now, for the PMOR, we are already reduced in staff from what the CBRE/HEERY team had, and to manage the pull-out of the these projects would increase the staffing requirements that much more.

So, as Frank said, I think we've looked at this a lot. We can certainly study it more with our folks. I know Danny and his folks have done a lot of work on it and Frank, but I would caution us to say that, you know, the staffing and the resources are critical for us to continue the program; and taking these -- breaking these out doesn't help the staffing reduction that we are faced with.

That's it. Thank you.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Thank you for that, actually, Kathleen, because I believe I brought that up at a facility task force meeting, because it just seemed, mathematic-wise, that if you are pulling out and now have double the amount of

projects, that you would need additional staffing on the POMR side. So thank you for confirming that.

Mr. Mayersohn, I think that this was one of my lighter questions, so I'm done.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay.

Ms. Fertig, did you have a question?

MS. FERTIG: Yes, I have several questions. Thank you.

Just on the recommendation with all of the things that have gone into cost, I am just going to make this comment before I start with my questions.

You know, we sat and watched the news teams called out to Northeast High School in 2013 when the rain was pouring into the classroom buildings, and I don't know how much the cost of that has gone up -- maybe it's more, maybe it's less -- but there is no circumstance, in my mind, under which students should be sitting under roofs that are leaking right on them and expected to perform.

So I think when we are considering this recommendation, which I obviously think is good, I think it's a good idea to break out some.

You say you have -- only two projects are roofing-only scope. Which two projects are those?

1 MR. GIRARDI: I don't know if they were two 2 that are roofing only.

MS. FERTIG: Okay. Well, that's page 17.

Okay. I --

MR. GIRARDI: Maybe Danny has that information, page 17?

MS. FERTIG: Page 17, the opportunity exists to extract 132 roofing scopes into individual projects; you are saying that number is more like 35, Danny?

MR. JARDINE: That we could -- that's not roofing only, no, ma'am. I am talking about ones that we could potentially pull the roofing out and do separately at this point that would fit within the \$2 million CSMP limit that we currently have to work under.

MS. FERTIG: Okay. That's what I was asking. Again, I am on page 17, and which says that there could be potential savings, and I'm gathering that you all say that you don't think that's true.

How many have not applied on page 18 for the sub permit?

MR. GIRARDI: What was your question regarding page 18?

MS. FERTIG: Page 18, at the top

recommendation: We recommend management -- roofing projects that have not yet applied for a sub permit and identify candidates for extraction. How many

have not applied for a sub permit?

MR. JARDINE: Okay. Let me get the question straight, Ms. Fertig. Because the issue is they can't apply for a roof sub permit until we've awarded the contract, whether it's a hard bid or a CBAR.

So once that process is started, the contractor has to give the roofer a contract saying, Okay, you are going to be doing my project. At that point, the roofing subcontractor has to go out and do his own engineering that's required by code and doing his nondestructive testing and doing his roof details. That typically takes — when I talk to a couple of our better roofers, they say it's usually about three months from when they are given a contract to when they are ready to submit to the binder for the first time.

There are others who have done a miserable job on trying to get them in, and we continually reach out them and see what we can do to help.

But it's typically about three months after the roofer has been given a contract.

MS. FERTIG: Okay. Well, I was asking the question on reference to the recommendation. Maybe Mr. Luker wants to answer? We recommend -- I'm going to that sentence: But have not yet applied for a sub permit.

MR. LUKER: Sure. So this is David Luker.

That comment was noted specifically to address projects that had not been through what we have, I would say, identified through this process as the lengthiest part of getting approved to build a roof, and that would be the sub permitting process.

So to Danny's point, there are procurement and contracting steps that have to happen prior to a roofing contractor developing and submitting a sub permit; but, I think, getting to the point of your overall question as to how many projects are -- you know, does that opportunity potentially exist for, as of May 1st, 58 projects were in pre-award and did not have final designs answered, and then 74 projects were in the bidding and award phase. So as of that point in time, all of those projects would have not had a sub permitting binder submitted or application applied for.

So there, obviously, are a great deal of complexities associated with an effort like this to

extract a project, but to be -- to provide the most conservative view of it in terms of improving timelines, you know, we did -- we did think that any project that hadn't yet had a sub permit application submitted would have been a candidate.

But as you've heard from Frank and Danny, there are various considerations as to why that -- that number of 132 options is probably not reality and probably smaller, hopefully not much.

MS. FERTIG: Okay. On page -- thank you.

On page 19: Based on our review, roofers have experienced significant difficulties with the process of obtaining the sub permit. It references eight roofing projects that have been completed.

What are those eight roofing projects?

MR. JARDINE: Ms. Fertig, I do not have that information at my fingertips. I will get it to Joris this afternoon for him to send it to the committee.

MS. FERTIG: Okay. Reading on: During the analysis of the 80 roofing projects, we noted that 26 of the 48 roofing sub permits were obtained but to one contractor. Who is that one contractor?

MR. JARDINE: Atlas Apex Roofing.

MS. FERTIG: And it says -- and follow up on,

why are other -- why are other roofers having a problem obtaining the roofing permit?

MR. JARDINE: There is not a good answer.

When you talk to both the roofers and the building department, sometimes -- sometimes they are dealing with new people who have not been involved on a Broward project before trying to put the roof binder together. That's been one of the comments that I've heard recently.

Sometimes it's a change of details, but everybody is working on getting those turned around in a much more timely fashion.

MS. FERTIG: Okay. So it says, Only a small group of roofing subcontractors have been able to consistently obtain a roofing permit. Is there another one, other than the one you mentioned that has 26 contracts?

MR. JARDINE: RSM wrote that comment. I know Atlas Apex has been very successful in getting roof sub permits in a timely fashion.

MS. FERTIG: Okay. And -- and if you could provide me -- I know you are not going to have it here, so I just would be interested on a followup on what 26 schools are being done by the one contractor and what the other schools are,

particularly those that are having problems getting a permit.

On the next page, page 20 --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MAYERSOHN: Ms. Fertig, I think you are onto observation number four; but if it's okay with the committee -- I'm fine with it. I just don't want to lose track of where we are.

MS. FERTIG: Yeah, I know. It's just kind of goes -- the analysis kind of flows so -- but I'll stop, Bob, if you want me to.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Well, I just don't want to lose track where --

MS. FERTIG: I have number four starting -- well --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Page 23.

MS. FERTIG: Yeah, and --

MR. MAYERSOHN: So let me -- let me do this --

MS. FERTIG: -- I'm on page 20.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Right. Let me do this, if I can: Dr. Walsh, do you have any comments on -- any further comments on observation number three?

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Yes.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay.

MS. FERTIG: Well, observation number four

United Reporting, Inc. (954) 525-2221

1 doesn't begin until page 23.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MAYERSOHN: No, because it says, "sub permitting process," so it's all part of the analysis, I believe.

MS. FERTIG: Okay.

MR. JARDINE: Excuse me.

MS. FERTIG: I'm on page 20 when she is done.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay.

Go ahead, Dr. Walsh.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. It's because you jogged my memory, Ms. Fertig.

So on page -- back on page 18, so if -- in order to apply for a sub permit, what's the definition of -- what does "sub" mean?

This would be Frank -- I guess Mr. Luker --

MR. GIRARDI: Sub permit is anyone that is under the general contractor.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay.

MR. GIRARDI: Out in the private sector, every subcontractor on the major subcontractors -- electrical, mechanical, plumbing -- have to pull separate permits. That is not so with the School Board. The only one that has a sub permit, and really you might as well just call it "roofing permit," because that's the only sub-permit request

that you are required by the building department.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. The reason I asked that is, when I asked before, and then when Mr. Luker reread that as of May 1st there were 74 in the bidding and award phase, in order for it to be a sub permit, that means the roofer is a sub, as you said, to the GC. So that would suggest if we are carving out -- if we are pulling roofing out, and it's already under a GC, then you would be canceling contracts with --

MR. GIRARDI: Yes.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Pardon?

MR. GIRARDI: Correct.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Except that you just told me ten minutes ago you wouldn't be doing that.

MR. GIRARDI: If we did pull it out. We are not pulling it out. If we were to pull it out from a GC, it would have to be removed from their contract and --

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Right, and to Ms. Fertig's point -- that's why I am asking the question, because she -- because the recommendation is: We recommend management and the PMOR perform an evaluation of roofing projects that have not yet applied for a sub permit and identify candidates

for extraction from GC to roofing-only scopes of work.

So what you are saying is that whatever the ones that were in bid and award back on May 1st, you are not going to touch any of the ones -- you are not going to be canceling GC contracts?

MR. GIRARDI: Anything that's been awarded to a general contractor, we would not be touching.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: That's actually been awarded, but sometimes we have a lag time where all the work has been done by procurement; it just hasn't gone to the Board for award.

So I guess I am trying to determine whether there are, in fact, contracts sitting out there that have gone through the solicitation process but just haven't gone to the Board for award.

MR. GAUCI: The ones that are sitting out there that haven't gone to the Board for award are the ones that procurement is waiting on contracts to come back signed. If -- if all the paperwork is done and we've got the signed contract, it will go to the next available Board meeting. So if it's -- if it's not already on a Board meeting, then we are waiting on or -- not "we," but procurement is waiting for the contract to come back signed from

1 the general contractor.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay. So I guess the followup question is: How -- well, we know what the number was as of May 1st that RSM was looking at. I guess the question is: What's the number now?

Mr. Mayersohn, would it be possible to get an answer to that question? I mean, I'll get it one way or another, but it -- it's a little murky as to what the current number is and what the impact would be on the contractors who haven't been awarded but may have already responded to put in a bid or, you know, if it's CM at risk. I don't know what the projects were, specifically, but I'm not clear on whether they would be canceling -- if not canceling contracts, it seems like procurement will have to do the work twice, depending on where it is in the process.

I mean, there were, back in May, 74 in the bid and award phase, unless that's not accurate; but I don't think RSM would be inaccurate. The question is: What's that number today?

MR. MAYERSOHN: So do we -- do we have a number, Frank, or no?

MR. GIRARDI: I don't know if Danny has an

1 updated number?

MR. JARDINE: I am adding -- I am adding that up right now. Bear with me.

MR. GIRARDI: He is looking to see if he can find it right now.

MR. JARDINE: There is about 37 projects that have not gone through -- wait a minute, that have -- that have not gone to procurement yet for bid and award or negotiations. There are currently 53 projects that have cleared through the design phase that we are now ready to start the procurement side of it.

So, look, if you -- if you've not opened -- if you've not publically bid the job, it's not too late to make a change. If we bid the job and we now want to say, Okay, I want to do the roof separately from everything else, I believe, at that point, you have to reject all the bids, because you are changing the way the project was procured --

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: And that's the answer --

MR. JARDINE: -- so --

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: And that's the question that I'm trying to get an answer to, is --

MR. JARDINE: Right, yes.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: -- how many of those

United Reporting, Inc. (954) 525-2221

situations are there?

MR. JARDINE: Dr. Lynch-Walsh, we have -- the list I have from August, and it's probably off a little bit, there is probably 40 -- I think it's 43 projects that are currently in -- that we have LORs on that are ready to go to the procurement side.

Now, I can -- you know, I'll see if I can fine-tune that, but it should be --

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Well, I mean the ones that have --

MR. JARDINE: -- about --

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: I am asking --

MR. JARDINE: -- 40.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: I am trying to get a feel for the number that have gone out that haven't been awarded but have gone into procurement.

MR. GIRARDI: Yeah, Danny, you are -- you are giving her information -- this is Frank Girardi -- information on what we are ready to bring to procurement to put out to bid.

I believe what she is asking for, and correct me if I am wrong, is what's gone out to bid but hasn't been awarded by the Board yet.

MR. JARDINE: Right.

MR. GIRARDI: We've opened the bids, we have a

low bidder, and we are now doing the paperwork to bring it to the Board to get awarded.

Is that what you were asking?

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: That is actually what I'm asking, yes.

MR. GIRARDI: So that would --

MR. JARDINE: I'll have --

MR. GIRARDI: I don't know if Chris Barnett is on here. If he -- if he is, he's the one that works on bringing everything to the Board and works with procurement. He might be able to give us an answer. If not, we can get that answer.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Because that would answer 3C.

MR. GAUCI: While we're moving on, I'll see if I can get that information, or Kathleen is listening, if she can see if Chris has that information?

MS. LANGAN: I will follow up and see if he has it, but our team is currently working on that. The roofing team, in coordination with just the contracting of all the scopes, are currently working on that so -- but I can -- I can check with Chris to see what he has currently. Be right back.

MR. JABOUIN: I just wanted to say that if

there is anything being forwarded to me for further forwarding to the committee, if you can please indicate what observation number and, in the case, the sub observation numbers in Dr. Lynch-Walsh's questions, so that way I can address them correctly.

Thank you.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Dr. Lynch-Walsh, any further questions on observation number three?

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: No, sir. Thank you.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay. I just -- I want to remind the committee is that it's 3:48. We are scheduled to end at 4 o'clock. I guess my question is: Is there anybody that is on the committee that has to jump off at 4 in order to maintain a quorum? If there is --

MS. POU: Mr. Mayersohn?

MR. MAYERSOHN: Yes.

MS. POU: I have to leave about 4:20.

MR. MAYERSOHN: 4:20. Okay.

So around 4:15, we will see -- actually, we have to have a motion to extend the meeting. Then we'll see where we are at at about 4:15. Does that work?

MS. SHAW: Mr. Mayersohn?

1 MR. MAYERSOHN: Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. SHIMM: Phyllis Shaw, I do have a commission meeting today.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Yeah, I have one --

MS. SHAW: I need to be out by five.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Ms. Shaw, what time do you have --

MS. FERTIG: Are you looking for a motion to extend?

MR. MAYERSOHN: Motion by Ms. Fertig to extend the meeting.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Second.

MS. SHAW: Is there a time?

MR. MAYERSOHN: Ms. Fertig, do you want to make a time?

MS. FERTIG: I am going to say, from what I just heard, that the maximum is going to be 4:30, but I don't know if Ms. Pou is on, so it's really going to be until we have -- don't have a quorum.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay.

MS. FERTIG: And I'll be joining her in leaving soon after.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay.

MR. JABOUIN: We currently have seven members, and I did not pick up when Ms. Shaw needs to

United Reporting, Inc. (954) 525-2221

1 depart.

MS. SHAW: By 4:30.

MR. JABOUIN: Thank you.

MS. SHAW: I have a commission meeting at 5:30, and I need to prepare.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay. All right. So we have a motion to extend the meeting by Ms. Fertig, a second by Dr. Lynch-Walsh. All in favor, signify by saying "aye."

ALL PRESENT: Aye.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Anybody opposed?

Okay. If -- if -- and I don't want to -- I don't want to minimize our questions, because this is, you know, very important; but if we can be a little bit more succinct, that would be helpful so we can get as much covered as possible on this report.

So, Ms. Fertig, you have the floor, because you were on -- you were stemming into observation number four.

You have to unmute yourself.

MS. FERTIG: I'm on page 20, and if Mr. Luker could just comment on these -- on these -- I guess this is my question, bottom line, without going and adding this to what's previous: Do you have to

add -- how do you come up with a total number of days that it takes to get through this process?

We saw the previous chart. The numbers are different than this chart, so I'm just looking for a timeframe.

MR. LUKER: Yes, ma'am. Sure.

So if you are looking at the first chart, the first row on page 20, Sandpiper Elementary School, six rounds of review, within those six rounds, 67 days were spent in the building department's queue; while 243 days, the permit comments sat in the roofer's queue for a total of 310 days to go from the initial submission of the sub permit binder to it -- until its approval.

MS. FERTIG: All right. Just --

MR. JARDINE: In the far right column is the math. It's just the math of the first two.

MS. FERTIG: Okay. And at the beginning of the report, you have what it takes to get to the sub permit?

MR. LUKER: Yes, ma'am. On the executive summary page?

MS. FERTIG: Yeah, I'm just it trying to get -- let me go back to that.

So on some of these projects, I got -- I know

Lake Forest was in excess of a hundred -- was 400 days on that first chart. Would you --

MR. LUKER: Which -- which page are you talking about on the first --

MS. FERTIG: I'm sorry. I'm trying to get back, because, of course, now I took them all apart.

This just seems like a very lengthy process over --

MR. LUKER: Are you referring to page seven --

MR. GIRARDI: Page seven.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. LUKER: -- with the --

MS. FERTIG: I think it picks up --

MR. LUKER: -- building --

MS. FERTIG: -- with the subject building --

MR. LUKER: Yes, ma'am.

In order for you to get a complete picture of how long it took to get from the initial plans that were submitted, which this chart on page seven covers, to the end of the -- the actual approval of the sub permit, you have to add the two numbers together but --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oh, my God.

MR. LUKER: -- I'm not even -- I'm not even sure that that is accurately capturing any time in

between the final approval of plans and procuring of the contractors to eventually submit a sub permit binder. So I think it's actually quite longer than those two added together, but those are the two days, or the two time periods, that are capturing connectivity with the building department, if that helps. I'm sorry for being so verbose.

MS. FERTIG: Thank you. That is what I was assuming, but I didn't want to assume it and be incorrect.

So I guess -- I guess a question I have, after all of that: Is there a simple chart that shows us how long this process is taking to get a roof on Lake Forest Elementary School?

MR. LUKER: We can certainly produce that simple chart, but it does not exist in this report.

MS. FERTIG: Okay. That, I think, would be very helpful.

Also, Dillard has had ten rounds of building department review. I just -- I'm just kind of wondering -- and then you say you have 26 projects done by the same roofer; can you tell us, is that roofer finishing these projects in a more expeditious manner, or are they -- some of these --

like, who is doing Dillard? Who is doing Lake

Forest? Who -- how are you evaluating the time

it's taking these people to complete the project,

whether it's the roofer or the architect, engineer?

How is that evaluation going -- being used to

determine who you are using on your projects?

MR. LUKER: So David Luker, RSM.

I am going to assume that question was directed to Frank and/or Danny.

MS. FERTIG: I am going -- that's probably good. Thank you.

MR. JARDINE: The designers -- it's -- how long it takes the designers to respond, to get a LOR, gets reflected in their evaluations; and conversely, when a contractor has been brought onboard, his ability -- or his roofer's ability to get a permit, a roofing permit, gets reflected in his evaluation.

MS. FERTIG: And how do you use those results?

MR. JARDINE: The information goes to

procurement that they use as they look at hiring

firms in the future.

MS. FERTIG: Okay. I -- I have to tell you, I find this unbelievable. I am just looking at -- I am just picking out a couple of most obvious

between page 7 and page 20. Dillard was at 396 days on page 7 and 353 on page -- that's two years.

I -- okay. I don't think there is anything anybody could say that would probably make any sense at this point.

Again, I'm asking this question, I'm going to want to see -- and I can do this, if it's not appropriate, Mr. Jabouin, just tell me; but I would like to see what projects have been completed and who the contractors were, and this is -- thank you -- thank you all for doing this audit. I think it probably provided a lot of really useful information to the District.

Bob, I'm taking a break.

MR. MAYERSOHN: You are taking a break?

MS. FERTIG: I'm taking a break. I'm still in the meeting, but I am taking a break.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Let me ask the committee a question, because we still have the charter school investigation report. It's scheduled for 15 minutes, and Mr. Jabouin can probably speak to it.

Do we want to -- because we are not going to finish this analysis today, do we want to go to the charter school report and see if we can submit that, or do we want to continue along the roofing

1 audit?

So I'll throw that out to the committee for a response.

MR. JABOUIN: As the committee evaluates it, I would like to maybe provide some information that could help you with your decision with respect to the charter school investigation.

There is no financial impact on the District. It's just that the Office of the Inspector General for the Florida Department of Education has asked us to complete this, and we do need to move it along, because they are expecting it.

But as I -- as I would go through the report and the allegations, there is no financial impact on the District, our FTE, our SMART bonds, and so forth.

That's -- that's all I wanted to add in the decision process.

MR. MAYERSOHN: So somebody has a question?

Dr. Walsh?

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Yes. I'm confused. This was a special meeting to address the RSM roofing analysis, and somehow this other thing snuck its way onto the agenda.

If we didn't have the special meeting, pray

tell, what agenda would this charter school investigation have gone to?

MR. JABOUIN: The answer to your question is:

I thought that we would have been done with the

meeting with sufficient time to be able to get this
report in.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: No, that's not the question I am asking. I am asking you: If we didn't have this, today, meeting, then there would have been no agenda to sneak it on to; so my question is, what agenda should this report be on? Because it's not today, since today did not exist normally. I'm guessing it would have been in October, so why don't we put that there?

MR. MAYERSOHN: My -- my only -- my only suggestion would be -- and I understand, Dr. Walsh, your question -- is that we are going to need more than 15 or 20 minutes to finish this --

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Absolutely.

MR. MAYERSOHN: -- if we at least -- if we at least accomplish one thing, which, as Mr. Jabouin said, is not -- there is no financial impact; but, again, it does meet the requirements of what the Auditor General is looking for, I think we would at least have some productivity to submit something,

because we are only on, like I said, observation four. We have five, six, seven, eight, nine. I don't know what's scheduled for our next October 8th meeting, but we are -- you know, we are obviously asking a line of questioning that I think we are expecting, probably even -- we may even have more questions that we'd like responses to, so I think --

I got you, Ms. Dahl.

-- I would suggest that, you know, we consider it. Now, it's -- again, it's up to the committee so --

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Can I respond?

MR. MAYERSOHN: Yes, you can --

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay.

MR. MAYERSOHN: -- and then Ms. Dahl.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: I absolutely agree, and I figured that's where you were going with this.

I guess my question is, when would we then continue this? Because in the interim, then perhaps Staff could provide written responses to my question, because that would have sped me along a lot, significantly, today, to have actually had questions answered.

So if we would then be covering this at the

September -- October 8th meeting, then the -- and they provide written responses, but then the issue is, we would have to curb the chief auditor's tendency towards packing the agenda with things that are not as salacious and juicy as this. We would need practically most of the meeting to finish discussing this. And I think it was -- P-Card audit took us three meetings.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Right. I have no problem, like I said, you know, continuing the line of -you know, continuing our discussion on this; but, again, to be productive, it's just my commentary is let's move something that we know is only going to take about 15 minutes, or at least -- or possibly take 15 minutes; but, again, it's up to the will of the committee.

Ms. Dahl, did you have a comment?
MS. DAHL: Yes, I do. Thank you.

I agree to go ahead to the charter, but I just want to make -- I just want to let you all know that I'm very alarmed by the things that we have learned today, that it's taking up to two years or more to get some of these roofs done, and we absolutely need to continue on this audit.

And, Mr. Jabouin, I agree with Dr. Lynch-Walsh

that you -- that we need another meeting to go over this, because as we look at different things, it has brought up other questions for myself, and how many years are we into this SMART bond now? I don't know.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Seven.

MS. DAHL: Dr. Walsh can tell us.

But I just -- I just don't understand why these things are happening. Thank you.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Ms. Shaw?

MS. SHAW: Good afternoon.

So 30 minutes is not enough time to continue this discussion, number one.

Number two, I think it behooves us to move the item and carry it, and I would love to move the item; but the third thing is, I would rather not carry this into our next meeting, because I'm not sure what is on our next meeting, but I have a feeling that we are also going to have -- hear from staff at the next meeting, so I would rather not carry it to the next meeting.

I would rather, if we are going to continue this discussion, we continue it in a special meeting, allowing our regular meeting to discuss whatever matter that comes to the Board at that

1 time.

MR. JABOUIN: If I can please add some information to Ms. Shaw?

So the November 19th meeting is very critical for the comprehensive annual financial report, so the October meeting may be the last chance to be able to get this all done. Because the way that the meetings are set up -- and as I mentioned before, the ability to do virtual meetings is going to be more challenging; it's not that easy to set up these special meetings. So time is running out, but maybe the goal would be to review it in October.

I will work with management to get written responses to the questions from Ms. Pou and from Dr. Lynch-Walsh and maybe ask the committee if there are any additional questions, to please provide them to me by this Friday so we can go ahead and get some additional responses from management and thus have a meeting in October that would finish this all.

That would be my recommendation to the committee.

MS. FERTIG: I'm adding my name in on questions, because I've mentioned a number of

things of that I was hoping for some more information on.

So I'm sorry, Bob; I am jumping in, but can I move that we defer this audit --

MS. SHAW: Mr. Chair?

MR. MAYERSOHN: Yes.

MS. SHAW: I do move so we -- I do make a motion that we move the report.

MR. MAYERSOHN: We move -- Ms. Fertig I believe had the floor, Ms. Shaw.

MS. FERTIG: Ms. Shaw, I -- just so we can maybe be in agreement here, because we are taking so much time on this that we won't get to anything, can I move that we defer this item and see if we can do a special-set meeting before the Governor's order expires to finish this?

I agree with Ms. Shaw about trying to add it to an October meeting when we don't know what's going on, but I think we need to finish this conversation. It needs to be as close proximity to what we are doing.

So my actual motion is to defer it until a special-set meeting hopefully before the end of the month.

MS. SHAW: I second, Phyllis.

United Reporting, Inc. (954) 525-2221

1 MR. MAYERSOHN: Second, Ms. Shaw.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Is there any discussion on the item, Dr. --

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Yes.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Dr. Lynch-Walsh?

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Two things -- well, yes, because I wrote it in the chat.

I believe the District has an update on virtual meetings, because I saw an email that got forwarded to me -- I don't know if we still have Mr. Moquin -- that virtual meetings may not be an issue in October.

But beyond that, I would have expected a special meeting before the end of September, since we are halfway -- it's 9/14, and if it is in October, not too far into October. I don't know what everyone else's schedule is, but sooner, rather than later, on this.

MS. FERTIG: My intent was September or the end of September.

MS. SHAW: That was my second.

MS. FERTIG: Maybe I didn't say that. I thought I did. Sorry.

MR. MAYERSOHN: I heard Ms. Fertig say something about September 30th?

MS. FERTIG: Yes, you did. You absolutely

1 heard that.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: That's a Wednesday.

MR. JABOUIN: I cannot confirm. All I can say is that I will try. There are many factors to be able to set these meetings up.

MR. MAYERSOHN: So, Mr. Jabouin, I believe -I believe the motion was by Ms. Fertig to defer
this meeting to a September 30th meeting, provided
that we can have a quorum or that people are
available. I believe Ms. Shaw seconded.

Is that correct, Ms. Fertig?

MS. FERTIG: Yes, that sounds like it's correct to me.

Is that what you thought, Ms. Shaw?

MS. SHAW: Yes, I second it.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay.

MR. JABOUIN: What we'll do is we'll try our best to try to set it up around then. If for some reason we cannot, we will try to set up a special meeting at some point before the other meeting; but please keep in mind that the packages for the October 8th meeting go out on October 1st. So it is something that -- this requires a scheduling effort. So even setting up this meeting required a challenging schedule effort. So we can try,

1 obviously.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MAYERSOHN: We have confidence in you, Mr. Jabouin.

MR. JABOUIN: Thank you, Mr. Mayersohn.

MR. MAYERSOHN: So the motion on the floor has been made and seconded. Is there any more discussion?

Seeing no more hands, I guess.

All those in favor, signify by saying "aye."

ALL PRESENT: Aye.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Anybody opposed?

All right. So we will now move on to item number five.

Mr. Jabouin?

MR. JABOUIN: Thank you very much.

The time is currently 4:09. I will summarize the situation in enough time to be able to close out the meeting at 4:20.

So agenda item number five is an investigation that was requested by the Florida Department of Education's Office of Inspector General. Now, this is not a project that we would have done, because we have a lot on our plate, but this is something that the Office of Inspector General requested, and we pretty much needed to get this done.

They requested this over a year ago, so -- and there is actually a 30-day requirement to get this done, but the amount of work that needed to be done to be able to perform an investigation was one that was far in excess of the 30 days. So we did get quite a few extensions, but as long as we let them know what is going on and what the progress of the work is, then this is fine.

Ultimately, this is an issue that has to deal with the control environment at Championship

Academy Charter Schools, the management company that they engaged to run the schools, and the governing board's oversight of the management company.

So this is a case where the management company was not looking at the activities of their main employee, the former CEO, Mr. Gustavo Prats. So when they were able to detect that there were some issues, they did not inform the District of these issues, of the changes in the management company, until months after these occurred.

So the management companies that run the schools, this Charter School Management, LLC, and this is Championship Academy of Distinction, LLC -- and if you go to page four of the report, I briefly

show the name of the companies and the schools involved, and you can see that 5219 is the only school that is managed by Charter School Management Solutions. I am going to refer to those companies as the "management companies."

So of the five schools, we were told at a meeting that we had on October 27th that two of the schools, which is 5219 and 5234, they no longer would be managed by the management companies; and then, about an hour before this meeting, I received a letter from the charter schools, from their -- from the governing boards, indicating that the remaining three schools would no longer be managed by the management companies.

Now, overall, there were eight allegations; and based on the work that we did in looking at these allegations, we did receive responses. And as I mentioned, this situation doesn't impact the District, because this is not an FTE matter. It's not related to the purchases that were done under the SMART bond.

But we do -- as a District, and my team, we have an obligation to determine if the schools have adequate standards of fiscal management, and this is in accordance with the terms of the charter

school agreements, the Florida Statutes and the Florida Administrative Codes.

So during the meeting that we had with them on July 29th, Cynthia Dotson, the CEO of the management companies, she mentioned that she was the one that completed the anonymous complaint to the Office of Inspector General, 413.

Let me go ahead and focus on the allegations. If you would please go over to page seven, where allegation number one is mentioned.

We did receive their general ledger. We went through their general ledger to be able to determine some of the recommendations that we have. What we are looking for right now is that they do a deeper dive. So we've asked them to do that and agreed upon procedures.

We met with their auditors a couple weeks ago, and I gave them specific instructions on the -- on the deeper dive -- deeper dive that they are to do. So if -- if it appears that there are monies that were acted inappropriately by the management companies or Mr. Prats, those are things that we are going to want to see that the school gets reimbursed for.

If you move on over to page eight, on

allegation number two, we do agree that the CEO's mother was paid a compensation that is in excess of what a similar district position would call for.

Now, the contract, that, as well as allegation number four, those were not approved by the governing board. The charter school department today pointed out in the bylaws that the former CEO -- actually, he is listed as an executive director in the school's bylaws -- he could sign such contracts, but that's something that we think should be brought up, specifically these significant contracts, in front of the governing board.

On page 11, on allegation number three, I believe that the way that the allegation was worded -- and that's the way that they found the issue, in which the fact that Ms. Alvare, which is the CEO's mother, was being paid at different locations, my focus was more on a holistic, whether or not she was getting paid excessively, and based on previous allegation, her compensation was more than what you would expect for somebody with those types of responsibilities.

On page 12, is the other person that was claimed in the allegation. It was listed that she

was a secretary, but her role is really more of a director of compliance. I did not have an exception to the level of her compensation; it was more on the approval process.

And then, if you go on to page -- allegation number five, that's already addressed in allegations two and four.

And then on allegation six, on page 16, we did see that there were delays in the payment of the compensation, and we did see that some of it was done after we entered the school.

And then on page 18, allegation number seven, this has to deal with the -- the name change of the schools. So the school was opened and approved as "Championship Academy of Distinction Broward."

Ms. Dotson, during our meeting, was concerned that her credentials and her name was being used to open the schools.

We went through the application, and we didn't find any connection to her name. It was applied under a separate company. So we didn't particularly have an issue with that, and we did check to see if the name change was proper, there was documentation that was provided for that.

And then on allegation number eight, on

page 20, this makes reference to the relationship that the former CEO, Mr. Prats, had with the former director of charter school management support here. We didn't see any basis of that, and just taking — taking a look at the situation at the schools, it's not the District's responsibility to have a proper internal control environment at the school; it's up to the school to have such an environment, and we didn't find any basis in that particular allegation.

It's currently 4:17, and that will conclude my summary, pending any questions from the audit committee members.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Do we have any questions?

MR. JABOUIN: Mr. Medvin?

MR. MEDVIN: Yes. Can you hear me?

MR. JABOUIN: Yes.

MR. MEDVIN: I would like to know why you, as the audit department, had to waste your time with this? This, to me, smells of pure politics. When something is done on an allegation that's anonymous, I give anything like that very little credence anyway.

And I think your scope is limited on what you could audit. If you want to go into the details of

the schools, go to it; but you didn't have the ability to do this.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I think this was a waste of time, as, you know, you found nothing -- no allegations being substantiated, and I don't think it's -- I think it's unfortunate that the State had to force you to do this and waste your time and resources.

MR. JABOUIN: Thank you, Mr. Medvin. I concur with much of what you are saying. This did take a good amount of time.

It is good to know that there was no financial impact on the District, and I would like to conclude on that and send the report up to the State.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Are there any other further questions?

MS. SHAW: So moved.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Who is that? Ms. Dahl?

MS. SHAW: Phyllis Shaw.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Oh, Ms. Shaw. Go ahead, Ms. Shaw.

MS. SHAW: I would like to move it.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Oh. Do I have a second?

MS. FERTIG: Second, Mary Fertig.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Wait. So a motion by

1 Ms. Shaw, a second by Ms. Fertig.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

All those in favor, signify by saying "aye."

ALL PRESENT: Aye.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Are there any opposes?

Seeing none, we move it for transmission.

It is now 4:19. I would just like to say -- I guess this is my first official, official meeting, and I want to thank you for your indulgence and participation.

Hopefully we will be able to have our continuation of the roofing analysis prior to our October 8th meeting. I know that Mr. Jabouin will work his magic so we'll be able to have that.

Is there any other further discussion before we make a motion to adjourn?

Dr. Walsh?

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Just to a quick question, just because I'm getting a headache and I can't remember.

Were we getting written responses to --

MR. JABOUIN: Dr. Lynch-Walsh cut off, but I believe her question, I know the answer to answer it.

What I will seek to do is get responses from management on the questions from Dr. Lynch-Walsh

and Mrs. Pou. And I've also asked the committee to please -- if there are any additional questions, please provide them to me by this Friday, so I can also seek to get those questions answered so we can have an efficient meeting.

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Written -- written responses, you are saying?

MR. MAYERSOHN: Right.

So, Mr. Jabouin, for -- I guess for future meetings, because I know sometimes, to obviously expedite our meeting and our time, if there are questions that committee members have -- and I'm not talking about -- I'm just talking about questions on a -- on a specific audit prior to the meeting, and obviously timeline would be important, as well, but can we have those submitted, if possible, in writing -- so I guess that would be a motion from the committee -- as opposed to somebody coming up with the question and going back later on to go, yeah, we'll get an answer?

MR. JABOUIN: Mr. Mayersohn --

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: I think -- did you call for a motion?

MR. MAYERSOHN: Well, I didn't. I was waiting for a response, first of all.

1 |

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: Okay.

MR. JABOUIN: Mr. Mayersohn, operationally, it would be very challenging to do this, because the reports themselves are finalized like probably the night before they are posted. So there are actually changes that are being made until the very last minute. So it's -- it's not really possible to turn that around between that timeframe and when the meeting occurs.

So I can see that you were hoping to have some advance questions similar to what we have now, but I don't think that we would be able to achieve that operationally.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Okay.

Dr. Walsh, you had a question?

DR. LYNCH-WALSH: A couple, real quick.

Okay. So, one, where you were going with that is if we -- well, there is -- it's a separate issue.

In this case, though, I submitted my questions on August 25th, and I think if we have special meetings, if there is more than the usual amount of time and we do have questions, it would definitely be beneficial. Today is the 14th, so they had these questions two weeks ago.

And then, also -- and this has come up before and it's a related issue -- if there is a question -- if committee members have questions, if we -- if -- it sounds as though what you are saying is if we have questions and we can get answers ahead of time, if we need a motion, to pass a motion so that we only have to ask the question once, and then part of the standard operating procedures going forward is that we expect questions to be answered. Because multiple times I've been told by the chief auditor that he does not respond to individual committee member questions.

So if we could clear that up as a standard operating procedure, that would be very helpful and save time in the future, because we wouldn't have to pass motions at each meeting if we want something answered.

MR. MAYERSOHN: Well, I -- Dr. Walsh, I think in -- I mean, my question in bringing it up is that if there was time -- and I understand Mr. Jabouin's point is that if -- for example, our October 8th meeting, if I had a question on October 7th at 6 o'clock at night, that may not be answered in writing. It may take time to respond to staff.

I agree with you in respect to if I've asked a question July 1st and still haven't gotten a response, that's something that could be provided in writing.

But I think where -- I think we'll move forward at least to hopefully have responses to -- in writing to those questions that we have asked and include them, hopefully, as part of the audit report so that they are documented. I think

Ms. Fertig had some questions, as well. I know you had some questions, and there may be others. I know Ms. Pou had some questions.

So hopefully those will be answered in writing and be made part of the report, not just necessarily documentation from the person who is taking -- the court stenographer who is taking the verbatim commentary.

So with that being said --

MS. FERTIG: Motion to adjourn.

MR. MAYERSOHN: You read my mind.

MS. SHAW: Second.

MR. MAYERSOHN: All right. So motion by

Ms. Fertig, second by Ms. Shaw.

All those in favor, signify by saying "aye."

ALL PRESENT: Aye.

United Reporting, Inc. (954) 525-2221

	Page 125
1	
2	CERTIFICATE
3	
4	THE STATE OF FLORIDA)
5	COUNTY OF BROWARD)
6	
7	I, EMILY SCOTT, certify that I was
8	authorized to and did stenographically report the
9	foregoing video-conference proceedings and that the
10	transcript is a true and complete record of my
11	stenographic notes.
12	Dated this 27th day of September, 2020.
13	
14	
15	NDTCA.
16	ned to
17	EMILY SCOTT
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

United Reporting, Inc. (954) 525-2221

A	<b>addition</b> 5:24 9:14	ahead 5:16 10:18	24:24 25:3 26:3	approved 83:10
ability 8:5 13:3	10:1 19:13 24:8	11:20 13:1 24:21	27:3 30:16 31:1	115:5 116:14
100:16,16 107:9	32:10,18 60:15	25:12 34:10 47:4	37:6,9 39:16 43:3,5	approximately 68:11
118:2	66:23 71:6	65:6 87:9 105:19	45:7 47:19 53:13	<b>April</b> 59:6 60:13
able 9:18,25 10:6	<b>additional</b> 3:10 14:16	107:19 114:8	54:4,4,18,18 57:4	ARCESE 2:11
18:8 25:11 26:23	21:12 25:16,18,21	118:20 122:6	59:15,16 62:23 63:4	ARCHER 2:23
38:16 61:21 64:5	76:4 80:1 107:17,19	airport 21:24	63:10 67:18 73:17	<b>architect</b> 35:12,16
72:14 73:2 85:14	120:2	alarm 25:21,23 42:4	78:13 83:3 85:3	37:13 38:2 100:4
93:11 103:5 107:7	address 21:20 42:16	alarmed 105:21	90:8 91:20,23 93:12	architect's 35:2
110:5 111:17 112:4	52:15 53:24 54:3	<b>alarming</b> 32:4 33:14	93:12,13 103:3	architect/engineer
112:18 114:12	83:7 94:5 102:22	<b>alarms</b> 72:7 74:2	119:22,22 120:20	35:10
119:10,13 121:12	<b>addressed</b> 20:11,13	<b>ALI</b> 2:11	<b>answered</b> 53:4 83:19	architects 36:20
absolute 47:11	21:6 40:4 41:21	allegation 114:10	104:24 120:4	37:11,18 43:6 59:21
absolutely 25:17	50:15 52:18 116:6	115:1,4,14,15,21,25	122:10,18,24	Architectural 2:25,25
55:11,14 76:17	addressing 35:19	116:5,8,12,25	123:13	area 21:11
103:19 104:17	adequate 113:24	117:10,21	answering 6:9 23:6	areas 19:3 25:16 72:6
105:24 109:25	<b>adjourn</b> 119:15	allegations 102:14	25:5 63:6	75:12
Academic 2:17	123:19 124:4	113:15,17 114:8	answers 23:20 37:25	<b>ASAP</b> 14:1 57:24
<b>Academy</b> 112:11,24	administrative 5:25	116:7 118:4	57:2 63:7 68:17,18	ASHLEY 3:7
116:15	7:5 8:19 13:7 114:2	allegiance 4:20	78:1,18 122:5	asked 20:1 41:15
accepted 124:4	admitting 69:13	allow 14:24 42:8	<b>Anthony</b> 2:5 7:20	56:12 60:22,25 78:8
access 12:25 38:24	adopted 66:7	allowing 12:15	<b>anybody</b> 34:8 94:14	88:2,3 102:10
accommodate 15:6	adopts 47:9	106:24	96:11 101:4 111:11	114:15 120:1 123:1
accomplish 103:21	advance 121:11	alternative/separate	124:2	123:7
accurate 90:20	advancing 35:17	70:16	anyway 21:2 23:16	asking 18:4 25:2
accurately 98:25	advisories 15:6	altogether 51:9 54:4	117:23 124:2	41:25 45:3 54:18,19
achieve 121:12	advisory 10:14,20	<b>Alvare</b> 115:17	anyways 33:14	56:16 57:13 70:14
acknowledge 8:20	12:11	AMOAH 2:25,25	apart 98:7	76:23 81:17 83:1
15:14	<b>AE's</b> 35:22	amount 35:16,21	Apex 84:24 85:19	88:21 92:12,21 93:3
acknowledging 13:21	<b>AECOM</b> 3:7 20:6	62:15 79:25 112:3	apologies 18:20	93:5 101:6 103:8,8
acknowledgment	79:1	118:10 121:22	apologize 30:25	104:5
10:13	affect 10:7 76:20	amounts 56:2	48:22	asks 69:18,18
acted 114:21	aforementioned	analysis 16:13,21	appear 13:19 30:9	aspects 61:13 72:9
action 16:1 34:11	51:18 52:7	17:9 28:4 30:2	appears 15:15 114:20	assertion 57:7
39:5 68:19 69:19,20		33:19 50:20 53:9	applicable 10:11	assess 44:18
69:21,25	106:11	56:18,24 61:1 65:13	41:13	asset 57:5,10 58:12
actions 22:3 49:11	agenda 4:25 5:1,5,8	68:12 84:21 86:9	application 16:23	58:15,24 59:23
69:8	5:11,19,20,21,24	87:4 101:23 102:23	17:2 83:23 84:5	60:18,24 67:2 68:25
actively 41:6	6:2,13,16 9:14	119:11	116:19	assist 65:13
activities 112:16	102:24 103:1,10,11	analyze 61:4	applied 81:21 82:2,4	Assistant 2:18
actual 48:3 98:20	105:4 111:19	analyzed 28:8	83:4,23 88:25	assisting 37:22
108:22	aggregate 35:21,23	and/or 20:5 71:22	116:20	Associate 3:4
add 14:17 37:15 72:3	ago 22:25 88:15	100:9	apply 82:7 87:13	associated 79:6 83:25
79:2 97:1 98:21	112:1 114:17	Andrew 2:5 3:11 8:11	appreciate 9:23	Asst 2:20
102:17 107:2	121:25	<b>annual</b> 10:19 68:16	appropriate 28:19	<b>assume</b> 99:10 100:8
108:17	<b>agree</b> 104:17 105:19	107:5	44:18 101:8	assuming 99:10
added 5:23 6:1 99:4	105:25 108:17	anonymous 114:6	approval 4:24 5:5,22	assumptions 76:3
addendum 6:3	115:1 123:1	117:22	73:20 97:14 98:20	at-risk 71:15
addendums 17:16	agreed 20:8 114:16	answer 18:21 21:16	99:1 116:4	Atkins 3:7
adding 91:2,2 96:25	agreement 108:12	22:1,7,9 23:3,8,9,16	<b>approve</b> 4:25 5:8	Atlanta 20:22
107:24	agreements 114:1	23:23 24:3,7,13,18	6:16	<b>Atlas</b> 84:24 85:19

attachments 11:14
attempted 55:21
attempted 33.21 attend 10:5 11:24
attendance 2:3 4:4
5:3,4 7:7,9,9 68:1
attendees 1:15 59:10
attending 7:23 8:1
attention 19:13 61:19
attorneys 12:5
audit 1:4 2:10 4:18
5:23 6:7 11:10 14:6
17:19 19:17 53:18
54:24 68:16 101:11
102:1 105:8,24
108:4 117:12,19,25
120:14 123:8
auditor 2:11,12,13
7:5,5 8:18 103:24
122:11
auditor's 5:25 105:3
auditorium 49:22
auditors 114:17
<b>Audits</b> 2:11,12
<b>August</b> 9:3 10:2,16
10:22 17:10,12 20:8
23:1 39:13,15 92:3
121:21
authorized 125:8
avail 41:8
available 89:22
110:10
<b>Avenue</b> 1:21
average 63:20
award 83:20 88:5
89:4,12,16,18 90:20
91:9
awarded 71:13,13,14
76:24,25 82:8 89:7
89:10 90:12 92:16
92:23 93:2
aye 6:25 7:1 34:6,7
96:9,10 111:9,10
119:2,3 123:24,25
<b>ayes</b> 7:3
В
<u>u</u>

## B back 8:4 10:12,18,24 14:21 20:15 23:10 23:15 27:7,17 28:5 30:24 31:1 34:25 35:14 36:15 37:1,12

39:23 45:6 77:23

78:5,5 82:17

1 1400 40
<b>beyond</b> 109:12
<b>bid</b> 76:13,18,23 77:2
77:4,21,22 78:4,21
82:8 89:4 90:13,19
91:9,14,15 92:20,22
bidder 93:1
<b>bidding</b> 83:20 88:5
bids 73:18 76:16,19
91:18 92:25
big 36:24 73:2
<b>binder</b> 82:20 83:22
85:8 97:13 99:3
<b>bit</b> 9:13,18 58:20
67:16 92:4 96:15
black 29:17,25 60:8
BLONDELL 3:3
<b>Blue</b> 59:9 60:14,17,22
61:9
<b>board</b> 1:1 2:1,2 10:13
10:20 12:10,19
10:20 12:10,19
14:19 15:2,14,25
17:11 19:17 47:9
53:5,5,17,19 54:7,8
60:6 68:17 69:4,10
70:19 73:20 87:23
89:12,16,18,22,23
92:23 93:2,10
106:25 115:6,13
<b>board's</b> 112:13
<b>boards</b> 113:12
<b>Bob</b> 28:2 32:2 33:11
86:10 101:14 108:3
Bobadilla 60:2,7
<b>Bobby</b> 3:6 21:23
22:11,18
<b>boiled</b> 70:18
bond 55:22 56:18
64:8 106:4 113:21
bonds 102:15
<b>bono</b> 61:1
<b>bottom</b> 52:15 57:8
96:24
break 80:23 101:14
101:15,16,17
breaking 79:17
BRENDA 2:25
briefly 112:25
<b>bring</b> 19:12 54:6
58:16 61:19 92:19
93:2
<b>bringing</b> 61:7 93:10

122:20 **brought** 68:15,16 79:22 100:15 106:3 115:11 **Broward** 1:1 85:7 116:15 125:4 **Brvan** 2:14 4:14 **bucks** 74:13 **budget** 44:8,12 budgetary 69:4 budgeting 44:5 **build** 83:10 **building** 2:19,20 17:2 17:14 20:10 24:15 24:24 25:15 29:11 31:6 32:18 35:3,10 35:13,18,23 37:1,12 38:16,20 47:18 49:14,15 50:9 56:20 56:21,21 85:4 88:1 97:10 98:14,15 99:6 99:20 building's 51:11 **buildings** 17:4 47:23 49:19,21,25 80:15 **bumbled** 73:3 **bunch** 54:20 **bundled** 70:20 **business** 3:3 12:22 56:3 bylaws 115:7,9  $\mathbf{C}$ C 2:14 125:2.2 cabinet 8:21 **cafeteria** 49:23,24 **call** 4:3,3,17 7:11,13 15:11 21:23 37:8 43:12 70:21 87:24 115:3 120:22 called 7:22 18:12 80:14 camera 65:8 cancel 76:13 canceled 76:25 canceling 78:23 88:10 89:6 90:15,16 candidate 84:5 candidates 82:3 88:25 **Cannon** 67:12

capability 76:21 **capable** 43:23 capital 6:3 17:14 20:4 21:18,22 48:25 51:4 54:1 56:11 76:8 **capturing** 98:25 99:6 car 62:23 care 62:22 **CARPENTER** 3:7 **carry** 106:15,17,21 carve 72:14 74:25 76:3,5 carve-outs 77:15 **carved** 74:21 **carving** 71:8 88:8 case 94:3 112:15 121:20 cases 10:11 36:22 catch 45:14 categories 28:23 category 33:1 **caution** 79:14 **CBAR** 82:9 **CBRE** 45:3 **CBRE/HEERY** 3:6,6 20:5 37:17 79:8 **CE** 10:9 **center** 35:22 centers 74:3 **Central** 67:13 **CEO** 112:17 114:4 115:8 117:2 CEO's 115:1.18 **certain** 10:6 29:23 certainly 79:12 99:16 certifications 59:20 certify 125:7 cetera 21:14 **chair** 2:4,5 4:5,7 5:2,9 5:18 6:13 7:6 15:14 16:10,17 17:23 19:19 53:19 54:5,7 108:5 **challenges** 11:8 21:13 25:25 69:22 74:23 75:1 challenging 107:10 110:25 121:3 Championship 112:10,24 116:15 **chance** 107:6

**change** 28:21 44:12 69:14 85:10 91:15 116:13,23 **changed** 42:10 73:12 77:12 **changes** 5:10,18 6:10 6:11,13,17 12:2 42:2,21,25 43:10,13 44:11,24 66:3 112:20 121:6 changing 91:19 **charge** 39:12 56:14 56:15 63:1 **CHARLOTTE** 3:12 **chart** 29:5 32:24 97:3 97:4,7 98:2,19 99:13.17 **charter** 2:12,23,24,25 14:3 101:19,24 102:7 103:1 105:19 112:11,23 113:3,11 113:25 115:6 117:3 **chat** 8:4 10:17,22 11:18 109:6 check 11:18 67:24 93:23 116:23 **chief** 2:10,11,17,17 2:18,19,20,21 5:25 7:4,5 8:18 105:3 122:11 **choice** 31:11 **Chomiak** 22:23 **choose** 33:18 **chose** 29:16 chosen 28:7 **Chris** 3:4 93:8,17,24 circumstance 80:18 cite 51:8 cited 18:25 50:24 51:8 City 55:19 **claimed** 115:25 clarification 32:7 classroom 32:18 80:15 **clear** 35:4 42:23 44:13 63:15 90:15 122:14 cleared 91:10 **Clerk** 2:14 **clients** 67:10

**close** 62:11 108:20 111:17 CM 71:14 90:13 **COA** 3:3 code 17:2 56:21 82:15 **Codes** 114:2 collaborative 41:11 44:22 colleagues 30:16 collected 61:12 **COLLINS** 2:23 column 35:1,7,8,15 35:22 97:16 **combine** 70:10 combined 70:21 come 8:4 28:5 61:8 89:20,25 97:1 122:1 comes 106:25 coming 39:25 47:16 73:18 120:19 **comment** 30:5 31:12 32:2 47:2,4 48:10 52:4 53:23 65:10,25 66:20,22,22 80:12 83:7 85:18 96:23 105:17 commentary 105:12 123:17 comments 12:1,2,8 12:11 13:7 14:9 16:9,11,25 17:11 19:6 29:1 31:15 35:14,18,20 37:19 37:23 70:2,6 85:8 86:21,22 97:11 **commission** 95:3 96:4 commitment 12:18 **committee** 1:4 2:3 4:18 5:23 6:5,7 8:20 9:21 10:8,14,15,20 11:11,12,14,16,18 11:22,25 12:4 13:7 16:5 17:20 18:4,9 19:17 53:18 57:16 60:14,19 84:19 86:6 94:2,12,14 101:18 102:2,4 104:11 105:16 107:16,23

117:13 120:1,12,18

122:3,12

committee's 10:25 12:14 19:13 61:6 commonly 18:25 communicated 9:22 30:24 community 10:10 12:8 **companies** 59:8 60:23 60:25 61:2 112:22 113:1,4,5,9,14 114:5,22 company 25:20 57:5 57:10 58:12,15,24 67:2 68:25 112:11 112:14,15,20 116:21 compared 77:22 comparison 17:1 compensation 115:2 115:21 116:3,10 complaint 114:6 **complete** 11:5 98:17 100:3 102:11 125:10 completed 10:15 30:14 44:15 64:7,11 64:24,25 84:14 101:9 114:6 completion 36:8 43:21 complexities 83:25 compliance 116:2 comply 38:6 components 18:24 comprehensive 57:11 61:10 107:5 **concept** 43:25 60:18 concern 11:4 concerned 116:16 concerns 11:3 70:6 **concise** 68:20 conclude 117:11 118:13 **concluded** 17:5 124:9 concludes 13:6 **conclusion** 14:15 61:9 **concur** 118:8 **condition** 49:13 50:14 conditions 61:13 65:11 77:15 conduct 12:22 67:6

confidence 111:2 Confidential 2:14 **confirm** 110:3 confirming 80:2 **conflict** 10:9,11 confused 102:21 confusion 9:10 conjunction 71:9 connection 116:20 connectivity 99:6 Connie 2:8 8:13 conservative 84:2 consider 15:8 66:13 104:10 considerations 30:4 84:7 considering 19:25 80:21 consistently 69:12,16 85:15 **constraints** 9:23 69:4 constructability 44:22 construction 2:21,22 24:12 44:9,15,25 consultants 37:20 Consulting 3:3,4 contact 23:18,18 **contain** 20:12 contemplate 30:3 51:5 continually 43:8 82:22 continuation 119:11 continue 68:13 79:16 101:25 104:20 105:24 106:12,22 106:23 continued 61:18 continuing 58:4,6 105:10,11 continuous 41:19 continuously 41:7 contract 22:15,19 38:4,7 40:1 45:3,4 57:10 58:4,7 76:8 82:8,11,19,25 88:19 89:21,25 115:4 contracting 70:17 83:13 93:22 **contractor** 72:16,17

73:5,6 75:11 82:11 83:14 84:23.23 85:25 87:17 89:8 90:1 100:15 contractor's 64:15 contractors 59:22 75:17 77:17 78:19 90:11 99:2 101:10 contracts 58:6 73:20 76:11 78:18,23 85:17 88:10 89:6.14 89:19 90:16 115:10 115:12 **contractual** 20:7 21:3 38:3 39:20,24 40:2 40:9 41:20 contribute 41:6 control 44:11 112:10 117:7 controlling 14:23 Controls 2:23 conversation 15:4 108:20 conversations 9:4 conversely 100:15 **COONEY** 2:18 coordinate 72:22 coordinated 60:14 coordination 72:24 93:21 Coordinator 2:24 copy 39:14 correct 28:10 30:10 30:11,12 31:21,24 65:1 78:6,16,24 88:13 92:21 110:11 110:13 **correctly** 28:9 31:18 31:19,21 94:6 correlated 19:2 correlates 29:24 cost 44:14 56:20 80:11,16 **costs** 56:1 council 55:17,18 **Counsel** 2:18,19 count 4:7 country 67:9 **COUNTY** 1:1 125:4 **couple** 11:2 42:20 43:13 46:2 47:8

53:20 60:23 68:9,22
77:19 82:17 100:25
114:17 121:16
course 9:8 45:2 98:6
court 1:18 3:8 9:1,2
9:11 32:12,13,16
123:16
covered 58:10 60:4
96:16
covering 104:25
covers 98:20
<b>CPA</b> 2:5
<b>CPAs</b> 12:5
create 69:19 71:18
creating 54:10
credence 117:23
credentials 116:17
criteria 43:23
critical 43:22 50:14
51:4 79:16 107:4
<b>CSMP</b> 71:18 72:19
72:19 73:11 76:6,7
76:16 77:17,21,24
78:15 81:15
cumulative 35:16
<b>curb</b> 105:3
<b>curbs</b> 72:25
curious 50:17
<b>current</b> 5:21 41:8
56:21 61:13 90:10
<b>currently</b> 22:20 49:14
53:25 81:15 91:9
92:5 93:20,22,24
95:24 111:16
117:11
cut 119:21
cycle 51:11 65:12
Cynthia 114:4
D 2:22

**D** 2:22 **D.C** 58:14 **Dahl** 2:6 7:18,19 11:3 68:3 104:9,16 105:17.18 106:7 118:18 **damage** 51:13 **DANIEL** 2:17 3:6 **Danny** 21:23,24 22:20,20 23:5,18 27:4 37:8,15,16

63:1 71:22 72:3 79:13 81:5,10 84:6 90:25 92:17 100:9 Danny's 83:12 data 28:8,13 29:20 30:3 31:5,16 33:2 33:12,14 60:25 61:5 61:7,8,11,12 dated 49:8 125:12 **DAVE** 2:23 **David** 3:3 18:17 67:4 83:6 100:7 day 31:6,15 33:5 125:12 day-to-day 20:17 43:19 days 28:15,22 29:10 31:7,18,23 33:6,16 35:2,9 36:23 37:1 38:4,6 97:2,10,11 97:12 98:2 99:5 101:2 112:5 **De** 2:5 7:20,21 68:3 deal 83:24 112:9 116:13 dealing 85:5 decided 39:11 56:17 decision 102:6.18 **deeper** 114:15,19,19 Deerfield 50:12 defer 108:4,14,22 110:7 defining 20:9 **definitely** 8:8 40:16 76:20 121:23 definition 43:21 87:14 **DEFP** 47:8 51:4 55:24 56:5 66:12 72:5 delay 26:20,22 28:15 28:16.21 delays 21:13 26:1,5,7

26:14,18,22 38:7

39:8 56:1 116:9

demographics 30:4

**department** 6:4 17:14

17:15 20:10 24:15

24:24 25:15 29:11

**DENIECE 3:5** 

depart 68:7 96:1

**depends** 76:15 **Derek** 60:1 70:20 73:3 describe 18:8 design 12:24 17:4 18:23 20:13,16,17 40:12,20 41:12 42:3 42:21,23 43:2,16,20 43:23 44:6,7,8,11 44:23 45:23 67:12 91:10 design-build 43:25 designated 47:17 48:8 designed 71:14 designer 45:17 **designers** 32:4 45:20 71:13 100:12,13 designs 83:19 destructive 44:19 **detail** 69:17 detailed 19:5 68:21 details 82:16 85:10 117:25 detect 112:18 **determine** 7:14 89:13 100:6 113:23 114:13 determines 15:25 **develop** 51:2 52:16 52:21 57:11 developing 41:10 43:23 65:10 83:14 development 44:15 device 9:12 die 62:15 difference 56:4 **different** 8:6 9:20 11:8 17:24 36:10

31:7 35:3,10,14,19

38:21 66:3 85:5

department's 97:10

111:20 115:6

departments 6:9

depending 77:16

41:13 61:7

departs 68:6

90:17

117:19

35:23 37:2,12 38:16

88:1 99:7,21 102:10

72:6 76:2 97:4 106:2 115:18 differently 34:15 difficulties 84:12 **Dillard** 31:17 99:20 100:1 101:1 **directed** 20:4 24:18 55:17 66:22 100:9 **direction** 34:9 54:9 **director** 2:21,22,22 2:23,23 3:3,6 21:22 22:20,21 24:9,11 53:25 115:9 116:2 117:3 **Disch** 7:22 discipline 21:12 disciplines 71:10 discuss 14:6 18:6 63:23 106:24 **discussed** 10:7 17:8 43:18 63:12 **discussing** 18:3 51:19 51:22 52:9,10 105:7 discussion 12:10 14:19 15:3 34:4 105:11 106:13,23 109:2 111:7 119:14 **discussions** 46:3 62:8 **disparity** 29:10,15,19 29:22 **Distinction** 112:24 116:15 distinguished 12:5 **district** 2:16 10:4 13:12,17 17:1 40:1 40:21 41:13 42:12 45:21 47:9,17 54:9 54:24 55:21 56:1 57:20 62:3 66:24 74:23 101:13 102:8 102:15 109:7 112:19 113:19,22 115:3 118:12 **District's** 40:20 41:7 42:3 44:10 117:6 **districts** 12:7 66:25 dive 114:15,19,19 **divided** 36:23 **DIVINE 2:25,25 document** 6:6 17:13 47:16 48:6 62:2

documentation 46:13 116:24 123:15 documented 123:9 **documents** 11:10,13 11:16 17:18,22 43:7 43:8 45:25 **doing** 8:7 13:3 41:2 45:25 46:1,5 53:10 58:3 64:10 65:18 67:24 75:3 76:16,21 78:20 82:12.15.15 88:15 93:1 100:1,1 101:11 108:21 dollars 48:23,24 **DONTE** 2:23 **Dotson** 114:4 116:16 double 27:7 76:19 78:3 79:25 double-check 67:25 **Douglas** 30:8 32:9 **Dr** 2:7,23 8:2,3 11:13 13:9.11 14:10 15:18 15:20 16:3,7 17:21 19:21,23 22:5,14,18 22:24 23:6,12,14 24:2,7,11,17,20,23 25:2,3,5,8,24 26:4 26:17,23 27:7,11,14 27:16,18,21 34:22 34:24 35:8 36:1,13 37:25 38:8,11,20 39:2 40:8,11,15,18 40:23 41:5.18.25 42:15,22 43:14,18 44:3 49:5,7 50:2 52:6,13,25 53:7,14 54:12,14 55:1,4,6,8 55:12,16 56:10,14 59:1,4,17 60:11 61:22 62:14,20,21 62:25 64:9,22 65:2 66:1 69:1 70:7,8 71:25 73:24 74:11 74:20 75:15,18,22 76:12,22 77:6,25 78:7,14,17,25 79:21 86:21,23 87:9,10,18 88:2,12,14,20 89:9 90:2 91:20,22,25 92:2,9,12,14 93:4 93:13 94:4,8,10

			l	<u> </u>
95:12 96:8 102:20	employee 112:17	execute 67:10	50:4 51:3 52:17,22	98:5,13,15 99:9,18
102:21 103:7,16,19	endangered 16:1	executive 2:13,21	55:2 56:5 66:3	100:10,19,23
104:13,15,17	enforce 38:6	12:15,22 13:13,15	facilities' 65:12	101:16 107:24
105:25 106:6,7	engage 56:2	13:16 21:21 24:9	<b>facility</b> 53:13 66:24	108:9,11 109:18,21
107:16 109:2,3,4,5	engaged 112:12	53:25 97:21 115:8	79:23	109:23,25 110:7,11
110:2 119:16,17,21	engagement 67:5	executive-order	<b>fact</b> 13:13 15:14 48:8	110:12 118:24,24
119:25 120:6,22	<b>engineer</b> 25:23 35:17	14:12	50:16 51:9 53:18	119:1 123:10,19,23
121:1,15,16 122:19	100:4	exhibit 47:7	54:20 62:4 66:13	Fertig's 88:20
<b>drawings</b> 21:12 25:17	engineered 25:19	exist 83:17 99:17	89:14 115:17	<b>fight</b> 50:16
25:18,21,21,22	engineering 2:25,25	103:12	factor 30:3	figure 69:5
44:16	82:14	existed 21:4 40:2	factored 20:25	<b>figured</b> 104:18
drivers 44:14	<b>engineers</b> 43:6 59:22	41:20	factors 110:4	<b>Fin</b> 59:9 60:15,17,22
dry 65:24	ensure 12:25 44:6	<b>existing</b> 58:17,19	fail 52:15	61:9
due 21:14 26:1,5,8	57:5,14	65:12	<b>failed</b> 54:21	<b>final</b> 83:19 99:1
49:12 57:17 58:8,9	entered 116:11	exists 81:7	failing 14:6	finalized 121:4
duration 41:13	<b>entire</b> 11:12 45:1	<b>expand</b> 54:13	failure 56:3	<b>finally</b> 23:24
	50:24	expect 115:22 122:9	fair 41:23	<b>financial</b> 51:13 102:8
E	entity 44:7	expectations 69:11	<b>fairly</b> 49:24	102:14 103:22
E 125:2,2	environment 112:10	<b>expected</b> 23:3 41:6,11	<b>fall</b> 57:18 59:24	107:5 118:11
earlier 20:20,25	117:7,8	45:19 80:20 109:12	fallen 60:8	<b>find</b> 22:11 32:3 50:2
36:16	environmental 44:19	expecting 102:12	familiar 29:6	91:5 100:24 116:20
early 57:6,15 63:18	equipment 26:11	104:6	far 35:7,8,15,21	117:9
69:1	ERHARD 2:14	expedite 120:11	59:23 61:25 68:23	<b>finding</b> 19:11 21:1
easy 107:10	<b>ERIC</b> 2:12	expeditious 99:25	97:16 109:15 112:5	findings 17:9
editorializing 48:17	especially 20:1	experienced 84:12	<b>fashion</b> 85:12,20	fine 31:2 72:4 86:6
Education 102:10	establish 12:13 44:13	expire 12:16	<b>favor</b> 6:25 34:5 61:17	112:8
Education's 111:21	established 10:20	expires 108:16	96:8 111:9 119:2	fine-tune 92:7
efficient 120:5	44:8	explain 21:15 22:3	123:24	fingertips 84:17
effort 83:25 110:24	estimates 76:9	54:20 55:21	<b>FCI</b> 50:9	<b>finish</b> 64:19 68:11
110:25	et 21:13	explanation 32:24	<b>FCM</b> 41:12	101:23 103:18
eight 6:7 39:9 84:14	evaluate 12:3,12	45:7	federal 48:23	105:7 107:21
84:15 104:2 113:15	evaluates 102:4	express 68:10	feel 33:12 34:14	108:16,19
114:25 116:25	evaluating 100:2	expressed 69:2	92:14	finishing 99:24
either 18:25 21:17,23	<b>evaluation</b> 61:6 88:24	extend 58:21 61:14	<b>feeling</b> 106:19	fire 21:14 25:18,19
33:21 49:22 50:11	100:5,18	94:22 95:9,10 96:7	FEMA 48:24	25:21,23 26:1 42:4
<b>Elect</b> 15:15	evaluations 100:14	extended 12:23	Fertig 2:7 7:24 11:17	72:7,9 74:2
electrical 87:21	eventually 99:2	extending 13:21	19:22 28:1,2,11,14	<b>firm</b> 67:12
Elementary 97:8	everybody 9:7 18:18	extensions 112:6	28:18,20 29:4,15	firms 17:5 71:15
99:15	42:22 85:11	extract 70:24 71:10	30:7 31:2,17,22,25	100:22
eloquently 66:2	evidence 45:16 62:3	81:8 84:1	32:22 33:7,10,20,25	<b>first</b> 4:24 5:3 8:7,20
else's 109:16	evolving 41:9	extracting 75:25	34:2,10,11 45:9,14	19:21 21:9 27:8
email 6:4 10:8 22:25	exact 64:1 70:19 74:6	78:19	45:22 46:9,14,17	30:23 51:23 52:2,19
109:8	exactly 55:6	extraction 71:4,7	47:1,2,5 48:5,20,22	53:1 55:9 64:4,14
<b>emailed</b> 10:15 11:11	example 122:22	82:3 89:1	49:2,8 65:4,7,8 68:2	68:10 71:21 72:3
11:14	exception 116:3	extrapolate 38:17,25	80:7,8 81:3,7,17,25	82:20 97:7,8,17
emails 11:7	excess 98:1 112:5	extrapolate 30:17,23	82:6 83:1 84:10,16	98:2,4 119:7 120:25
<b>emergency</b> 13:17,22	115:2		84:20,25 85:13,21	fiscal 113:24
14:21 15:24 47:18	excessively 115:20	F	86:4,8,13,16,19,25	fit 81:14
48:8 50:15	Excuse 22:16 54:5	<b>F</b> 2:19 125:2	87:5,7,11 95:8,10	<b>five</b> 95:5 104:2
Emily 1:19 3:8 125:7	87:6	faced 74:24 79:19	95:14,16,21 96:7,18	111:13,19 113:6
125.17	54.20	fooilities 2:21 17:4	25.17,10,21 20.7,10	111.13,17 113.0

**facilities** 2:21 17:4

excuses 54:20

125:17

96:22 97:15,18,23

116:6

**five-vear** 47:10 55:24 123:6 75:17 87:17 89:8 61:3 65:6 69:22 great 55:18 83:24 56:4 66:24 forward-thinking 90:1 102:9 103:24 71:23 72:19.20 **GREENBARG** 3:12 **flag** 4:23 111:21,24 114:7,11 73:13 75:5 82:13 **GROSSMAN** 3:12 61:11 **flinging** 53:17 **forwarded** 11:12,17 114:12 87:9 89:21 92:6 group 12:4 19:8 **flip** 75:24 39:21 94:1 109:9 Georgia 24:1 97:12.24 101:23 85:14 floor 96:18 108:10 forwarding 94:2 **getting** 14:2 21:25 102:13 105:19 **GRUB** 3:11 **found** 115:16 118:4 24:3 26:11 34:25 106:1 107:18 guess 8:5 14:24 22:22 111:5 **Florida** 1:22 67:9,13 **four** 36:23 86:5,13,25 37:11 46:5 47:24 110:22 112:25 27:1 34:5 36:19 67:15 102:10 96:20 104:2 112:25 74:21 76:25 83:10 114:8,9 116:5 39:5,7 40:9,24 43:2 111:20 114:1,2 115:5 116:7 83:15 85:11,19 86:1 117:25 118:1,20 45:11 48:10 59:25 Frank 2:21 21:21 125:4 115:20 119:18.20 120:20 61:23 62:9,20 76:22 **flows** 86:9 23:17 24:7 25:3,12 **Girardi** 2:21 21:21 goal 71:18 107:12 78:1 87:15 89:13 **fluffy** 74:3 32:15,15,17,22 37:7 21:21 22:10,16,22 **God** 98:23 90:2,5 94:13 96:23 flying 23:25 37:18 39:11,14,21 23:4,8,24 24:5,10 goes 59:24 63:13 86:9 99:12,12 104:19 **focus** 114:8 115:19 40:25 47:19,22 24:14 25:1,7,14 100:20 111:8 119:7 120:9 folks 79:4.13.13 49:19 52:3,23 54:17 **GOHL** 2:17 26:3,6,14,20 27:4 120:17 124:3 **guessing** 103:13 **follow** 19:18 30:7 56:12 57:25 63:17 32:7,15,15,15,19 **going** 8:3 13:17 18:15 31:13 37:3 47:12 63:25 70:22 71:22 37:5,7,7 47:21,22 21:19 22:8 23:8,15 **GUESTS** 3:2,10 48:12 84:25 93:19 74:19 79:3,11,14 48:18,21,25 49:17 23:21,22 25:6,7,10 **guide** 55:23 **followed** 29:7 60:9 84:6 87:15 90:24 49:19 52:2,3,12,24 26:21 27:1,6,24 guidelines 20:19 67:15 92:18 100:9 53:4,8 54:11,22 28:5 33:2 36:15,18 40:16,20 **following** 4:1 21:2 Friday 5:20 6:5 10:16 55:2.5.7.11.14 38:18 39:17 42:6 **guides** 9:15,15 30:9 31:4 10:21,24 107:18 56:11,12 57:25,25 45:23 46:4,22 47:14 **GUMS** 3:4 follows 19:15 33:22 120:3 59:3,12 63:25,25 47:15 53:18 57:2 **Gustavo** 112:17 **followup** 15:18 34:23 **front** 20:14 40:6,12 64:12 65:1 68:22 63:7,8 65:19,22 guys 34:9 38:12,21 39:4 57:22 78:7 36:19 45:10 59:6 53:17 115:12 71:23 72:2 74:5,17 66:6 69:5,6 72:1 65:5 73:24 85:23 **FTE** 102:15 113:19 gymnasium 49:23 75:4,16,19 76:5,15 75:8,19 77:23 79:6 90:3 **fully** 43:23 77:3,20 78:6,11,16 80:11 82:12 83:4 50:1 **function** 67:13 **font** 6:11 79:1 81:1,5,23 85:22 89:5,6 95:16 H **force** 16:5 50:4 79:23 **funding** 66:11 69:5 87:16,19 88:11,13 95:17,19 96:24 **Hagen** 7:22 further 44:23 86:22 100:5,8,10 101:6,22 118:6 88:16 89:7 90:25 **half** 64:19 **forego** 13:25 94:1,8 118:15 91:4 92:17,18,25 103:17 104:18 **halfway** 109:14 foregoing 125:9 119:14 93:6.8 98:11 105:13 106:19.22 **HAMBERGER** 2:19 forensic 49:11.11 Furthermore 44:13 give 16:4 54:8 61:1 107:9 108:19 112:7 hand 8:5 13:10 27:9 foreseeable 44:24 44:21 62:22 82:11 93:11 113:4 114:23 45:11 79:2 Forest 31:22 98:1 future 100:22 120:9 117:22 120:19 121:17 **handful** 64:18 122:9 99:15 100:2 122:16 given 9:10 21:3 23:10 hands 9:11 19:19 **forget** 20:23 **FYI** 13:22 36:17 39:20,24 **good** 8:23 14:1 33:10 form 10:9 77:2 41:19 55:16,18,25 33:11 39:16 45:8 111:8  $\mathbf{G}$ hang 8:3 22:17 70:23 71:19 78:13 formal 45:24 65:2 71:5 80:22,23 **gained** 71:17 75:2 **happen** 39:7 50:3 **format** 59:20 82:19.25 85:3 100:11 106:11 **gaining** 61:20,20,20 **giving** 37:1 74:5 69:16 72:18 83:13 **former** 12:6 112:17 118:10.11 **Garth** 3:5,5,5 **happened** 49:12 50:6 gotten 45:24 57:23 115:7 117:2,2 92:18 gathering 81:19 50:17 60:5 63:10,14 Fort 1:22 **glad** 56:25 123:2 Gauci 7:25 24:19.21 75:6 **forth** 23:15 30:25 **go** 4:23 5:13,16 10:18 governing 112:13 25:9 26:11 89:17 happening 23:13 102:16 10:25 11:19 13:1 113:12 115:6,12 93:15 106:9 17:23 18:1 19:9 forthcoming 13:5 Governor's 12:15 **GC** 75:22 88:7,9,18 **happy** 19:8 21:17 23:15 24:21 25:12 108:15 **hard** 76:10,16 77:22 89:1.6 forward 11:20 35:17 27:17 32:5 34:10 graces 71:5 general 2:18,19 55:21 78:4 82:8 46:1,25 57:9 58:23 36:15 46:13 47:4 granted 63:11 64:15 73:5,6 75:11 hard-bid 76:21 77:23 61:15 69:24 122:9 48:17 50:13 56:17 grateful 9:24

individual 81:8 **JOHN** 2:18 78:2 **hurricane** 48:2,19 **issue** 14:12,13 15:5 hasty 53:16 HVAC 21:14 26:1,5,8 122:12 82:6 105:2 109:11 join 27:6 **individuals** 17:3 46:8 112:9 115:17 **ioined** 46:22 headache 119:18 26:19,25 70:25 71:8 71:11 72:17 74:2,4 indulgence 119:8 116:22 121:19 joining 15:15 95:21 heads 66:16 **health** 15:25 74:8,9 75:21 industry 41:9 122:2 JONATHAN 2:14 ineffectively 51:12 issues 9:5 20:13 21:4 hear 18:18 106:19 **Joris** 2:11 8:18 18:21 I **inform** 112:19 26:9 29:7 37:22 117:16 84:18 idea 41:5 68:24 80:23 heard 84:6 85:9 **information** 6:6 13:4 40:3 41:21 51:20,22 juicy 105:5 **identified** 17:12 21:5 95:17 109:23 110:1 14:17 40:6 54:7 52:10 112:19,20 **July** 49:8 73:11 114:4 40:3 83:9 item 4:24 5:20,21,24 hearing 42:24 59:8 64:2 81:6 84:17 123:2 **identify** 8:22 82:3 heavy 72:23 92:18,19 93:16,18 6:2 7:4 14:20 70:4 jump 9:9 94:15 **HEERY** 20:6,8,13 88:25 100:20 101:13 106:15,16 108:14 **jumping** 108:3 ignored 52:20 55:20 21:17,23 22:8,10 102:5 107:3 108:2 109:2 111:12,19 jurisdictions 67:8,14 **II** 2:14 23:22 36:17 40:1 initial 42:11 50:23 **items** 74:8 K **III** 2:12,13 97:13 98:18 60:6,7 61:23 62:10 iterative 41:11 **imagine** 39:3 50:6 **KASHAMA** 2:13 62:10 **initiative** 41:7 62:17 J immediate 16:1 **Kathleen** 3:7 79:1,22 **HELD** 1:14 insanity 24:4 **impact** 75:25 90:10 **Jabouin** 2:11 4:5,7,11 93:16 inspect 58:7 64:21 Hello 26:10,13 102:8,14 103:22 4:14 5:2,6,9,13,17 **KAUFMAN** 3:4 help 30:17 46:24 **inspected** 57:23,24 113:18 118:12 7:6,10,15,18,20,22 KAUFOLD 2:22 48:13 73:8 79:18 58:2 **impacted** 78:19 inspection 45:18 8:9,11,13,15,18,25 KCW 12:19 82:23 102:6 implement 44:10 13:8 16:10,15,20 keep 7:8 13:21 25:9 **helpful** 33:13 35:25 57:17 61:21 18:7.11 19:12 54:5 37:21 59:8 65:6.23 **inspections** 2:20 58:3 67:16 69:12,21 implementation 96:15 99:19 122:15 58:11 54:13 67:22,24 68:8 71:5 110:21 34:14.19 70:3 93:25 95:24 **keeping** 37:21 **Inspector** 102:9 **helps** 99:7 **import** 43:22 96:3 101:8,21 102:4 key 18:24 **Hev** 24:5 111:21,24 114:7 importance 20:9 kids 65:24 66:17 Hi 18:17 103:3,21 105:25 instance 56:19 **important** 12:1,9 107:2 110:3,6,17 kind 19:2 30:25 46:12 high 47:17 50:8 80:14 instances 9:17 54:6 65:23 69:7 111:3,4,14,15 46:24 50:17 68:14 highest 36:22 instituting 14:19 117:15,17 118:8 69:19 78:9 86:8,9 Hills 65:16 96:14 120:15 instructions 114:18 **improve** 41:7 69:24 119:12,21 120:9,21 99:21 hire 58:23 72:17 73:7 **intent** 109:18 improving 84:2 121:2 **kindly** 8:22 73:13 interest 16:2 **in-house** 67:3 **Jabouin's** 122:21 knew 39:23 66:6,6 hiring 58:5,14 100:21 interested 85:23 **in-person** 13:14.24 **Jardine** 3:6 21:24 **know** 10:6.16.22 12:9 history 50:5 **interim** 104:20 inaccurate 90:21 37:16,16 38:2,9,14 13:2 14:1,13,25 hit 76:10 interior 72:8 inappropriately 38:22 40:5,10,14,17 15:1 18:3,4,13 19:5 hold 23:24 27:8,18 internal 117:7 114:21 40:19 41:4,17,24 19:5 20:20 21:22,24 37:14 interpret 43:6 **include** 44:16 65:12 42:1,18 43:5,17 23:19 24:13,18 26:6 interrupt 9:10 holding 26:15 35:24 123:8 44:1 45:22 46:11,16 26:7,15 29:19 31:3 62:2.2 introduce 47:15 **included** 17:19,21 62:19,21 74:16,18 31:6,9 35:12 36:14 **hole** 60:8 introduced 60:18 19:1,7 40:16 77:5,13 78:24 81:11 37:4,4,5,14 42:4,6 **holistic** 115:19 **Inventory** 2:11 including 61:7 82:5 84:16,24 85:3 42:11 43:24 45:22 Hollywood 65:16 investigation 14:3 incorporate 16:4 85:18 87:6 91:2,6 47:9 49:1 51:16 **hope** 9:18 21:16 22:2 101:20 102:7 103:2 44:21 91:21,24 92:2,11,13 56:7 57:16 58:2 111:19 112:4 hopefully 23:20 35:25 92:24 93:7 97:16 59:13.14 61:17 62:1 67:16 84:9 108:23 incorrect 99:11 **INVITED** 3:2 **increase** 79:6,10 100:12,20 63:18,20 66:23 67:9 119:10 123:6,8,13 involved 16:22 76:7 increased 71:20 Jeff 2:17 8:23 67:11,14 68:6,7,24 hoping 39:21 64:4 85:6 113:2 **indicate** 6:8 94:3 **job** 37:2 46:4 76:1 68:25 69:13,19,22 108:1 121:10 involvement 20:14 **indicated** 7:25 9:5 82:21 91:14,15 74:17 75:4 77:6 host 56:22 Irma 48:2,7,21,24 54:7 60:16 **jobsite** 45:24 79:4,13,15 80:13,16 hour 113:10 **ISS** 16:24 28:13 indicating 113:12 jogged 87:11 81:1 83:17 84:3 hundred 98:1 31:16 38:24 39:4

85:18,22 86:8 90:3 90:13,13,25 92:7 93:8 95:18 96:14 97:25 104:3,4,10 105:10,11,13,20 106:5 108:18 109:9 109:15 112:7 117:18 118:4,11 119:12,22 120:10 123:10,12 **knowledge** 19:4 32:4 known 43:2 knows 69:10

## $\mathbf{L}$

lack 19:4,4 32:4 50:21,22,25 51:8,9 51:17 52:6,7 55:25 56:19 **lag** 9:13 89:10 **Lake** 31:22 98:1 99:15 100:1 **landed** 23:25 **LANGAN** 3:7 79:3 93:19 language 20:12 largely 20:22 62:6 late 31:10 91:15 Lauderdale 1:22 leader 38:10 **leaders** 12:8 38:15 **leading** 11:5 51:12 **leaking** 80:20 learned 65:21 70:1 105:22 **leave** 94:19 leaving 95:22 led 55:25 **ledger** 114:11,12 left 70:25 71:12,16 **length** 28:24 lengthiest 83:10 lengthy 98:8 **Leo** 60:2 **Leonardi** 2:2 15:15 **let's** 4:17,19 44:6 63:22 71:3 73:25 105:13 **letter** 113:11 level 12:10 68:4

77:18 116:3

**life** 51:11 65:12 lifespan 61:15 lifetime 58:21 **light** 20:9 lighter 80:5 **limit** 81:15 **limited** 117:24 line 96:24 104:5 105:10 link 10:21 list 19:7 92:3 **listed** 115:8,25 listen 24:22 28:3 **listening** 30:16 93:17 **little** 9:13,18 34:15 58:20 67:16 72:15 90:9 92:4 96:15 117:22 **LLC** 112:23,24 **local** 10:10 locations 115:19 long 22:25 29:23 37:14 38:13 48:16 98:18 99:14 100:13 112:6 long-range 48:11 52:17,22 61:16 65:11 66:10,12 long-term 51:2,5,9,10 51:18 52:4,8 53:6 53:13,21 54:1,21 55:23,24 56:5,13 64:8 67:1,7 68:23 **longer** 9:18 11:6 33:4 53:2 57:9 60:2,3 99:4 113:8,13 look 13:18 26:17,24 29:9,20 34:20 43:8 45:20 50:7 53:6 56:13 57:1 58:17

61:15 64:3 66:25 69:22,25 91:13 100:21 106:2 117:5 looked 23:4 36:9 50:10 55:5 59:19

**looking** 13:12 14:11 23:5,6 29:5,16 32:23 35:1 36:25 39:16 46:6 47:12 51:14 53:8 65:11

79:11

71:2 72:5 90:4 91:4 95:8 97:4,7 100:24 103:24 112:16 113:16 114:14 looks 8:6 39:22 **loop** 31:5 **LOR** 100:14 **LORs** 92:5 lose 86:7,12 **lot** 37:10 48:14 63:22 66:5 68:17 72:15,23 75:12 79:12,14 101:12 104:23 111:23 **love** 106:15 low 93:1 LUCKIE 3:4 Luker 3:3 16:15,18 17:7 18:8,17,20 19:14 28:6,10,12,16 28:19,24 29:13 30:2 30:12 31:12,20,24 32:17 35:4,6,12 36:6 37:4 67:4,4 83:3,6,6 87:15 88:4 96:22 97:6,21 98:3 98:10,12,14,16,24 99:16 100:7,7 Lvnch-Walsh 2:7 8:2 8:3 11:13 13:9,11 14:10 15:18,20 16:3 16:7 17:21 19:21,23 22:5,14,18,24 23:6 23:12 24:2,7,11,17 24:20,23 25:2,5,8 25:24 26:4,17,23 27:7,14,16,18,21 34:24 35:8 36:1,13 38:8,11,20 39:2 40:8,11,15,18,23 41:5,18,25 42:15,22 43:14,18 44:3 49:7 50:2 52:6,13,25 53:7,14 54:12,14 55:1,4,6,8,12,16 56:10,14 59:1,4,17 60:11 61:22 62:14

75:22 76:12,22 77:6 77:25 78:7,14,17,25 79:21 86:23 87:10 87:18 88:2,12,14,20 89:9 90:2 91:20,22 91:25 92:2,9,12,14 93:4,13 94:8,10 95:12 96:8 102:21 103:7,19 104:13,15 104:17 105:25 106:6 107:16 109:3 109:4,5 110:2 119:17,21,25 120:6 120:22 121:1,16

Lvnch-Walsh's 94:4  $\mathbf{M}$ **M/WBE** 59:20 ma'am 28:10,24 31:12,20,24 81:12 97:6,21 98:16 magic 119:13 main 47:18 112:16 maintain 52:16,21 94:15 **major** 87:20 majority 30:1 making 36:20 65:9 manage 79:9 managed 51:3 52:17 52:22 113:3,9,13 management 2:21 19:15 20:16,17 21:7 32:5 37:10 40:13 43:16,20 50:22 52:14 57:5,10,12 58:12,15,24 59:23 60:18,24 66:8 67:2 68:18,25 75:13 79:5 82:1 88:23 107:14 107:20 112:11,13 112:15,20,22,23 113:3,5,9,14,24 114:5,21 117:3 119:25 management's 34:11 50:23 manager 2:11,12,25

2:25 39:3 62:11

managing 12:6

managers 66:5 74:24

Page 133 manner 99:25 manufacturers 59:22 MARQUARDT 2:13 **Marte** 15:10 **Mary** 2:7 7:24 11:16 19:21 27:9 49:8 50:8 118:24 master 20:18 40:13 41:8 61:16 math 97:17,17 mathematic-wise 79:24 matter 106:25 113:19 matters 5:25 7:5 8:19 10:7 11:23 **MATTHEW** 3:3 **maximum** 95:17 **Maversohn** 2:4 4:2,6 4:9,17,22 5:4,7,12 5:15 6:15,19,22,24 13:8 14:8,18 15:9 15:17,23 16:6,8,12 16:19 18:1,19 19:20 21:19 23:14 25:3,6 25:12 27:11,15,17 27:20,25 33:7,17,24 34:3,8,22 37:24 45:8,9 46:18,19 47:4 49:5 56:9 65:3

7:2,8,13 8:9,10 13:6 65:4 66:19,21 67:18 67:21,22,23 68:3,8 70:4 80:4,6 86:4,11 86:17,20,24 87:2,8 90:7,23 94:8,11,17 94:18,20,25 95:1,4 95:6,10,14,20,23 96:6,11 101:15,18 102:19 103:15,20 104:14,16 105:9 106:10 108:6,9 109:1,4,23 110:6,16 111:2,4,5,11 117:14 118:15,18,20,23,25 119:4 120:8,21,24 121:2,14 122:19 123:20,22 124:1 mean 23:19 33:2,9 36:4,22,24 38:2 59:10 87:14 90:8,19 92:9 122:20

62:20,21,25 64:9,22

65:2 66:1 69:1 70:7

70:8 71:25 73:24

74:11,20 75:15,18

Meaning 51:21 means 33:4 35:4 88:6 meant 45:15 mechanical 70:25 71:8,11 72:10,13,15 72:16,21,21 74:2,4 74:12,14 75:13 87:21 **media** 74:3 medias 72:8 **Medvin** 2:5 4:13 6:18 6:19 8:11,12 68:2 117:15,16,18 118:8 meet 103:23 meeting 1:4 4:4,10,11 4:19 5:14,23 7:23 8:1,22 9:3,8,25 10:1 10:2,6,25 11:22 12:14,17 13:1 14:5 14:23 15:16 17:3,8 17:10,17 24:6 68:1 79:23 89:22.23 94:22 95:3,11 96:4 96:7 101:17 102:22 102:25 103:5,9 104:4 105:1,6 106:1 106:17,18,20,21,24 106:24 107:4,6,20 108:15,18,23 109:13 110:8,8,20 110:20,22,24 111:18 113:7,10 114:3 116:16 119:7 119:12 120:5,11,15 121:9 122:17,23 124:5 meetings 9:17 12:16 13:3,25 14:24 53:5 63:23 105:8 107:8,9 107:11 109:8,10 110:5 120:10 121:22 Meloni 2:22 59:14 60:11 member 11:16 15:15 17:11,20 19:17 53:5 53:19 68:5,6 122:12 member's 10:14 Member-Elect 2:2 members 2:1,3 4:8 8:20 9:6,21 10:8,16

10:21 11:1,3,8,11 12:5,7,19,20 13:2 67:25 95:24 117:13 120:12 122:3 memo 49:8,10 50:18 memorandum 10:9 memory 14:5 87:11 **mention** 16:17 **mentioned** 36:15 41:2 66:1 68:22 72:11 73:9 85:16 107:8,25 113:18 114:5,10 Meo 2:5 7:20,21 68:3 Messier 50:9 60:2 70:20 73:3 met 56:20 114:17 **method** 66:7 **Michael** 3:6 7:25 **MICHELE** 2:13 MICROSOFT 1:14 **middle** 42:10 Mike 21:23 22:11.18 million 62:11 71:20 73:9,10,12,14,14,19 73:21,23 81:15 mind 80:18 110:21 123:20 **minimize** 96:13 minor 6:10 42:2,6 43:11.12 minority 30:1 minute 22:5 91:7 121:7 minutes 9:3 27:5 68:11 88:15 101:21 103:18 105:14,15 106:12 miserable 82:21 missed 55:9,13,15 68:5 70:9 **missing** 18:25 mistake 55:8 mitigate 44:23 **mobilized** 57:6,15 mobilizing 63:18 68:24 moment 11:21 18:11 Monday 1:11 4:18 money 53:6,20,21 71:18 75:3

Money-wise 75:9

monies 114:20 month 12:16 63:20 63:22 108:24 months 15:7 46:2 64:14,16,20 82:18 82:24 112:21 **Moquin** 2:17 8:23,23 13:19 14:11,14,18 15:4,13 56:7,9 60:1 109:10 **MORGAN** 2:20 morning 6:5 11:18 Moses 2:6 7:16 mother 115:2,18 motion 4:25 5:7 6:16 33:24,25 34:4 94:22 95:8.10 96:7 108:8 108:22 110:7 111:5 118:25 119:15 120:18,23 122:6,7 123:19,22 124:1,4 motions 122:17 move 27:3 45:25 102:11 105:13 106:14,15 108:4,7,8 108:9,14 111:12 114:25 118:22 119:5 123:5 moved 6:18 118:17 moving 4:24 7:4 16:12 37:22 46:25 55:12 57:8 58:23 69:24 70:4 79:4 93:15 **multiple** 44:2 122:10 municipal 10:10 municipalities 12:6 murky 90:9 muted 27:10 65:7,7 Myrick 15:5

N

name 9:8 59:9 107:24 113:1 116:13,17,20 116:23 **names** 7:11 Natalie 8:2 **Nathalie** 2:7 11:13 40:5 42:1 nature 12:11 19:11 53:23

necessarily 14:22 65:23 123:15 necessary 34:13,18 necessitate 44:12 need 6:20 9:10 10:12 11:23 12:18,24 18:5 24:2 25:18,19,21,22 27:1 42:16 43:3 54:8 57:23 58:11 65:5 69:7,8,9,14,25 75:10 76:20 80:1 95:5 96:5 102:11 103:17 105:6,24 106:1 108:19 122:6 needed 12:21 19:9 29:8 66:7 73:4 111:25 112:3 needs 10:14 18:10,13 66:13 95:25 108:20 negotiation 77:22 negotiations 91:9 neither 23:12 never 40:23 50:5 59:23 61:19 63:7,8 new 6:6 32:10,17,18 32:20 49:24 58:4,10 59:19 64:6,10,10,13 64:13 85:6 newer 49:25 news 80:13 nice 14:13 **night** 121:5 122:24 nine 17:5 18:3 33:21 33:23 104:2 nondestructive 82:15 nonsensical 53:23 normal 37:2 normally 103:12 **Northeast** 47:17,21 47:23 48:14 49:3 50:11 65:16 80:14 note 65:15 noted 83:7 84:21 notes 17:11 125:11 **notice** 29:18 November 107:4 **number** 5:21,24 6:2 7:4 13:15 14:20 18:22 19:20,25 20:3 21:5 27:12 28:15.22

29:10 33:16 34:21

36:22,24 40:3 46:23 46:25 50:19,22 70:4 70:5.15 77:11 81:9 84:8 86:5,13,22,25 90:4,5,10,22,24 91:1 92:15 94:3,9 96:20 97:1 106:13 106:14 107:25 111:13,19 114:10 115:1,5,14 116:6,12 116:25 74:6 94:4 97:3 98:21

**numbers** 32:19 35:5 0 o'clock 23:20 94:13 122:24 **obligation** 21:3 38:3 39:20,24 40:2,9 41:20 55:22 66:15 113:23 obligations 20:8 **observation** 6:7 18:7 18:22 19:7,16 20:3 21:5 27:12 28:4,5 32:3 40:3 45:5,6,10 46:20,25 50:19,22 50:24 70:5,15 86:5 86:22,25 94:3,4,9 96:19 104:1 observations 17:6,24 18:2,4 39:10 46:5 50:21 63:9 68:12 69:23 70:1,10 **obstacles** 21:13 26:1 obtain 30:23 85:15 obtained 84:22 **obtaining** 84:13 85:2 **obvious** 100:25 obviously 36:10 80:22 83:24 104:5 111:1 120:10,15 occurred 39:8 56:23 66:5 112:21 occurrence 44:24 occurring 20:6 occurs 121:9 **October** 10:3,25 12:18 103:13 104:4 105:1 107:6,13,20

99:1 108:18 109:11,15 57:1 72:14 73:13 52:15 57:8 71:4,6 83:15 84:4,13 85:2 109:15 110:22,22 75:20 76:8 81:12 81:3,6,7,18,21,24 85:15 86:2 87:13,16 **plate** 111:23 113:7 119:12 89:4.5.17.19 92:9 81:25 84:10,11 86:3 87:23,25 88:6,25 platform 1:15 122:22,23 ongoing 11:25 57:11 86:3,15,19 87:1,7 97:11,13,20 98:21 **play** 73:6 99:3 100:17,17 off-the-top-my-head open 14:22 30:14,18 87:12,12 96:22 97:8 played 50:8 27:23 59:21 77:18 116:17 97:22 98:3,10,11,19 permits 24:16 75:6,7 please 9:7 10:16,22 **offered** 60:24 61:9 opened 91:13 92:25 101:1,1,2,2 112:25 84:22 85:20 87:22 16:17 18:11 24:19 **Office** 2:10,18,18,21 116:14 114:9,25 115:14,24 permitting 16:23 25:4 55:21 62:21,24 116:5,8,12 117:1 20:4 21:17 56:11 **operating** 122:8,15 36:9 38:19 47:25 68:5,6 94:2 107:2 operational 51:13 102:9 111:21,24 paid 62:11 115:2,18 83:11,22 87:3 107:17 110:21 114:7 operationally 121:2 115:20 **person** 14:25 115:24 114:9 120:2.3 Officer 2:17 121:13 **paper** 31:13 123:15 **pledge** 4:19,20 officers 10:10 **opinion** 68:15 papers 30:15,18 personnel 76:4 plumbing 87:21 **official** 2:19,20 119:7 opportunities 61:14 paperwork 89:20 persons 12:5 ply 48:2 71:19 77:19 93:1 **pertains** 15:24 43:16 PM 38:2,8,9 39:1 119:7 paragraph 55:9 **phase** 83:20 88:5 **PMOR** 20:11 74:23 **oh** 33:25 39:22 98:23 opportunity 81:7 118:20,23 83:17 pardon 40:5 88:12 90:20 91:11 79:7 88:23 **PHILLIP** 2:22 **okav** 4:6,9,13 5:6,12 **opposed** 7:2 34:8 part 12:12 17:7,17 **point** 14:5 23:17 6:15 15:9,17 16:3,6 36:4,5 52:10 56:22 20:7,7 24:15 37:10 **phone** 18:13 23:24 27:13 31:2 32:22,22 16:12 19:20,23 96:11 111:11 40:1 44:4,5 45:2 photographs 46:10 33:10 39:7 62:7 24:10 25:8 26:3,17 120:18 124:2 52:18,19 53:1,12 **Phyllis** 2:8 8:15 71:5 65:18 71:16 74:20 **opposes** 119:4 95:2 108:25 118:19 27:20,25 28:11,14 54:2,23 58:1,18,19 77:8 81:14 82:13 30:7 31:17,22,25 **opposite** 70:19 59:12 64:12 67:5 pick 33:21 95:25 83:12,15,21 88:21 32:19 36:1,13 38:11 **options** 84:8 68:14 69:7 72:6,13 **picking** 100:25 91:18 101:5 110:20 38:20 39:3 40:5,7 order 4:4,19 12:15,22 73:2,22 77:3 83:10 picks 98:13 122:22 **picture** 98:17 40:19 42:15,22 45:9 13:13,15,16 87:13 87:3 122:8 123:8,14 **pointed** 115:7 46:17 47:5 49:4,7 88:5 94:15 98:17 participate 12:21 pictures 46:9 **points** 46:23 participation 119:9 52:13 53:14 55:1.10 108:16 piggybacking 59:1 policies 15:24 particular 117:9 place 50:25 59:24 policy 14:20,21 15:21 56:25 61:22 64:22 original 5:10 6:3 65:2,4 67:17,21 13:13 17:16 63:12 particularly 86:1 60:21 76:11 **politics** 117:20 68:8 70:3,15 72:2 **originally** 5:19 77:9 116:22 plan 18:23 20:21 **POMR** 80:2 73:24 74:11 75:15 outlay 51:4 partners 12:7 34:12 36:6,8,11,16 poor 49:13 76:22 77:6.25 78:14 overall 51:19 52:8 pass 122:6,17 36:17 47:6,10,11 Portfolio 2:18 78:17,25 80:6 81:3 61:10,18 83:16 **PATEL** 2:13 48:9,12 50:23,25 **portion** 74:21 81:4,17 82:5,12 113:15 pay 17:2 51:2,8,9,14,18,19 position 115:3 83:1 84:10,20 85:13 overhead 75:23 payment 116:9 51:22 52:4,8,8,17 positive 26:18 85:21 86:5,24 87:5 overlooked 19:1 **pending** 117:12 52:22 54:10,21 **possible** 13:4 90:7 87:8,10,18 88:2 oversee 72:22 75:13 **people** 11:19 39:18 55:23,24 57:11 96:16 120:17 121:7 90:2 91:16 94:11,20 oversight 112:13 43:6 54:19 55:23 61:16 64:8 65:11 124:6.6 overstepped 19:1 57:16 59:11 85:6 95:20,23 96:6,12 66:10,13,24 69:3,8 **possibly** 14:19 26:9 97:18 99:18 100:23 100:3 110:9 69:25 26:21 76:18 105:14 P **plane** 24:3 27:5 post-design 77:2 101:3 104:15 percent 75:20,20 **P-Card** 105:8 110:16 121:1,14,17 percentages 75:12 **planned** 48:4 58:1 **posted** 121:5 **p.m** 1:12,12 124:9 **perform** 80:20 88:23 old 64:14 **planning** 51:5 53:22 potential 75:22,24 packaged 70:20 older 53:11 112:4 54:1 55:25 56:5,19 77:15 81:19 packages 43:24 performed 45:18 omitted 54:4 56:19,24 65:13 66:4 potentially 71:14 110:21 **onboard** 64:5 100:16 67:12,14 67:7 76:24 81:13 83:17 packing 105:4 **once** 12:20 64:3 76:7 period 36:3 **plans** 19:6 35:13,24 **Pou** 2:8 8:13,14 17:21 page 17:25 19:14 76:11 82:10 122:8 periods 99:5 38:18 48:11 51:6,11 49:6 66:19,21 67:17 21:5,7 29:3,4 35:7,9 ones 21:25 24:16 **permit** 21:11 25:15 53:6 65:15 67:1.11 67:19,20 68:2 94:17 45:17 46:23 52:14 26:24 37:20 49:18 81:22 82:2,4,7 83:5 68:19,19,23 98:18 94:19 95:18 107:15

120:1 123:12 Pou's 70:13 **pound** 18:14 **pouring** 80:15 **PPO** 41:12 55:19 58:5.25 practically 105:6 practice 45:21 **practices** 41:9 56:3 **Prats** 112:17 114:22 117:2 **pray** 102:25 **pre-award** 83:18 **Pre-Construction** 2:22 preconstruction 43:22 predated 60:7,7 predominantly 29:17 29:25.25 **prefer** 17:23 18:1 prepare 22:7 96:5 **prepared** 16:22 17:13 23:11 prequalification 59:21 presence 46:7 **present** 1:15 7:1 14:25 34:7 60:15 75:1 96:10 111:10 119:3 123:25 presentation 60:17 President 3:5 **pretty** 33:14,14 111:25 prevent 69:3 **previous** 10:1 96:25 97:3 115:21 **price** 78:5 **pricing** 77:23 primarily 36:12 **primary** 51:19 52:8 principals 12:6 prior 21:6 22:1,21 40:4 41:21 42:16 43:4 44:15 48:19 53:16,17 73:9 83:13 119:11 120:14 prioritizing 51:1 private 87:19 **pro** 61:1

**proactively** 21:6 40:4 41:21 **probably** 19:14,23 20:24 31:9 65:21 75:9 77:14 84:8.9 92:3,4 100:10 101:4 101:12,21 104:6 121:4 **problem** 36:16 47:5 48:14 56:3 85:2 105:9 problematic 23:23 **problems** 13:23 26:8 37:23 86:1 procedure 122:15 procedures 30:2 114:16 122:9 proceedings 4:1 124:8 125:9 process 16:13,21,23 17:2 18:23,24 20:18 20:23 30:10.14.21 30:21 31:4,14 36:16 36:17 41:10 42:7 43:20 44:5,11,23 47:24 57:22 82:10 83:9.11 84:13 87:3 89:15 90:18 97:2 98:8 99:14 102:18 116:4 processes 20:10 33:22 procure 57:9 **procured** 76:1 91:19 procurement 73:15 73:17 75:25 76:1,11 83:12 89:11,19,24 90:16 91:8,12 92:6 92:16,20 93:11 100:21 procurement's 78:3 procuring 99:1 **produce** 99:16 produces 44:7 **product** 61:10,18 64:20 productive 105:12

productivity 103:25

**Professionals** 41:12

program 2:23 3:6

professional 44:7

48:12 50:21 53:12 54:25 55:22 56:11 56:13 58:18,19 60:20 61:21 62:10 72:7 74:24 79:17 **programs** 6:4 17:15 20:4 21:18,22 54:1 76:8 **progress** 65:9 112:7 prohibit 69:2 **project** 20:19 30:13 30:20 33:9 37:10 40:15 43:20 44:9,12 44:14 66:5 71:1 72:20 73:25 74:24 76:17 82:12 84:1,4 85:7 91:19 100:3 111:22 projects 21:14 26:2 26:16,21 28:13 36:2 36:7,9,11 51:2 71:12 76:13,19 77:1 77:4,7,11,14 78:21 79:9 80:1,24,25 81:9 82:2 83:8,16 83:18.20.21 84:14 84:15,21 88:24 90:14 91:6,10 92:5 97:25 99:22,24 100:6 101:9 **proper** 6:8 51:10 116:23 117:6 **Property** 2:11 protect 16:2 **provide** 20:17 43:19 60:24 84:1 85:22 102:5 104:21 105:2 107:18 120:3 **provided** 9:16 10:4 19:24 31:16 54:16 101:12 110:8 116:24 123:3 proximity 108:20 **public** 10:10 12:25,25 14:23 15:25 16:2,9 16:11 publically 91:14 **published** 5:10,20 publishes 47:9

12:3,4,13 22:19,21

36:4 39:2 41:8.14

**pull** 70:18 72:24 81:13 87:21 88:16 88:17 **pull-out** 79:9 **pulled** 36:2 39:4 45:1 pulling 79:5,25 88:8 88:17 **punt** 39:11 purchases 113:20 **pure** 117:20 **purple** 6:11 purposes 33:19 put 12:3 27:2,3 32:25 39:18 45:11 48:2 49:21 54:17 55:14 59:23 63:3,6,19 64:3 66:11 71:15 72:25 76:9,12,14,23 77:1 78:4 85:7 90:12 92:20 103:14 putting 58:15 63:23 64:2 66:11 0 quarter 64:4 question 15:19 18:21 20:3 21:9,10 24:8

24:13,14,24 25:2,4 25:24,25 27:8 28:3 29:14 30:17 36:19 37:25 39:10 40:7,8 41:15,19,25 44:9,17 47:1 49:7 51:17.23 51:24.25 52:6 53:24 54:15 55:16,17 57:13 59:6 60:1 62:9,9 63:8,10 67:19 70:12,13,23 71:10,21,23,24 73:24 74:22 75:1 78:1,8 80:7 81:23 82:5 83:2,16 88:21 90:3,5,8,21 91:22 94:13 96:24 99:12 100:8 101:6.19 102:19 103:3,7,10 103:17 104:19,22 119:17,22 120:19 121:15 122:3,7,20 122:23 123:2 questioning 49:2

104:5 questions 6:8,10 13:9 14:8 17:13.20 18:5 19:10,17 20:1,1 21:2,18,20 22:8 23:1,2,22 27:12 39:13,22 40:18 45:4 46:19 50:20 56:25 62:24 63:5 70:5,14 80:5,8,12 94:5,9 96:13 104:7.24 106:3 107:15,17,25 117:12,14 118:16 119:25 120:2,4,12 120:14 121:11,20 121:23,25 122:3,5 122:10,13 123:7,10 123:11,12 queue 29:12 35:2,10 35:22 97:10,12 quick 26:3 32:8 67:24 77:17 119:17

121:16
quite 29:14 61:19
99:3 112:6
quorum 4:2 12:19,20
12:21 13:14 14:22
14:23 67:24 68:4
94:15 95:19 110:9
quorums 13:24

R R 125:2 race 29:10.16 rain 80:15 raise 8:5 raised 13:10 reach 82:22 **reached** 12:20 26:22 read 19:14 41:1 43:14 54:22 71:24 123:20 **reading** 31:18,19,20 84:20 ready 82:19 91:11 92:6,19 real 32:8 33:16 63:7 121:16 realistic 33:15 reality 84:8 realize 11:22

47:20 48:7,14 49:3

64:20 65:24 66:16

roof 16:23 32:20 really 27:21 39:16 relationship 117:1 34:13,18 79:10 35:11,18 36:6,8,11 remaining 74:15 45:5 48:13 61:17 103:23 36:16,17 40:19 69:24 73:8 76:6 113:13 requires 25:15 42:12,25 43:7,9 49:13 50:6,13 52:24 remember 50:8 44:23 61:8,25 64:15 77:21 87:24 95:18 110:23 101:12 116:1 121:7 119:19 **requiring** 21:11,12 84:11 97:9 99:21 reason 37:13 51:19 **remind** 94:12 reread 88:4 107:12 52:9 88:2 110:19 **remote** 12:15 reroof 72:25 reviewed 5:22 **Rebecca** 2:6 7:18 remove 33:8.18 **reroofed** 49:15 50:16 reviewing 38:12 receive 10:17,23 removed 88:18 **reroofing** 33:9 58:22 reviews 20:21 42:19 rescinding 13:20 44:22 11:19 113:17 **renovation** 32:9,11 researched 58:13 revise 28:25 38:18 114:11 32:21 **received** 11:7,17 renovations 72:8 **resolution** 16:25 19:6 **revised** 6:8,12 17:20 58:13 61:4 **repairs** 29:8 56:22 resolved 31:15 revising 35:19 113:10 repeat 29:13 resources 51:12 revision 38:5 recited 4:21 **replace** 66:14,15 79:16 118:7 revisions 42:6 72:25 recognize 15:12 respect 6:2 10:19 **REYNALDO** 2:12 **RFP** 20:6 39:25 43:15 recognized 25:13 **replaced** 49:16,18 12:14 18:7 30:4 recommend 52:21 65:19,22 54:9 67:6 102:6 45:2 58:15,23 59:2 82:1 83:3 88:23 **report** 14:3,7 16:5 123:1 63:17.19 recommendation 18:6 20:24 33:8 **respond** 21:8 38:5 RFPs 58:13 **RFO** 20:12 33:8 52:16,19,20 38:11,15,25 40:21 53:1 100:13 104:13 122:12.25 53:1.2 54:3 55:20 46:12 50:9 53:16 rhetorical 57:1 55:20 57:8 71:6 55:19 68:16,17 responded 90:12 **RHONDA** 2:24 80:10,22 82:1 83:2 69:10 70:13 96:17 response 6:3 19:5,15 right 4:2,13,17,22 88:22 107:22 97:19 99:17 101:20 21:7 22:7 32:5 5:22 14:16 15:17 recommendations 101:24 102:13 50:24 52:14,23 57:7 16:8,12 23:13 31:25 103:6,11 107:5 68:18 70:22 71:1 32:13 34:10 35:8,9 19:2 71:3 114:13 recommending 33:18 108:8 112:25 102:3 120:25 123:3 35:15,21 36:13 33:20 118:13 123:9,14 responses 17:17,25 40:14 45:15 46:21 record 46:21 125:10 125:8 19:25 27:2,22,23 47:3 48:20,20,24 recorded 4:12 reporter 1:18,19 3:8 28:25 39:18 69:18 49:5 52:25 55:12 recording 4:6,9 3:11 9:1,2 32:12,13 104:7,21 105:2 57:3 64:1 66:19 reduced 79:7 32:16 107:15,19 113:17 73:23 74:6 77:5.16 119:20,24 120:7 reduction 79:18 **reporting** 1:20 3:8 78:1,17 79:7 80:20 refer 46:23 113:4 123:6 86:20 88:20 91:3,5 9:12 **reference** 83:2 117:1 reports 26:24 38:8,9 responsibilities 91:24 92:24 93:24 references 84:13 38:10,21 69:13 115:23 96:6 97:15,16 105:9 **referring** 47:7 98:10 121:4 responsibility 10:14 111:12 114:14 **reflected** 100:14,17 **represent** 35:5 36:3 117:6 120:8 123:22 124:1 regarding 20:18 represents 35:15 responsible 37:19 **ringing** 23:25 46:20 53:10 54:25 reputational 51:13 38:1 **rise** 4:19 request 40:24 87:25 restate 15:21 risk 3:3,4 44:17,18 81:23 resubmit 28:25 38:18 **regards** 38:7 72:2,12 **requested** 23:9 46:22 90:13 **regular** 106:24 111:20,24 112:1 **results** 100:19 **RIVERA** 2:25 reimbursed 114:24 require 25:16 71:7 retained 45:16 road 58:20 75:12 reiterate 70:22 return 23:10 35:20 **Rob** 22:22 Robert 2:4,19 27:10 **Reiterating** 37:18 required 9:15 16:2 returned 17:15 reject 91:18 66:24 82:14 88:1 revert 39:17 robust 44:10 **related** 20:10 44:17 110:24 review 18:23 19:6 **role** 116:1 51:11 113:20 122:2 requirement 112:2 20:20 28:25 29:1.12 roll 7:13 relates 14:21 18:22 requirements 13:14 30:23 31:7,14 35:3 **RONALD** 2:20

				1 490 130
102:22	29:18,24,25 33:5,21	selecting 51:1	shop 25:22	solicitation 89:15
rule 14:21	55:19 61:2,3 65:16	send 10:18 22:25	short 11:5	<b>Solutions</b> 3:5,5 113:4
run 112:12,22	65:18 66:6,14,15	84:18 118:13	short- 68:23	solve 48:13
<b>Runcie</b> 15:5	85:24,25 112:11,12	sense 45:6 101:5	show 113:1	somebody 23:18
running 107:11	112:23 113:1,6,8,11	sent 6:4 10:21 47:7	showed 38:12	62:15 102:19
	113:13,23 116:14	48:6	showing 28:14,22	115:22 120:18
S	116:18 117:5 118:1	sentence 83:4	29:2 47:16	somewhat 32:4
safer 71:25	scope 16:22 44:17	separate 87:22	shows 38:17 99:13	soon 27:5 42:9 95:22
safety 15:25 21:14	79:5 80:25 117:24	116:21 121:18	side 56:12 75:24 80:2	sooner 109:16
26:1	scopes 70:17,25 71:4	separately 73:7 81:14		sorry 8:5 28:20,20
salacious 105:5	71:7,8,11 78:20	91:17	sign 55:15 115:9	29:13 32:12,13
sample 36:2,2,7 39:6	81:8 89:1 93:22	separation 72:12	signed 10:12 22:14	45:14 48:17 49:19
samples 36:7	Scott 1:19 3:8,11 9:2	<b>September</b> 1:11 4:18	22:19 89:20,21,25	54:14 98:5 99:7
sampling 44:20	9:9 125:7,17	5:20,23 6:5 10:24	<b>significant</b> 43:9 74:21	108:3 109:22
Sandpiper 97:8	SE 1:21	11:15 40:22 59:5	84:12 115:12	sort 13:11 15:20 23:3
SARAH 2:2	second 6:20,21,22	61:24 105:1 109:13	significantly 104:23	54:3 60:8 61:1
sat 80:13 97:11	21:10 22:17 34:1,25	109:18,19,24 110:8	signify 6:25 34:6 96:8	78:18
save 75:4,8,9,11	51:24 58:1 95:12	124:5 125:12	111:9 119:2 123:24	sound 66:16
122:16	96:8 108:25 109:1	series 19:2	silence 25:10	sounded 77:10
saving 71:17 75:2	109:20 110:15	serious 12:2,12	similar 21:13 25:25	sounding 78:9
savings 75:23 81:19	118:23,24 119:1	seriously 23:2 63:5	67:13 115:3 121:11	sounds 62:17 110:12
saw 97:3 109:8	123:21,23	serve 17:16 77:14	similarly 55:20	122:4
saying 6:25 30:8	seconded 110:10	Service 1:20	simple 99:13,17	speak 60:19 61:12
32:14 34:6 42:16	111:6	services 2:18 76:2	single 31:15	101:21
49:12 74:7 78:12	Secondly 14:2	set 12:16 13:1 24:16	sir 94:10	<b>SPEAKER</b> 18:10,12
81:9 82:12 89:3	seconds 18:9,21	76:2 107:8,10 110:5	sit 25:10	18:15 22:17 26:10
96:9 111:9 118:9	62:22	110:18,19	site 19:5 45:16	26:13 34:1 62:13
119:2 120:7 122:4	secretary 2:13 116:1	setting 110:24	sites 46:4	86:15 98:23
123:24	section 15:21,23	seven 4:7 29:3,4,17	sitting 36:25 80:19	speaking 9:6 32:12
says 38:4 42:12 45:15	17:19 20:15 28:4	35:7,9 68:12 95:24	89:14,17	speaks 16:18
71:6 81:18 84:25	43:15 45:1	98:10,11,19 104:2	situation 23:21	special 4:18 11:22
85:13 87:2	sections 9:20 43:18	106:6 114:9 116:12	111:17 113:18	102:22,25 106:23
schedule 109:16	<b>sector</b> 87:19	<b>shape</b> 77:2	117:5	107:11 109:13
110:25	see 11:19 14:2,4 15:7	share 38:25	situations 92:1	110:19 121:21
scheduled 12:17	15:10 21:7 29:9	shared 49:8	six 18:14,14 34:16,16	
94:13 101:20 104:3	30:18 44:6 47:10	<b>Shaw</b> 2:8 8:15 46:21	64:16 97:9,9 104:2	Specialist 2:14,14
scheduling 51:1	48:5 50:12 58:20	68:3 94:25 95:2,5,6	116:8	<b>specific</b> 19:10 67:6
110:23	60:10 66:25 69:17	95:13,25 96:2,4	skewed 32:20	114:18 120:14
school 1:1 2:1,2,12	71:3 82:23 91:4	106:10,11 107:3	skewing 31:5	specifically 20:15
10:13,20 12:7 14:3	92:7 93:15,17,19,24	108:5,7,10,11,17,25	skews 33:2,12	26:8 83:7 90:14
30:5 31:10 33:19,22	94:21,23 101:7,9,24	109:1,20 110:10,14	<b>skip</b> 44:4 56:18	115:11
47:17 51:3,6 80:14	108:14 113:2	110:15 118:17,19	small 85:13	specification 42:8,10
87:22 97:8 99:15	114:23 116:9,10,23	118:19,20,21,22	smaller 84:9	specifications 20:19
101:19,24 102:7	117:4 121:10	119:1 123:21,23	<b>SMART</b> 48:11 72:6	40:15 42:5,13 59:19
103:1 112:23 113:3	seeing 33:5 34:5	sheer 19:25 70:23	72:10 102:15 106:4	sped 104:22
113:3 114:1,23	74:22 111:8 119:5	<b>Shelley</b> 2:22 59:14	113:21	<b>spend</b> 69:6
115:6 116:11,14	seek 119:24 120:4	60:10	smells 117:20	spending 29:11 36:20
117:3,7,8	seen 40:23 69:13 75:6	<b>shift</b> 66:4	sneak 103:10	spent 9:24 17:3 49:3
school's 115:9	segment 60:17	<b>Shimm</b> 8:16 95:2	snuck 102:23	97:10
schools 2:23,24,25	SEIFER 2:12	shoot-from-the-hip	software 16:24	<b>spot</b> 63:3
28:7,12 29:6,16,17	selected 28:12 61:3	27:23	<b>sold</b> 70:19	sprinkler 25:19
L				

**sprinklers** 25:18 72:9 Student 3:11 8:21 teams 1:14 80:13 33:1,1,13,13,15 **Sr** 3:4 students 80:19 **support** 2:14,23,24 tell 26:24 34:14 49:10 37:24 45:6 46:11,14 **STACY** 3:12 study 79:12 2:25 117:3 99:23 100:23 101:8 48:18 49:17 53:4 **stuff** 38:3 staff 2:10,16,17 10:5 **supposed** 11:4 13:12 103:1 106:7 57:3 63:12 65:14,20 19:24 54:9 69:11 **sub** 16:23 21:11 20:16 22:13 41:18 **telling** 24:23 66:4,9,9,12,13 69:7 79:8 104:21 106:20 25:15 81:22 82:2,4 sure 4:14 5:11 16:19 temporary 48:1,21 69:21,24 70:9 71:25 122:25 82:7 83:5,11,14,22 31:19 36:20 37:11 49:21 73:16 75:8 76:5,10 **staffing** 79:10,15,18 84:4,13,22 85:20 50:4 56:20 62:25 ten 28:7,12 30:8 77:7,11 78:7 79:11 80:1 87:2,13,14,16,23 63:4,15 66:10,16 65:21 88:15 99:20 80:4,21,22,23 81:20 **stand** 77:9 88:6,6,25 94:4 83:6 97:6 98:25 tendency 105:4 83:15 84:3 86:4 standard 122:8,14 97:13,20 98:21 99:2 106:18 tenth 33:21 90:21 92:4 98:13 **standards** 17:1 40:20 sub-permit 87:25 **surface** 68:18 term 28:16 57:9 99:3,18 101:3,11 41:8,9,10 42:3,13 subcontractor 72:17 surpass 9:19 terms 36:3 38:7 60:9 103:24 104:5,8 42:21,23 43:2 56:21 82:13 87:20 surrounding 20:2 61:13 71:1,17 75:2 105:7 106:14 subcontractors 85:14 suspending 13:14 60:13,19 113:24 84:2 113:25 108:19 115:10 87:20 **symposium** 59:7,13 star 18:14 **tested** 42:9 117:24 118:3,5,5 **subject** 98:15 start 5:15 37:8 72:3 59:18 60:14,17 testing 30:22 44:19 120:22 121:12,21 74:6 80:12 91:11 submission 16:25 82:15 63:13 122:19 123:5,5,9 started 30:21 35:1 97:13 system 2:14 38:24 text 20:2 **thinking** 54:2 62:4,6 82:10 **submit** 18:6 25:22 42:7 thank 4:16 5:17 6:15 78:9 starting 86:13 69:10 82:19 99:2 **systems** 42:21 7:10,15 8:17,25 **third** 57:10 74:7,7,8,9 101:24 103:25 11:21,25 12:13 13:8 74:10.15 106:16 starts 36:24 T state 9:7 13:16,22 **submits** 35:13,14 16:3,7,20 31:25 **THOMAS** 2:18 T 125:2,2 67:8,15 73:11 118:6 submitted 37:12 32:16 34:2,24 46:17 thought 27:2 32:24 table 34:25 39:18 63:6 78:11 118:14 125:4 39:13 83:23 84:5 49:4 61:22 65:3 take 4:4,22 5:2,4 7:6 103:4 109:22 statistics 11:1 98:19 120:16 66:18 67:17,20 68:7 7:8,9 9:11 11:21 110:14 status 50:15 121:20 68:8 70:8 79:3,20 15:2 23:2 28:18,21 submitting 83:14 statute 73:12.22 79:21 80:2,9 84:10 three 6:2 24:12 29:18 54:24 56:7 62:22 subsequent 36:10 Statutes 114:1 94:7,10 96:3 99:9 58:5,8 60:25 61:1,3 105:14,15 118:9 Ste 1:21 60:22 100:11 101:10,11 64:17 70:5,15 82:18 122:25 stemming 96:19 substantiated 118:5 105:18 106:9 111:4 82:24 86:22 94:9 taken 48:15 57:4,14 stenographer 123:16 105:8 113:13 **successful** 34:13,18 111:15 118:8 119:8 57:21 63:16 stenographic 1:19 61:20 85:19 124:7 115:14 takes 11:23 33:5.6 125:11 succinct 96:15 thankful 9:24 threshold 71:19 stenographically **suddenly** 54:19 66:7 61:23 63:18,19 **Thanks** 18:20 28:2 threw 43:24 82:16 97:2,19 sufficient 103:5 33:11 46:18 throw 102:2 125:8 100:13 Stephanie 8:16 **suggest** 43:1 88:7 thing 25:14 41:19 thrown 59:9 talk 22:22 24:19,21 STEPHANIK 2:24 104:10 47:13 51:7 53:17 Thursday 11:15 25:11 46:23 82:17 steps 44:18 57:4,14 suggestion 103:16 54:16 65:14,20 tied 13:15,22 50:21 85:4 57:21 63:15 83:13 suggests 20:13 72:22 77:20 102:23 50:22 **talked** 59:11 stick 73:22 **Sullivan** 2:18 14:15 103:21 106:16 time 8:7 9:15,15,19 talking 9:6 25:9 35:6 **Stoneman** 30:8 32:9 summarize 111:16 things 16:18 20:5 9:22,23 11:23 17:3 49:14 63:2 71:2 stop 86:10 summarized 17:8 23:7 39:19 46:6 17:10 22:12,12 77:8 81:12 98:4 stopped 62:5 19:14 56:23 66:6 68:9,23 23:17 28:24 35:16 120:13.13 straight 82:6 **summary** 33:3 97:22 69:16 72:11 74:3 35:21,23 36:3,21 **tangible** 62:1,3 Stranahan 65:15 117:12 76:14,23 80:11 41:3 42:20 47:3 task 16:4 37:21 50:4 strategic 47:6 50:25 **summer** 50:10 105:4,21 106:2,9 51:25 56:15 60:12 79:23 51:18 52:7 54:10 Sun-Sentinel 3:11 108:1 109:5 114:22 71:18 72:1 75:2,5,8 team 8:7 17:7 38:9,14 67:7 **Superintendent** 8:24 think 8:6 15:24 18:13 77:8 82:20 83:21 43:23 79:8 93:20,21 strictly 55:3 15:2 55:18 56:6,16 22:14 23:2 29:3 89:10 95:6,13,15 113:22 **struck** 29:5 Superintendent's 31:10,10 32:10,23 98:25 99:5 100:2

103:5 106:12 107:1 63:3 70:18 82:22 62:13 waits 35:13,14 weakness 20:11 units 72:24 73:1 107:11 108:13 85:7 89:13 91:23 Walsh 23:14 25:3 Wednesday 110:2 27:11 34:22 49:5 111:16.17 117:19 92:14 97:23 98:5 **unmute** 9:12 18:16 week 13:17 38:15 86:21 87:9 102:20 weeks 58:3 63:19 118:3,7,10 120:11 108:17 96:21 121:23 122:6,16,21 **TUNNERMANN unmuted** 18:10,17 103:16 106:7 114:17 121:25 122:25 2:12 unnecessary 56:1 119:16 121:15 welcome 30:15 **timeframe** 68:24 97:5 turn 38:3 65:8 121:8 unwilling 56:2 122:19 welfare 16:1 121:8 turned 61:24 85:11 **update** 109:7 Walsh's 37:25 went 17:10 50:10,19 timeframes 69:9 **turning** 37:19 76:18 **updated** 6:6 42:4 want 11:21,25 15:12 114:11 116:19 tweaks 42:6 91:1 24:21 27:8 31:18 timeline 36:10 58:2 weren't 21:4 36:20 63:17,24 64:1,3 32:5 42:14 43:11 twelve 14:25 updating 42:7 39:12 40:3 41:21 69:18,20 120:15 twice 90:17 **usage** 16:24 50:11 52:2 54:13,14 56:14,15,17 63:1 timelines 84:3 two 5:24 7:4 11:7 use 38:25 72:18 73:11 66:14 68:9,14 70:21 65:18 timely 85:12,20 19:19 21:18 23:7 73:21 100:19,21 71:23,24 78:4 79:4 whatsoever 51:15 times 10:4,6 47:8,16 24:9 28:23 34:21 124:6 86:7,10,11 91:16,16 white 29:25 122:10 **useful** 101:12 94:11 95:14 96:12 WILLIAMS 3:5 36:18 38:5 46:25 willing 15:2 27:3 today 8:6 13:4 14:3 49:18,21 50:19,22 usual 121:22 96:13 99:10 101:7 Wilma 48:19 23:3,11 47:8 62:8 58:7 62:22 76:19,19 **usually** 82:18 101:22,23,25 90:22 95:3 101:23 80:24,25 81:1 97:17 utilized 51:12 105:20,20 114:23 wish 5:2 7:6 103:9.12.12 104:23 98:21 99:4,5,5 **utilizing** 70:16 117:25 119:8 wondering 29:22 31:9 99:22 105:22 115:7 101:2 105:22 122:17  $\mathbf{V}$ 121:24 wanted 13:2 19:12 106:14 109:5 113:7 Woods 15:11 various 84:7 told 54:17 65:22 115:1 116:7 121:25 28:6 34:22 47:15 word 28:21 vendor 42:8 88:14 113:6 122:11 two-thirds 74:12,18 65:10,25 66:23 worded 115:16 **verbatim** 123:17 67:25 93:25 102:17 **TOLENTINO** 2:14 types 67:11 115:23 words 124:6 verbose 99:8 tomorrow 16:4 typically 82:16,24 wanting 7:8 work 11:6 16:22 17:5 verify 45:17 wants 37:15 56:7 27:24 30:15,18 ton 77:10 U versus 35:22 74:2 top 58:5 81:25 72:3 83:3 31:13 44:17 72:13 Uh 24:20 **VICE** 2:5 **topic** 60:4 warranty 57:18,19 77:16 78:3 79:14 **Uh-huh** 40:10 41:4 video-conference **topics** 60:15 59:20,25 60:4 64:16 81:16 89:2,11 90:17 124:8 125:9 43:17 total 28:8 29:10 35:2 Washington 58:14 94:24 107:14 112:3 **ultimately** 38:1,10 view 12:25 84:2 35:9,21,23 36:23 wasn't 22:21 51:7 112:8 113:16 112:9 virtual 1:15 13:3.25 97:1.12 waste 117:19 118:3.7 119:13 unbelievable 100:24 14:24 107:9 109:8 touch 89:5 watched 80:13 **worked** 67:8 underlying 55:22 109:10 touching 89:8 way 10:5 30:20 77:2 working 14:14 58:24 understand 11:2 virtual-versus-quo... town 21:25 90:9 91:19 94:5 73:15 85:11 93:20 32:23 49:9 56:4 14:12 **trace** 50:5 102:24 107:7 93:23 59:18 60:5 62:1,5 virtually 12:21 15:1 track 65:6 86:7,12 115:15,16 workload 76:4 103:16 106:8 visit 45:16 **tracking** 16:24 51:10 we'll 11:6 14:4 26:17 works 93:10,10 122:21 visiting 45:23 traction 61:21 50:7 64:3 94:23 workshop 17:12 understanding 28:9 visits 19:5 **training** 10:19 11:5,6 110:17,17 119:13 world 71:12 30:19,24 34:12,17 voice 68:14 transcript 125:10 120:20 123:5 worth 67:11 44:14,16 voices 44:2 transmission 119:5 we're 93:15 wouldn't 15:7,8 unfortunate 48:15 **volume** 70:24 **TRAVIS** 3:11 we've 9:16 19:1 23:19 22:24 28:16 39:6 118:6 voting 10:9,11 true 81:20 125:10 43:9,10,10,12 46:1 40:11 76:12 88:15 unfortunately 30:5 **try** 54:20 61:18 110:4 46:4 58:12,13 64:17 122:16  $\mathbf{W}$ **UNIDENTIFIED** 110:17,18,19,25 69:12 72:14 73:13 wrapped 74:1 wait 22:5 39:22 91:7 18:10,12,15 22:17 124:4 73:15,23 74:6 75:6 write 63:20,21 118:25 26:10,13 34:1 62:13 trying 13:18,23 22:11 75:16 78:11,12,13 writing 23:10 55:14 waiting 89:19,24,25 86:15 98:23 24:2 37:21 59:17 78:13 79:11 82:7 59:2,3 63:16 120:17 120:24 unintelligible 44:3 60:5 61:25 62:5 89:21 92:25 114:15 122:25 123:4,7,13

				Page 141
written 19:24 22:7	<b>16</b> 36:4 51:21 52:11	99:22	<b>52</b> 13:16	
27:1,22 34:15 39:17	116:8	<b>27th</b> 113:7 125:12	<b>5219</b> 113:2,8	
63:11 104:21 105:2	<b>17</b> 51:21 52:11 81:3,6	29th 114:4	<b>5234</b> 113:8	
107:14 119:20	81:7,18	<b>2A</b> 51:17 52:1	<b>53</b> 91:10	
	*	<b>2B</b> 52:13	<b>58</b> 83:18	
120:6,6	<b>18</b> 64:14,20 71:5,6		36 63:16	
wrong 33:1 92:22	81:21,24,25 87:12	2C 55:16	6	
wrote 85:18 109:6	116:12	<b>2D</b> 57:3	6 122:24	
X	<b>19</b> 62:6 84:11	3	<b>6.3</b> 20:15	
	<b>19th</b> 107:4			
Y	<b>1A</b> 39:10	<b>3.05</b> 43:19	<b>6.4.3.5</b> 20:16	
yeah 5:15 7:9,13	<b>1B</b> 24:13,14	<b>3.2</b> 43:18	<b>6.4.3.6</b> 20:18	
14:14 15:13 18:15	1st 73:11 83:18 88:4	<b>3:15</b> 68:10	60 18:9,21	
	89:4 90:4 110:22	<b>3:48</b> 94:12	633 1:21	
18:15 33:10 37:16	123:2	<b>30</b> 77:14 106:12	<b>66</b> 74:13	
42:1 46:4,14 62:16		112:5	<b>67</b> 97:9	
86:8,16 92:17 95:4	2	<b>30-day</b> 112:2	<b>69</b> 13:15,20	
97:23 120:20	<b>2</b> 73:10,14,14,18,21	<b>300</b> 31:23	7	
year 48:4 56:18 58:9	73:23 81:15	<b>304</b> 36:23		
64:15,18,19 112:1	<b>2:00</b> 1:12	<b>30th</b> 49:8 109:24	<b>7</b> 101:1,2	
year's 20:11	<b>2:12</b> 14:4	110:8	<b>70</b> 29:20 62:11	
years 24:9 29:7 34:16	<b>20</b> 62:7 75:20 86:3,19	<b>310</b> 97:12	<b>74</b> 83:19 88:4 90:19	
34:16 36:4,19 42:4	87:7 96:22 97:8	<b>33316</b> 1:22	<b>75</b> 26:21 37:1	
43:13 48:15,19	101:1 103:18 117:1	<b>35</b> 77:14 81:10	<b>7th</b> 122:23	
65:17,21 69:13	<b>20/'21</b> 69:1	<b>353</b> 101:2		
101:2 105:22 106:4	<b>200</b> 1:21	<b>37</b> 91:6	8	
<b>yep</b> 41:17 44:1,1	<b>2013</b> 47:8,11,17 48:6	<b>396</b> 31:17 101:1	<b>80</b> 28:8,13 75:20	
YVONNE 3:5	49:9 66:3 80:14	<b>3C</b> 78:18 93:14	84:21	
	<b>2014</b> 50:10 51:16	<b>3rd</b> 1:21	<b>8B</b> 10:9	
Z	56:15 70:20		<b>8th</b> 10:25 12:18 104:4	
	<b>2015</b> 20:7,8 21:4 36:4	4	105:1 110:22	
0	40:2 41:20 51:21	<b>4</b> 14:20 15:23 23:20	119:12 122:22	
	52:10 59:7,10,11,19	71:20 73:9,12,14,18		
1	60:12,13 62:4,12	73:21 94:13,15	9	
<b>1-A</b> 39:20	63:11,14	<b>4-million</b> 77:18	<b>9/14</b> 109:14	
10 33:5	<b>2016</b> 40:22 41:16	<b>4:09</b> 111:16		
<b>100</b> 73:25,25 74:1,13	61:25	<b>4:15</b> 94:21,23		
74:14	<b>2017</b> 42:11	<b>4:17</b> 117:11		
<b>1001</b> 14:20 15:22,23	<b>2018</b> 21:6,8 22:2,21	<b>4:19</b> 119:6		
<b>10th</b> 11:15	36:8,12 40:4 41:22	<b>4:20</b> 94:19,20 111:18		
<b>11</b> 17:25 21:5 45:17	42:5,17 62:6 63:14	<b>4:25</b> 1:12 124:9		
115:14	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<b>4:30</b> 95:17 96:2		
<b>11th</b> 6:5 17:12	<b>2019</b> 36:8	<b>4.</b> 30 93.17 90.2 <b>40</b> 92:4,13		
<b>12</b> 19:14 21:7 32:18	<b>2020</b> 1:11 125:12	<b>400</b> 33:6 98:1		
115:24	<b>2021</b> 57:6,15 63:18			
<b>12-month</b> 64:16	64:4	<b>400-some</b> 31:23 <b>413</b> 114:7		
<b>132</b> 81:8 84:8	<b>21</b> 38:4			
<b>13th</b> 9:3 17:10	<b>23</b> 86:15 87:1	<b>43</b> 92:4		
<b>14</b> 38:5 52:14,15 57:8	<b>241</b> 51:3	<b>45</b> 68:11		
<b>14th</b> 1:11 4:18 5:23	<b>243</b> 97:11	<b>48</b> 84:22		
10:16,22 121:24	<b>25th</b> 10:24 23:1 39:13	4th 5:20		
<b>15</b> 101:20 103:18	39:14 121:21	5		
105:14,15	<b>26</b> 84:22 85:17,24			
103.17,13		<b>5:30</b> 96:5		
	-	-	-	-